CANADA

HOUSE OF COMMONS DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

THIRD SESSION—TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

19 Elizabeth II

VOLUME I, 1970

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE EIGHTH DAY OF OCTOBER, 1970,
TO THE TWELFTH DAY OF NOVEMBER, 1970, INCLUSIVE

INDEX ISSUED IN A SEPARATE VOLUME

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

Available from Information Canada, Ottawa, Canada

23226—1½

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, October 8, 1970

THIRD SESSION—TWENTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT—OPENING

The Parliament which had been prorogued on the seventh day of October, 1970, met this day at Ottawa for the dispatch of business.

The House met at ten-thirty o'clock, the Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Speaker read a communication from the Secretary to the Governor General, announcing that His Excellency the Governor General would proceed to the Senate chamber at 10.30 a.m. on this day, for the purpose of formally opening the third session of the twenty-eighth Parliament of Canada.

• (10:50 a.m.)

A message was delivered by Lieutenant Colonel A. Fortier, Assistant Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker with the House went up to the Senate chamber.

• (11:40 a.m.)

And the House being returned to the Commons chamber:

* * *

[*Translation*]

OATHS OF OFFICE

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 1, respecting the administration of oaths of office.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

* * *

[*English*]

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that when the House did attend His Excellency the Governor General this day in the Senate chamber, His Excellency was pleased to make a speech to both Houses of Parliament. To prevent mistakes, I have obtained a copy, which is as follows:

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

I have the honour to welcome you to the Third Session of the 28th Parliament of Canada and to present, on behalf of my Government, various matters which it wishes to lay before you.

Before proceeding, I should like to recall to your minds a few events of the year which have been of special significance in our national life.

The Northwest Territories, which comprise 40 per cent of our land and water, and the "Keystone" Province of Manitoba, have each celebrated the one hundredth anniversary of their entry into Canada.

They were greatly encouraged in these exercises, and Canada as a whole was delighted by the presence of our gracious Queen and The Duke of Edinburgh, accompanied for the first time by The Prince of Wales and Princess Anne. The Royal Family travelled extensively in the Northwest Territories and visited a great many Manitoba communities, ending with an enthusiastic send-off from Winnipeg. In Ottawa we were all pleased to play host for two days to Prince Charles, a friendly and interested guest.

The interest of Canada as a whole in these centennials was shown in many ways, including a Session of the Cabinet in Winnipeg, individual visits by the Prime Minister and other Canadians in public life, and by the participation of my wife and myself.

Our own travels in the Western Arctic and in the Yukon Territory enabled us to round out our tours of all the Provinces and Territories.

Next year British Columbia, which extended the Canadian Federation to the Pacific Coast in 1871, will mark the centennial of this historic event. It will give Canadians much satisfaction to know that Her Majesty and The Duke of Edinburgh, accompanied by Princess Anne, will visit the Province in early May and join in the centennial celebration.

We gather here today within a few hours of the conclusion of the Second Session of this Parliament. In a real sense, the interval between the second and third sessions cannot be measured in terms of hours or days. The Third Session of the 28th Parliament commences in the decade of the seventies, a decade which we dare not assume will be a continuation of the past. The passing of the sixties and the beginning of the seventies reminds us that Canada faces a new age; an age which will be subject to forces not all of which are yet comprehended or understood, forces which will proceed from external as well as internal origins. It is a new age not so much because of changed circumstances, but new because of changed values and attitudes.

Because of the clash between these new values and the old, because of the quest by the young and the disillusioned for some resolution of attitudes, we live in a period of tenseness and unease. It is an age frequented by violence as desperate men seek ill-defined goals; an age of frustration as gentle men question impatiently old assumptions. It is an age in which the life-support systems of the biosphere may collapse unless man reverses his present course and begins again to live in harmony, rather than in competition, with his environment. It is an age in which the forces of science and technology now in motion are so massive, so swift, and so comprehensive that man may be facing his last opportunity to control his own destiny rather than be subject to it.

The decade of the seventies extends beyond our present vision, yet the momentum of change is already so overwhelming that man can no longer afford the luxury of reacting to events. He must anticipate and plan. He must accept that contentment and indifference are illusory; that the most dramatic reality is change; that there is more need than ever before to preserve as constant values truth, honesty, excellence and relevance; that a society which is not inspired by love and compassion is not worthy of the name.

We are entering an age of tension, an age of challenge, an age of excitement. At the threshold of the seventies a choice is

open to Canadians as it is open to few persons in few countries. With foresight and stamina and enterprise, ours may be, if we wish it;

—a society in which human differences are regarded as assets, not liabilities;

—a society in which individual freedom and equality of opportunity remain as our most cherished possessions;

—a society in which the enjoyment of life is measured in qualitative, not quantitative terms;

—a society which encourages imagination and daring, ingenuity and initiative, not coldly and impersonally for the sake of efficiency, but with warmth and from the heart as between friends.

As Canada moves into the seventies, we are all invited to join in this bold enterprise—to share the excitement, to face the challenge, to pursue the distant ideal of a just society.

The Canada of the seventies must continue to be a land for people; a country in which freedom and individualism are cherished and nurtured; a society in which the Government lends its strength to withstand, rather than support the pressures for conformity.

One of the greatest of the challenges to individuality comes from the increasing pressures of urban living. It is estimated that eighty per cent of the population of Canada will be resident in a few large cities by the end of this century. By comparison with the recent past, this is a new face of Canada bringing with it a new accumulation of problems. One of those problems is the need for adequate housing, another the provision of the many services necessary in an urban environment. Much progress has already been attained in these areas, but much more remains to be done. To solve the problems will require an ever-increasing share of the nation's financial resources; not to solve them, to permit unmanaged growth, would result in an unacceptable drain of the nation's human resources. To foster coordination of the activities of all levels of government, and to contribute to sound urban growth and development, the Government proposes the re-organization of its urban activities under the direction of a Minister of State for Urban Affairs and Housing. The Government seeks, by making rational its efforts in these fields, and through consultation with those most directly concerned, to help Canadians reach and implement the decisions that will determine their urban future.

There exists in Canada a great wealth of untapped and uncoordinated scientific talent and experience not now adequately utilized in the quest for solutions to our modern problems. In order to serve better the industrial and technological sectors of our economy, as well as Canada at large, a programme will be introduced to gather and focus these sometimes divergent and competitive scientific resources. In this respect the Government will consider with care measures recommended by the Senate Committee on Science Policy and the Science Council of Canada.

A society is said to be judged best by the compassion and the fairness with which it treats those of its members who breach or are accused of breaching the norms of conduct which it establishes for itself. The Canadian record in this respect is of a high standard, but not so high that it can withstand all criticism. You will be asked, therefore, to consider further measures intended to continue the reform of the law in these areas. Legislation has been prepared which deals with bail and pretrial detention, and with the treatment of young offenders.

Norms of conduct are never static, however, and certainly not at present. A society which cherishes the concept of freedom of individual rights must be prepared constantly to assess the effect and extent of changing attitudes, no matter how distressing or disturbing the re-evaluation may be to some persons. Previously accepted postures are under attack in Canada and require study in several areas. The Government accepts its responsibility in this process. The report of the Commission of Inquiry into the Non-Medical Use of Drugs, expected within the next few months, will require careful study and discussion. The Government proposes to make time available during this session for discussion of still another controversial issue. It proposes a special debate on abortion.

To ignore the undoubted widespread challenges to present laws in these fields would be dishonest. You will be invited, therefore, to participate, in the examination of these important questions. You will be asked as well to give consideration to the report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women when once this is received.

Fortunately, not all aspects of Canadian life are subject to such differences of opinion, and the need for legislation in certain sectors is widely recognized. Two such sectors, immense in size and largely overlapping, are those of the consumer and the employee. Every Canadian is a consumer of goods and services, millions of Canadians are employees. To face today's competitive marketing system, the consumer requires protection in a number of respects. Measures will be introduced, therefore, to protect Canadians more adequately from the results of combines, mergers and unfair trade practices, to regulate the labelling and packaging of consumer goods, and to protect further the users of consumer credit.

Because the Canadian work force is growing in size and sophistication, and operating within an increasingly integrated industrial environment, present measures must be amended to meet changing social requirements. You will be asked, therefore, to approve a revised legal framework for labour-management relations and a new set of labour standards for industries within federal jurisdiction. Sweeping changes in the field of unemployment insurance will be proposed in a bill designed to widen considerably both the benefits offered and the persons who are qualified to take advantage of them. These measures will make more rational and more fair the assistance available to those temporarily without employment. The legislation is a product of the careful study of this subject tabled in Parliament last session in the form of a white paper.

A number of other studies of this same nature have been underway in past months as well. These reflect Government planning for the Canada of the seventies. Parliament will be invited to examine in this session a number of white papers in such diverse fields as communications, citizenship, immigration, national defence, and income security policy.

The Government is pleased at the widespread and largely constructive public response to its invitation to comment upon the proposals contained in its white paper on tax reform. The views of those who have participated in this exercise are being examined and carefully considered, as will those of the two Parliamentary Committees. Thereafter, legislation will be introduced incorporating policies designed to make more equitable the economic burden shared by our fellow dwellers in this complex and varied land. These taxation measures are part of the Government's pledge to utilize the wealth of Canada for the good of all Canadians and not just for those fortunate enough to be shielded by the protective apparatus of giant corporations, alert professional organizations or powerful labour unions.

It remains the goal of the Government to be concerned with the production of wealth. It also remains the goal of the Government that Canadians be given the opportunity to enjoy that wealth. Income security programmes offer one means by which this latter goal can be attained. To this end legislation will be introduced.

All our efforts for a stable prosperity and for a humane community will be of little value to us, however, if we do not quickly and determinedly grapple with the threat to our well-being and the well-being of future generations of Canadians which is represented by environmental pollution. Pollution is a many-headed hydra and requires action in many forms. You will be asked to consider bills intended to deal with pollution in two of its aspects: in the ocean and in the atmosphere. More pressing than any single step or steps, however, is the need to co-ordinate and consolidate our efforts in an effective fashion. There will be proposed the establishment of a department to be concerned with the environment and the husbanding of those renewable resources that are a part of and dependent upon it, with a mandate for the protection of the biosphere.

However worthy our goals, and however strong our will to attain them, they will nevertheless be denied to us in whole or in part should our economy be malfunctioning. It would be irresponsible to suggest that the economy is now in a satisfactory condition. When costs rise more rapidly than productivity, when men and women are unable to gain employment, when a reasonable distribution of the wealth of Canada is denied to certain sectors or regions, then these are matters for deep concern. Fortunately, our population, the number of Canadians engaged in productive employment, the total volume of goods and services which they produce, and Canadian exports all continue to grow.

Export sales of grains, so important to Canada's economic well-being, are exhibiting a steadily rising trend in marked contrast to the very stagnant situation a year ago. The LIFT program has removed a substantial portion of the accumulated wheat surplus which was inhibiting the international wheat market, and has encouraged a healthy diversification of agricultural activities. The unanimous support accorded the Goverment's initiative in the development of national marketing agencies by the First Ministers at their recent meeting assures continued cooperation between both levels of government. That cooperation will provide a basis for improved marketing structures for agricultural commodities, which will benefit both producers and consumers in almost all segments of agricultural endeavour. The Government will continue to introduce programmes designed to improve the market potential for agricultural produce and to assist in the adjustment to changes in this vital sector of our economy.

Canadian industry is responding to the challenges of growth and of adaptation to a changing world environment. Our exports in past months have achieved record heights. In an attempt to place the textile industry on a competitive footing, legislation to facilitate adjustment of that industry will be introduced this session.

We are not yet free of inflationary pressures but there has been real progress and price increases have abated to the extent that the Canadian record in the battle against inflation is superior to that so far attained in any other western country. In the result it has been possible for the past several months to moderate certain monetary and fiscal restraints. Unemployment remains distressingly high in some parts of Canada although the rate has not increased significantly in recent months, and measures to encourage regional economic expansion in areas of slower development are beginning to show results. Soundly based growth, which is prerequisite for increased permanent employment opportunities, will continue to be encouraged and will reflect success to the extent that restraint is exercised by all Canadians in the cost area, and that improved productivity strengthens the position of Canada in external trade.

In sum, the vitality of the economy, coupled with present governmental policies, is countering slowly but effectively the pressures of inflation and unemployment. So long, however, as Canadians who desire work are unable to find it; so long as persons on fixed incomes are unable to provide adequately for themselves and their dependents; then so long must the Government strive to assist them.

It must do so even as it acknowledges and weighs the concern expressed increasingly by Canadians about the extent and the nature of foreign ownership in the Canadian economy. Legislation dealing with one aspect of this complex problem, the uranium industry, will be introduced for your consideration.

All these matters require your earnest consideration even as the events of the world beyond our borders demand our constant attention. Canadians have long realized that they represent but a single segment of a larger world community. The political, economic and social health of Canada cannot be maintained should infection of either a primary or secondary nature be rampant in the world at large. The Government continues, therefore, to direct its efforts in increasing measures to those tasks where Canadian initiative and Canadian competence may prove to be as effective as has other Canadian enterprise in the past. Much of this effort is expended within the framework of the United Nations, celebrating this year a quarter century as the conscience and the hope of mankind. In such diverse but important fields as disarmament, environmental protection, economic development planning, the creation of new international legal structures for the deep oceans and outer space, and international security, we work and remain committed to a world in which peace, social progress and the dignity of man will be the norm and not the exception as is now too often the case.

An economy that is in need of adjustment; a society beset by a variety of tensions; an environment that has been abused and degraded; an international community that is under intense pressures—these are the problems that demand our urgent attention. But of those that are basically Canadian, none is insoluble. None takes the form of those dilemmas or irreconcilable issues which elsewhere fire the violence of despair. Notwithstanding its difficulties, Canada continues to enjoy social stability to an exceptional degree.

This stability is not simply a matter of luck. Good fortune is a factor, but we should accept gracefully the fact that we are also more amenable to reason and, perhaps, more capable of wise decision than we are normally willing to admit. The burden of our European inheritance and our fascination with our American neighbour tend often to distract us and cause us to be unaware of that reasonableness and that wisdom. We forget to our own disadvantage, for these are traits that have made Canada a land of freedom. Canadians should pause on occasions such as this to reflect that their country is regarded by others with envy. It is a high place of liberty in the world. It is held in esteem because in Canada respect is paid to the individual; privacy and freedom of thought are honoured. Among us, each citizen, each community, finds its roots in liberty. Our national entity does not depend upon a melting pot, but is a concerted exercise of free will.

It is in this sense of liberty as a supreme value, and of tolerance as its social and political expression, that we find our foundation and strength as a people. Let us recognize with pride and with modesty what so many strangers admire and see in us: that we have achieved greatly, that in the future even greater achievements are within our reach. We have the capacity, if we retain the will, to adjust our society to reflect the values of our peoples, to benefit from a rich cultural life, to create viable political and social structures, and to strike an equilibrium with nature without which all the rest may be undone.

The conviction is growing throughout the world that if man is to survive he must strive without delay to regulate his future. This is a task which presupposes a fullness of freedom and an extensive field of human experience. Now, as we enter the decade of the seventies, Canada is free enough, vast enough, and diversified enough to undertake this task which is so vital and which will have such world-wide effects. Should we not lose our will or our nerve, this task can be accomplished and could prove to be the principal element of the Canadian fact. We stand on the threshold of greatness.

Members of the House of Commons:

During this Session, you will be asked to grant the necessary funds for the services and expenditures authorized by Parliament.

Honourable Members of the Senate:

Members of the House of Commons:

The Prime Minister will lay before you today a list of bills that will be submitted to you during the Session.

May Divine Providence guide you in your deliberations.

[*Translation*]

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister) moved:

That the speech of His Excellency the Governor General, delivered this day from the Throne to both Houses of Parliament, be taken into consideration later this day.

Bills in Speech from the Throne

[*English*]

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I just say a word on this motion. In view of the fact that Your Honour has just reported to the House that you have a copy of the Speech from the Throne, and as I believe this matter has been raised in previous sessions, I should like to make the request that once we come back from the other place and Your Honour has received a copy of the Speech from the Throne a copy should be on the desk of each member.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I think it is unfair for us to have to wait to see it in today's *Hansard*, which we shall not get until tomorrow.

An hon. Member: It isn't worth it.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Someone says, "It isn't worth it", but that is not the point. I suggest that copies be made available to all of us before we meet this afternoon and that at the opening of future sessions a copy be placed on each member's desk so that it will be available when we return from the Senate chamber.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The suggestion made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is obviously an excellent one which appears to have the support of all members of the House. I am sure that arrangements can be made, with the excellent facilities of the House of Commons, to have copies of the Speech available for the benefit of all hon. members before two o'clock this afternoon. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

• (11:50 a.m.)

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I request leave of the House to table a list of the titles of the several bills which were referred to in His Excellency's speech. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that this list be printed in today's *Hansard*.

Mr. Speaker: The Right Hon. the Prime Minister requests leave to table a list of the titles of the several bills which were referred to in His Excellency's speech and to have it printed in this day's *Hansard*. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

(Editor's Note: The list referred to above follows:)

1. A bill to amend the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act.
2. A bill to amend the Established Programs (Interim Arrangements) Act.
3. A bill to amend the Small Business Loans Act.
4. A bill to amend the Farm Improvement Loans Act.
5. A bill to amend the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act.
6. Pilotage Legislation.
7. A bill to amend the Judges Act.
8. A bill respecting Investment Companies.
9. A bill to amend the Criminal Code (Bail Reform).
10. A bill respecting the Tax Review Board.
11. A bill respecting the Canada Development Corporation.
12. A bill respecting the Maritime Code.
13. A bill to amend the Statistics Act.
14. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Control Act.
15. A bill respecting Young Offenders.
16. A bill to amend the Canada Shipping Act (Pollution).
17. Legislation relating to Income Security.
18. A bill respecting Canada Co-operative Associations.
19. A bill to amend New Zealand Trade Agreement Act.
20. A bill to amend the Export Development Act.
21. A bill to amend Canada Elections Act (Election Expenses).
22. Veterans Pension Legislation.
23. Textile Legislation.
24. A bill to amend the Combines Investigation Act.
25. Resource Administration Lines Legislation.
26. A bill respecting the C.N.R. Financing and Guarantee, 1970.
27. A bill respecting Statutory Instruments.
28. A bill to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act.
29. A bill to amend section 51 of the British North America Act.
30. Computer Facilities Ownership Legislation.
31. A bill to amend the Immigration Appeal Board Act.
32. A bill to amend the Criminal Code (Right to Privacy).
33. A bill respecting the Security Review Board.
34. A bill respecting Government Organization 1970.
35. Budget Bills.
36. Air Pollution Legislation.
37. A bill to amend the Anti Dumping Act.
38. A bill respecting the Auditor General.
39. A bill to amend the Citizenship Act.
40. A bill to amend the Canada Labour (Standards) Code.
41. A bill to amend the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act.
42. A bill respecting Consumer Packaging and Labelling.
43. A bill amending the Interest Act and the Small Loans Act.
44. A bill to amend and consolidate the Weight and Measures Act and the Units of Measurement Act.

45. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act.

46. A bill respecting the Federal Court.

47. A bill amending the Canada Grain Act.

48. A bill respecting assistance to Deuterium of Canada.

49. A bill respecting Farm Products Marketing Agencies.

50. A bill to amend the National Parks Act.

51. A bill respecting the Yukon Minerals.

52. A bill to amend the Prairie Farm Assistance Act.

53. A bill to amend the Livestock Feed Assistance Act.

54. Agriculture Adjustment Legislation.

55. A bill to amend the Buffalo-Fort Erie Public Bridge Company Act.

56. A bill to amend the Canada-Finland Income Tax Convention Act, 1959.

57. A bill respecting the Canada-Jamaica Income Tax Agreement.

58. A bill amending the Criminal Code, Omnibus Bill, (Highjacking, etc.).

59. A bill respecting Cigarette Advertising.

60. Weather Modification Legislation.

61. A bill amending Crop Insurance Act.

62. A bill amending the Australia Trade Agreement Act.

63. A bill respecting Co-operative Credit Associations.

64. A bill amending the Northern Canada Power Commission Act.

65. Grain Legislation.

66. A bill amending the Food and Drugs Act and the Narcotics Act.

67. A bill to amend the Representation Commission Act.

68. Ports Legislation.

* * *

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister) presented the following message from His Excellency the Governor General:

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons a certified copy of an Order in Council appointing the Honourable Allan Joseph MacEachen, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, the Honourable Charles Mills Drury, President of the Treasury Board, the Honourable Jean Chrétien, Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and the Honourable Donald Stovel Macdonald, Minister of National Defence, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons as commissioners for the purposes and under the provisions of the one hundred and forty-third chapter of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1952, intituled: An Act respecting the House of Commons.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES OF THE WHOLE

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale), that

Mr. Gérald Laniel, member for the electoral district of Beauharnois, be appointed acting chairman of the committees of the whole.

Motion agreed to.

[*English*]

PROVISION FOR EXTENSION OF SITTING, OCTOBER 9, 1970

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of Standing Order 2(2), the House shall meet at 11 o'clock a.m. on Friday, October 9, 1970, and that such sitting shall not be adjourned until the leaders of all parties have spoken in the Address Debate.

Motion agreed to.

SITTING SUSPENDED

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the sitting be suspended until two o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the suggestion of the Right Hon. the Prime Minister. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: This sitting stands suspended until two o'clock this afternoon.

At 11.55 a.m. the sitting of the House was suspended until 2 p.m.

SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

* * *

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

ADDRESS IN REPLY, MOVED BY MR. JACQUES-L. TRUDEL AND SECONDED BY MR. A. B. DOUGLAS

The House proceeded to the consideration of the speech delivered by His Excellency the Governor General at the opening of the session.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel (Bourassa): Mr. Speaker, some moments in life take on a very special meaning, I believe the present moment to be such a one, not only for myself, but also for my family and for all my fellow-citizens of the riding of Bourassa, whatever their political affiliation.

The honour conferred upon me by the Prime Minister and his colleagues by selecting me to move the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne is reflected on my constituency, on the urban community of Greater Montreal, and on the whole province of Quebec.

I must also point out, Mr. Speaker, the especially warm welcome of my colleagues.

In the past, it was more or less understood, that this was a wonderful opportunity for the mover of the

Address to describe the beauties and natural resources of his constituency. I can hardly fail to go along with that tradition.

This new constituency created in 1968 includes part of Ahuntsic and the whole of the city of Montreal North. To the north, it is bound by the Black River which circumscribes the riding from east to west.

In this area of the island of Montreal the population has increased from 30,000 to 130,000 inhabitants in a few years. It is made up mostly of French Canadians, but English, Italian, German, Dutch, Russian, Scandinavian, Ukranian, Polish and other citizens are to be found also. It is a young population.

The diversity of the national structures described this morning as far as bilingualism, the various standards of living and the evolution which is leading toward national unity are concerned, can surely be found in our area. As we heard in the Speech from the Throne this morning, Canada is still in the process of discovering and developing itself.

This is a reality in our area.

These first years of the seventies mark the beginning of a new era, and we must realize all the advantages we have. Our first duty, therefore, is to ensure human development and we must detect and analyze any trend that could impede the progress which is the objective of the whole society.

If I had to describe the current period in a few words, I would mention the tension, the challenge and the agitation, characteristics about which we cannot help worrying.

Aware that diversity may be our strength, and anxious to see the establishment of a just society, we must eliminate all obstacles against individual freedom, thus allowing inventiveness, initiative and creativity to bring about with warmth and cordiality the new society we are all seeking.

In my opinion, the greatest asset of the riding of Bourassa is its cosmopolitan population. This demands much from everyone because of the sudden transformation which took place in a city the geographical boundaries of which do not always coincide with the political divisions.

The common problem to most of my fellow-citizens is therefore their own adjustment to this urban society in perpetual development and this leads us to contemplate short term solutions in order to prevent the possible disruption of a society which is growing too fast.

Each level of government has offered solutions to the daily problems. May I point out some of them regarding the urban community and my own riding in particular.

Expo 67 opened, for Quebec and for Canada, a window on the world.

The international airport at Sainte-Scholastique will allow us to receive travellers and businessmen from the world over while a part of our population will be able to do the same and it will create new job opportunities for a number of our fellow-citizens.

The basic structures and services offered the general public by the municipalities and governments, provincial and federal, have also helped on the whole.

The Central Housing and Mortgage Corporation has enabled many individuals to find suitable lodging through building loans for single or multiple-unit dwellings as designed by certain companies.

In spite of tremendous efforts by all those governments, may I point out again the alienation of certain individuals in a society often at grips with endless jurisdictional quarrels to which solutions are not forthcoming.

While listening closely to the list of bills proposed in the Speech from the Throne, I noted that the same formula will be kept for discussions, consultations, and the enumeration of matters of principle, methods used with success in the case of the white paper on tax reform.

It would take too long to enumerate all the subjects proposed, but still I must point out a few, and more specifically, the amendments to the Criminal Code with regard to detention of the accused, the attitude of our society towards young delinquents, the report on the royal commission of inquiry on the status of women and the nonmedical use of drugs.

Other topics will also be of interest to us: reform of the Unemployment Insurance Act, new labour standards, fairer distribution of wealth and new legislation respecting Indians.

The speech dealt also with communications, citizenship, immigration, national defence and social policy, all of which well deserve very special attention.

Mr. Speaker, the efforts made in my riding should not be overlooked. The generation gap seems to be a general topic of conversation. Many of those who discuss that problem seem to overlook a whole group of citizens, namely those who, having reached the golden age, no longer have their place in the sun. I should like to mention at this point the solution found in the constituency of Bourassa, where 558 citizens now live in the Angelica home. I am sure that this home could serve as a model in the rest of Canada. It is located in a picturesque area, along the Back River, but close enough to all the services required by older people. It is a place where those who built in the past the buoyant society we enjoy today are given a hearty welcome.

I am sure this group of citizens will be highly pleased to hear about the increase in benefits for older people and veterans provided for in new legislative measures.

It seems that the problem facing the world in the past few years has been the fight against inflation. The constituency of Bourassa has been no exception in that matter. This dreadful calamity affects small wage earners and retired people much more than other citizens. In order to cure that inflationary psychosis, new ways had to be found which required the co-operation of all: municipalities, contractors, unions and governments, in order to give a new start. Many of those who attempted at the outset to solve that problem seemed quite pessimistic.

The last of those projects, launched by the *Société Claude Legault*, in Montreal North, provides the kind of new start I have mentioned. People were so enthusiastic about those new homes that there are already far from enough of them. Such low-priced houses seem to have aroused in all those involved in housing an awareness that was necessary to allow another segment of our

people to fulfil themselves and to raise their family in decent surroundings.

The setting up of a special secretariat entrusted to a minister without portfolio responsible for urban affairs and housing, will enable us to break new ground.

The increasing student population has also found another solution during the summer of 1970 by setting up a co-ordination bureau for summer employment applications and opportunities. Staffed by students, it has permitted a much more successful contact with those in need.

At the end of September, a public transportation project was announced for the island of Montreal, including an extension of the subway. This is undoubtedly an urgent necessity which should be met by the proposed department of municipal affairs should do it.

But I must here, Mr. Speaker, underline another feature of our society which gives rise to great problems. I mentioned the Back River which delineates the natural borders of my constituency. I cannot go on without mentioning factors which contributed to the pollution of that waterway. The urban community has already announced a major development to be implemented over a five-year period.

By setting up a department of the environment which would be responsible for the management of natural resources and which should consider introducing legislation on pollution of environment, waters and atmosphere, we would have the proper agency to deal with problems created by that river flowing through several Greater Montreal constituencies. I hope these issues will be given special priority without unduly glossing over yesterday's excuses, namely jurisdictional conflicts.

The textile industry must be given special attention. That is an area of industry which particularly affects a great number of persons who are now employed there.

The White Paper in social security, Mr. Speaker, will certainly spur further exchanges with the people so that legislation can be implemented in order to bring about concrete solutions.

These revamped social measures will enable all our fellow-citizens to forge ahead, giving better treatment to a great many and promoting the national unity which we all desire.

There is a solution to every problem.

The enactment of the pieces of legislation proposed in the Speech from the Throne will establish an atmosphere of peace and social progress, and will enhance the dignity of man by giving him full freedom, by allowing him to live new and gratifying human experiences, while taking into account the Canadian heritage in the North American context.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas):

That an Address the text of which follows, be presented to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada:

To His Excellency the Right Hon. Roland Michener, Chancellor and Principal Companion of the Order of Canada, upon whom has been conferred the Canadian Forces' Decoration, Governor General and Comander-in-Chief of Canada.

May it please Your Excellency: We, Her Majesty's most loyal and dutiful subjects, the House of Commons of Canada, in Parliament assembled, beg leave to offer our humble thanks to Your Excellency for the gracious speech which Your Excellency has addressed to both Houses of Parliament.

• (2:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, it is a great honour to be selected to second the motion for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne at the opening of the third session of Canada's twenty-eighth parliament. I am particularly pleased because the motion for the address has just been moved by the hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel), who is one of the most capable, likeable, respected and fluently bilingual members of this House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia): I have a great admiration for people who speak more than one language, and indeed I have a certain amount of envy of them. Although I have taken some French lessons I will not try to demonstrate the results of that effort here today.

As has often been said before in like circumstances, the honour that has been given to me today by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), and the government, is far from being mine alone. It is mainly a tribute to the constituency I represent, recognition of the importance of the great Canadian prairies, and an acknowledgement of the eminent position our area holds in the minds and hearts of our Prime Minister and his government, and indeed in the thoughts of Canadians everywhere.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, you will permit me to follow the usual custom of placing on the record a few remarks about the constituency of Assiniboia which it is my privilege to represent. It is one of those ridings which increased in size in the latest revision of electoral district boundaries. It is some 180 miles from east to west, and from 90 to 96 miles north to south. There are three constituencies in southern Saskatchewan bordering on the United States, and Assiniboia is the central one.

The southern boundary of Assiniboia constituency is the famous forty-ninth parallel, which forms the international line between the Canadian provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia, and the United States. With the exception of some ridings along the Great Lakes and the constituency of Yukon, the Assiniboia constituency has more miles of international boundary, 180, than any other federal electoral district. We have a close and cordial relationship with the residents of North Dakota and Montana, and I believe that the overwhelming majority of our residents would reject the doctrine of socialism—pardon me, of isolationism.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, most of us are extremely thankful that we have such a strong and friendly neighbour, and we are happy that we still have this long, undefended boundary which is unmatched any-

where else in the world. We hope that wise counsel will continue to prevail on both sides of that boundary so that we can continue to set this remarkable example of peaceful coexistence to the rest of the world.

My area is predominantly rural, with rich farm land and ranching country prevailing in most parts. We do have some unique areas which may soon be incorporated into a prairie grasslands national park. Such a park would preserve for posterity some of the great expanse of our prairie landscape in its original state, and I hope that further progress toward the establishment of such a park, in co-operation with the Saskatchewan government, will be made this year.

Agricultural production includes wheat, barley, oats, flax and many other field crops. There is increasing interest in an already thriving cattle industry, and more land is being seeded each year for pasture and forage. Large numbers of hogs, sheep and poultry are produced, and there are some fine dairy herds as well. I was pleased to note in the Speech from the Throne references to programs to improve market potential for farm products. As you know, Mr. Speaker, and as we were reminded in the Throne Speech this morning, the market for grain has improved greatly, and the outlook is for a continuation of a good demand for grain for the next year or two at least.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia): While this happy development may be partially due to world conditions, much of the credit must go to the government for the sincere interest they have demonstrated in the welfare of the grain industry. The wheat board, with the very valuable addition of Mr. Charles Gibbings as a commissioner on July 1, 1969, with the encouragement of many members of Parliament, and under the direction of Saskatchewan's cabinet minister, has done an outstanding job of seeking out and developing grain markets. As time goes on I think we will be able to appreciate even more the tremendous effort that was expended in so successfully reviving Canada's grain industry by the present Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Lang), who still retains his responsibility for the Canadian Wheat Board. It was a stroke of genius when the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) gave a prairie cabinet minister the task of building up our great grain industry to the exclusion of any other duties for nearly a year. He has really done a remarkable piece of work, and this has been recognized, and perhaps rewarded, by the addition of more responsibilities.

While prairie people are pleased to see this recognition, there is a widespread feeling that the grain industry is of sufficient importance to merit the undivided interest of a cabinet minister, and I express the hope that this will be taken into account in the course of some future re-organization in the government.

Other important factors contributing to the improved grain markets are the granting of even more generous credit terms to our customers by the government, and by a continuous expansion of our food aid programs. We hope that the foreign policy review referred to in the Speech from the Throne will include further development of these forward-looking policies.

Mention was made in the Throne Speech of measures to assist in the adjustment to changes which have been going on and will continue to take place in Canadian agriculture. I hope that such plans will be advanced by the second Canadian congress on agriculture which will be held here in Ottawa late next month. The first Canadian congress on agriculture was convened by the government in March, 1969, and it was the first time in history that a national meeting sponsored by a federal government had ever been called to discuss national agricultural problems and to attempt to define long term policy. The November congress could mark the beginning of a bright new era for the farming industry.

With regard to assistance to farmers in the adjustments that face us, we need programs to assist small farmers to attain economic units, or to retrain for other work if that is what they wish. For older farmers who are on small units there should be a plan to permit them to retire with dignity, and to continue to live on the farm if they prefer. The average realized net farm income in Canada, which is the actual take home pay, was less than $3,400 per farm last year, which means that most small operators had an even smaller income. Far less than half of the farmers in Canada earn enough to make them subject to income tax. Therefore most small operators will not have had sufficient income in recent years to make the Canada Pension Plan meaningful to them.

Because of the hardships and uncertainties in farming, especially on the Prairies, relatively few young people have entered the industry in the past 20 or 30 years. As a result, the average age of farmers in the west is well over 50 years. I hope that farm policies will be such as to make agriculture more attractive to young people.

We have in Canada one of the most efficient farm industries in the world. Agricultural output per person engaged in the industry increased 11 per cent in 1969. Each year Canadians have been spending a declining portion of their incomes on food, and each year the farmer's share of the food dollar goes down as a greater share is taken by the food processors and handlers. If we in this country wish to have a plentiful supply of good food at reasonable prices, we must adopt farm policies that will keep agriculture healthy and in the hands of capable owner-operators, a system which has amply demonstrated its efficiency.

One of the disadvantages under which farmers operate, especially in the grain growing areas, is extreme variability in income. For instance, the total realized net farm income in Saskatchewan in 1966 was $465 million. In 1967 it was $484 million, in 1968 it was $367 million, and last year at was $199 million. I hope that the programs to assist in adjustments to change in the industry mentioned in the Speech from the Throne will include a farm income maintenance plan to help smooth out these income swings which are causing so much hardship and worry to grain producers.

It appears that we may be approaching another period of expansion, and now would be a very appropriate time to initiate a plan to stabilize and maintain farm incomes

at an acceptable level. Prices for agricultural products have gone up very little in the past 20 years. In the case of grain, some prices are lower now than they were in 1949. The industry has survived because of a phenomenal increase in efficiency, unmatched by any other segment of our economy. However, we cannot count on that rate of efficiency improvement being sustained; further steps must be taken to ensure that agriculture remains viable and progressive. The very commendable action taken recently in this regard is certainly appreciated, and we look forward to favourable developments this session.

Although the new Canada Grain Act was not enacted into law earlier this week, as many of us had hoped, I trust that arrangements can be made to move it forward into this new session without losing much of the progress already made. One of the main features in that legislation is the provision which would authorize the use of protein content as an important new factor in our wheat grading system. This change is imperative so that our wheat can be fully competitive in all our grain export markets, many of which require certain standards and uniformity in protein content.

The Farm Products Marketing Agencies Act is also urgently needed by some segments of Canadian agriculture. The standing committee has not yet had sufficient time to deal fully with this bill and the many amendments that may be put forward by committee members.

I hope that all members will agree to transfer these two bills to this new session without loss of status, and that the government will do everything in its power to see that these two important pieces of legislation receive early consideration.

The government has demonstrated a sympathetic understanding of the serious problems besetting the prairie grains industry. Contributing to that understanding have been the frequent visits to Saskatchewan by many cabinet ministers. I wish to thank those who have come to our province and to the constituency of Assiniboia. We are especially grateful to the Prime Minister, who made a special effort some 15 months ago to visit farms in my area and to talk to representative farm operators and their families. I am sure that his contacts then have helped him appreciate the situation there and enabled him to support present and future plans in the field of farm policy. An invitation is hereby extended to all cabinet ministers to visit our part of the country. You will be made very welcome, whether or not it is your first visit. This invitation is always out to all parliamentarians and all residents of every province. If you come in the summer or the fall you will marvel at our open landscape, our large fields of growing or ripening grain, our ranching country and our tidy towns and cities. You will enjoy meeting the friendly people, too, I am sure.

• (2:30 p.m.)

We do have some other industries in Assiniboia constituency. There are two very productive sodium sulphate mines at Ormiston and Gladmar, and there are a considerable number of oil wells in various locations. There are some very important secondary industries in the city of Weyburn, as well as at some of the other progressive urban centres. Although some people have reservations about it, most are pleased to see construction under way on a distillery in Weyburn.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia): This will provide employment for a significant number of people and a market for hundreds of thousands of bushels of grain each year, with prospects of expansion in the future.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia): This particular industry was developed under the federal industrial incentive plan shortly after our part of Saskatchewan was designated as an eligible area. Saskatchewan is definitely an area of slow industrial growth, and I hope that all concerned will see to it that more industries will be established under this imaginative program in the future than there have been to date. Our economy is in great need of diversification and, comparatively speaking, Saskatchewan has received a very small share of the industrial incentive grants to date. I note with approval that this regional development incentive plan will be continued.

The Speech from the Throne indicated that action on tax reform will be taken in this session. People all over Canada have taken a great interest in this matter and have responded strongly to the invitation to comment on the white paper on the subject which was issued 11 months ago. This has been an exercise in democracy which is different from previous approaches by government to tax reform. As a result many people have been unable to understand or accept the government's stated intention of giving full consideration to points of view and suggestions for change which might be brought to their attention. I trust that when the legislation forecast in the Throne Speech is introduced, it will show that the government has taken into account the earnest and well documented proposals of many organizations and private citizens. In this regard, I take the liberty of quoting two sentences from the eighteenth report of the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs. Two of their principle conclusions as a result of their extensive study and hearings are, "That the tax load now borne by lower income Canadians be reduced", and "that preservation of an economic climate favourable to growth must be a central consideration of Canadian tax policy".

Both of these principles are important in western Canada, especially the one about growth. The development of the economy in the west is not nearly as far advanced as in central Canada, and we are particularly concerned about this matter. I commend those two principles to the government, as tax reform measures are being prepared for legislative action.

There has been mounting concern across our nation about the sorry state of labour-management relations. In the Prairies we are heavily dependent on the continuity of such services as grain handling and transportation. With these facilities being required to operate at full capacity in the foreseeable future, we are apprehensive about the possibility of strikes or lockouts. The indication

in the Speech from the Throne that there will be action in this session to amend the labour code and to find better methods of achieving industrial peace is very encouraging. Surely, we can devise a system which will settle disputes without resorting to the almost barbaric use of force, as epitomized in strikes and lockouts. These almost always cause more damage to third parties and to the national economy than they inflict on those who are directly involved. We must devise a more civilized approach to this serious national problem.

The Throne Speech referred to inflation. It is encouraging to note that Canada's efforts to control inflation have met with some success, indeed more success than attained in other western nations. Mention was made of a moderation of fiscal and monetary restraints. This is good news, but I hope that great care is taken to prevent another round of inflation. This economic scourge is felt more by primary producers and disadvantaged people who live on low fixed incomes than by others. It is the duty of the government to guard such people against further inflationary inroads on their already meagre incomes. I was glad that the Throne Speech indicated that all Canadians will continue to be urged to exercise restraint in the area of prices and costs.

Reference was made in the speech to the review of our national welfare and income maintenance programs. I hope that this will culminate in some action in this session to provide more assistance to those in unfortunate circumstances. I have particularly in mind those who are living on small pensions and those who are unemployed.

Since we are all consumers, we welcome the forecast that there will be legislation to give added protection to Canadians against unfair trade practices and against deceptive or confusing labelling and packaging of consumer products. Consumer credit and interest rates are to receive attention as well, and this will be appreciated by many people.

Even on the wide expanses of the Prairies, we are concerned about pollution. It is a national problem of mounting proportions which is disturbing most Canadians. Although the danger is not as imminent and pervasive in the west, we have instances of pollution that have served to make many of us acutely aware of this threat to our environment. I therefore welcome the news that a new department of government will be established to co-ordinate our national effort to cope with pollution in its many forms. Economic issues have little significance if we lose our heritage of clean water, fresh air, and pure food by neglecting to deal with the multitude of threats that beset us. Canada owes a debt of gratitude to those citizens, to those Members of Parliament, and to those government officials who have taken an interest in this serious matter. The government is to be commended for taking such prompt action to do an effective job in organizing, in order to control or prevent the pollution of our environment.

Another important subject alluded to in the Throne Speech was the creation of a branch of government to deal with urban affairs and housing. This will fill a genuine and widely felt need as our nation becomes more and more urbanized. We cannot, as a nation, afford to ignore the very real problems with which our cities are struggling.

The government has shown great initiative and flexibility, as well as awareness of public opinion, in making these significant new moves in administering our national affairs, which I am sure will be approved by a majority of Canadians.

The Throne Speech made reference to plans for greater co-ordination of our scientific and technical resources. Some of us have been concerned that research and development in Canada has lacked impetus and direction. We have felt that there have been gaps and overlaps in our research work. It is gratifying to learn that steps will be taken soon to ensure that improvements will be made in this field which is vital to our future. May I introduce a suggestion for early investigation? It is the possible conversion of farm products, a renewable resource, into motor fuel. Some authorities state that the world's petroleum resources may not last very long, so we should be concerned about searching for another source of fuel for our ever-growing number of motors.

The government's concern for the rights of individuals is again evident in the announcement that there will be further reform in the criminal law in this session. Improvements in our system of pre-trial detention and bail, and our treatment of young offenders will be proposed. This will be applauded by all who are concerned about the proper and fair administration of justice.

The speech dealt with the work of the United Nations, and Canada's support of that institution. World peace is the outstanding issue of our times. We in Canada must do everything in our power to strengthen this instrument of international negotiation and international law. The United Nations has been in existence for 25 years, and during that time it has been successful in preventing a third world war. With the genuine support of people of all nations, it can grow in power and influence and it can keep our civilization from destroying itself. We pray that, God willing, it will succeed.

There were references in the Speech from the Throne to the Manitoba centennial this year, which was marked by visits from the Queen and the Royal Family and by the Governor General. May I take this opportunity to congratulate my neighbouring province on the very successful and impressive celebrations that were held.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (2:40 p.m.)

Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia): We were also informed that British Columbia would be celebrating 100 years in Confederation in 1971, and that The Queen and The Duke of Edinburgh will visit that fine province in May. I know that B.C. people will have a great year, and I congratulate them in advance.

Saskatchewan is staging a special celebration next year as well. It is called "Homecoming '71". All former Saskat-

chewan residents are invited to return some time in 1971 for a visit. A similar event was very popular in 1955 when Saskatchewan had its 50th anniversary as a province, and it was felt that there should be another homecoming in 1971. Whether you are a former Saskatchewanite or not, you are invited to come to Saskatchewan in 1971, even if it is just on the way to or from British Columbia.

Canada is a great country, and we Canadians are the most fortunate people in the world. The Speech from the Throne challenged us to work together to create an even greater country, where we can continue to enjoy, and enhance, our heritage of individual freedom, equality of opportunity, and the scope we have to exercise our initiative, our ingenuity, and our imagination.

Let us get on with the tasks which lie ahead with energy and optimism, rather than gloom and foreboding. A former Governor General, that devoted and highly respected Canadian, the late Mr. Georges Vanier, is credited with the following statement:

> People do not age by living a number of years. I am convinced we grow old only by deserting our ideals. We are in fact, as old as our doubts and despairs, but we are as young as our faith and our hope, especially faith and hope in our youth, which is after all, the same as saying our faith and our hope in our country's future.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by again expressing my gratitude at having been given this privilege today and I now take pleasure in seconding the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne which was so ably moved by the hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel).

On motion of Mr. Stanfield, the debate was adjourned.

On motion of the Right Hon. Mr. Trudeau, the House adjourned at 2.47 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, October 9, 1970

The House met at 11 a.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

REFERENCE OF WHITE PAPER AND EVIDENCE ADDUCED TO STANDING COMMITTEE ON LABOUR, MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, there have been some discussions about continuing the work of certain committees and in particular the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration with regard to unemployment insurance. If there is general consent, I wonder whether the following could be made an order of the House:

That the White Paper entitled "Unemployment Insurance in the 70's" laid before the House, June 17, 1970, and the evidence adduced by the committee in its study of the aforementioned matter during the second session of the 28th parliament be referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the acting House leader is correct in assuming that there is general agreement that this be made an order of the House. In fact, it is in keeping with the request of the standing committee in the last session. I would just like to express the hope that if there is any delay in dealing with the white paper and the legislation to follow on the subject the government will consider bringing in interim legislation regarding unemployment insurance benefits so that in the intervening time adequate benefits will be available to meet the situation that may obtain this winter. Perhaps some time soon the government might indicate whether the bill listed by the Prime Minister yesterday, specified as a bill to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, is such an interim bill or whether it is the major bill to be introduced later.

Mr. Baldwin: Maybe he will put out a white paper on that.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the suggestion made by the acting House leader. Is it the pleasure of the House to agree to this proposal?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ABDUCTION OF SENIOR BRITISH TRADE COMMISSIONER—PRESENT SITUATION

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to direct a question on another subject to the Minister of Finance, but first of all I wonder whether the right hon. Prime Minister has anything further he can tell the House in connection with the Cross case.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON MEASURES TO COMBAT UNEMPLOYMENT

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Finance whether he has in mind proposing any concrete measures to combat the threat of rising unemployment this winter? If so, could he indicate very briefly what these measures are, because none were mentioned in the Speech from the Throne?

Mr. Speaker: The statement to be made by the minister should be very brief. I appreciate the form in which the statement is suggested because normally if it were to be an extended statement it would have to be made on motions.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): I will be saying something about this matter in a statement to be made during the throne speech debate.

Mr. Stanfield: When he makes his statement, will the minister be prepared to detail the measures that the government intends to propose, and would he also undertake to indicate clearly the direction in which the government intends to guide the economy?

Mr. Benson: My hon. friend will have to wait for my statement.

* * *

FINANCE

LOWERING OF INTEREST RATES—SUGGESTED MEETING WITH BANKS

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, as the minister has now had an opportunity to consider the suggestion I made the other day—he said he would consider it—of approaching the chartered banks and suggesting to them that there is no justifiable excuse for not starting to lower interest rates as the Bank of Canada and United States chartered banks have done, would he answer my question now and advise us whether he has considered calling a meeting of chartered banks to tell them that they should get on with the job of lowering interest rates in Canada without further delay?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): I have considered the matter and decided against it.

* * *

MANPOWER

DEPARTMENTAL FORECASTS OF WINTER UNEMPLOYMENT LEVELS

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration if I can get his attention. Can the minister in his new role inform the House whether or not his department has conducted any studies involving the forecasting of unemployment levels this winter and, if so, would he consider tabling such studies?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the department, of course, is constantly reviewing the situation. I shall have to look into the question of whether there is anything that would be suitable for tabling at this time.

ALLEGED CURTAILMENT OF ADULT TRAINING COURSES

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Has a directive gone out to the Manpower offices asking them to curtail applications from unemployed people to take adult training courses in view of the great pressure on the budget because of the high unemployment rate?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I doubt very much whether any such directive has gone out, but I shall check.

* * *

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO FOREIGN CONSORTIUM TO RE-OPEN BAFFIN ISLAND IRON MINES

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Are any plans being considered by his department for the granting of financial assistance to a consortium of South African and American corporations to re-open the iron mines on Baffin Island?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, we are studying the Merry River project undertaken on Baffin Island. We have not yet defined any final policy. The interested companies are in contact with the experts of my department, and if they submit a definite plan, we shall see what the government can do to help them.

[Mr. Hees.]

As far as I am concerned, I would like to see this important iron ore deposit developed one day. This would allow for the creation of many permanent jobs for the native population of the area.

[*English*]

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In view of the fact that seven out of the eleven companies now undertaking development in the Northwest Territories are foreign-owned, would the minister undertake to make a statement to the House on motions before this agreement is finally entered into, giving the House such information as the total amount of government assistance and the companies to which this assistance will be granted?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Naturally, if the government comes to a decision, we shall make a statement in the House of Commons, but I do not think we can reach a concrete proposal for several months and perhaps a year.

* * *

POLLUTION

MEASURES TO ELIMINATE MERCURY CONTENT IN JAMES AND HUDSON BAYS

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Is the minister taking concrete measures to check pollution in James and Hudson Bays, which is actually threatening our natural resources?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Here are the facts, Mr. Speaker. The plants polluting James Bay are not located in the Northwest Territories. They are rather to be found in Ontario or Quebec.

We are now conducting studies to determine what the sources of pollution are and we will immediately get in touch with the provincial authorities concerned, in order to make them aware of that problem and ask them to act accordingly.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question.

Is the minister aware that the Domtar plant at Lebel-sur-Quevillon is a source of pollution of the James Bay waters?

Mr. Chrétien: I do not know if it is exactly that plant. It is possible and should that be the case we will advise the proper authorities to take the necessary steps to protect James Bay and its natural resources on which the Eskimos and the Indians of the area depend a great deal for their livelihood.

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question.

Could the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development tell the House whether the companies concerned have been informed of the study conducted by the department and whether they have been requested to co-operate in the matter?

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I could not give a definite answer to this question. I will make inquiries and will then be pleased to pass the information on to the hon. member.

[*English*]

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. Has his department been checking this particular pulp mill for effluent containing mercury in the James Bay area?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

ALLEGED DEMOTION OF K. A. STEAD BECAUSE OF INABILITY TO SPEAK SECOND LANGUAGE

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. I gave him notice yesterday and I feel sure he has looked into it. Has the Prime Minister investigated the charge made by the Public Service Alliance that Mr. K. A. Stead, a civil servant of 30 years standing, has been demoted from his position as chief of the education and extension services branch of the National Museum to a clerical job because of his inability to speak a second language even though he is at present taking a second language course and, I am told, doing very well at it? If the charge is correct, would the Prime Minister advise the House what action the government is planning to take to correct this injustice?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member did inform me that he would be asking the question. He would perhaps get a more lengthy answer if he could wait until the minister in charge of the department is on duty in the House but, as best I am able, perhaps I can deal with the question.

I did discuss the matter with the Secretary of State who told me he asked for a report on the complaints to which the hon. member refers. He has had no report as of the moment I am speaking. I might say that it remains the government's policy that supervisors are expected to communicate with their subordinates in the language of the subordinate. In the matter of establishing French or English-speaking units within the Public Service, our policy remains the same. I did write to all deputy ministers quite some time ago suggesting that they come up with a list of possibilities for the establishment of unilingual services. It is only after I have had that list and after I have had their recommendations as to the possibilities of implementing them that such units will be established.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, the right hon. Prime Minister has not advised the House whether or not this charge of demotion is correct, and has not said what the government intends to do about it. Will he ask the minister to report to the House on his first appearance here next week on this specific matter and answer the specific question? In view of the fact that this sort of thing appears to be occurring fairly regularly at the present time, would the Prime Minister give serious consideration to making amendments to the Public Service Employment Act to guarantee by law the kind of protection to civil servants who speak only one language that was promised to the House and the country by Prime Minister Pearson when he introduced the legislation?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, on the first question I repeat that the minister has asked for a report and, as I said, the report has not been received yet, so obviously I cannot comment on this case at the moment. The hon. member should know that the minister does not administer the National Museum. It is administered independently and he is only answerable for it. It is not something that happened within his department. Therefore he has to ask the museum for a report, which has not come in. In answer to the second question, I do not admit the premise.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary to the Prime Minister.

Does he not think that the hon. member who is so touchy regarding unilingualism and bilingualism should be reminded that people speaking French only have been bearing for over 50 years what he now fears suffering?

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to hon. members that we appear to be entering the field of debate at this point. This is not really the time to enter on a debate and the Chair is now prepared to recognize the hon. member for Peace River.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. What I said was attacked by an hon. member. I say that my objective in all of this is to protect French-speaking civil servants in exactly the same way as I hope to be able to protect English-speaking civil servants.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

INTERPROVINCIAL MARKETING—REQUEST FOR REFERENCE TO SUPREME COURT—INTERVENTION IN CASE BEFORE QUEBEC COURT

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Acting Minister of Justice. Now that the province of Alberta has become the sixth province to let down the iron curtain against the importation of agricultural products, a situation which means that more

than half the country is involved, will the minister give serious consideration to preparing terms of reference under the appropriate section of the Supreme Court Act so that this illegal procedure on the part of so many provinces can be challenged at the earliest possible date?

Mr. Trudeau: Indecision and delay.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Acting Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I will be very glad to take that question as notice.

Mr. Baldwin: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I should like to respond to the proved master of indecision and delay who sits opposite me.

Mr. Trudeau: Not quite, yet. The hon. member will have to move over one seat. He is not leader yet.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I trust that I may now be permitted to ask my question. Will the minister give consideration to the proposal which I advanced to the Minister of Agriculture a few days ago that the government appoint counsel to appear in the constitutional case now taking place in the province of Quebec involving the extent to which the regulations of that province contravene section 121 of the British North America Act?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, as to the premise preceding the formal part of the question, I want to make it very clear that I not only cannot accept it but that I deplore such language being used in these circumstances—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. McIlraith: —by an official spokesman for the official opposition in the House. As to the question itself, I will be very glad to look into the matter.

Mr. Baldwin: What does the minister deplore? What have I done?

* * *

INDIAN AFFAIRS

STERILIZATION OF ESKIMO WOMEN

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development on a rather serious matter. Is the minister aware that a program of sterilization of native Eskimo women was apparently introduced in the Holman Island community on Victoria Island, that five women have been so sterilized and that some others are being considered? If he is aware, will he inform the House who authorized this unnecessary and inhuman program, in view of the availability of birth control methods?

[Mr. Baldwin.]

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I have no information on this problem. The hon. member was kind enough to give me notice of his question, so I have had an investigation made but I have not yet received any report.

I am not aware that any authorization was given by my department. Health services in the Northwest Territories are under the jurisdiction of the Department of National Health and Welfare. I therefore asked one of my department's officers this morning to get in touch immediately with the representatives of the Department of National Health in order to determine whether any authorization had actually been given or whether the facts alleged by my hon. friend were correct.

As soon as I obtain further information, I shall be happy to inform the House, but, at this time, I do not believe that such an authorization was given. If such action took place it must have been because of some local or individual initiative, rather than under a government policy.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I want to put a supplementary question to the minister and express my appreciation for his announcement.

It is not possible that such a program should be implemented without any authorization. I should like to ask the minister to draw the attention of the Minister of National Health and Social Welfare to this question and the program I just mentioned.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, it was done this morning.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Malpeque.

* * *

GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

LACK OF PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO MINISTER OF NATIONAL DEFENCE

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Is the indication in *Hansard* that the services of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence have been terminated in that capacity and that as yet no replacement has been appointed correct? Second, when will this omission be rectified?

Mr. Stanfield: Can they not find anybody to work with him?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there is provision in the law for the appointment of only 16 Parliamentary Secretaries. I recognize the matter

alluded to by the hon. member and hope we shall have his support when we ask the House to increase the number of Parliamentary Secretaries.

Mr. Baldwin: What about appointing a backbencher?

Mr. MacLean: In the interval, can the Prime Minister assure the House that this omission to appoint a Parliamentary Secretary to a minister who is in great need of one—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLean: —is not an indication of a further downgrading of the government's estimation of the importance of national defence?

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, I can give that assurance, Mr. Speaker. Able though the minister is, I am anxious to have him assisted by a Parliamentary Secretary, and I hope the House will perhaps give unanimous consent so that we can increase the numbers very soon.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

PUBLICATION OF CARR REPORT ON TOLLS

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister and ask him whether the Carr report respecting tolls on the St. Lawrence Seaway has already been published or will soon be?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I did not understand the question very well. I think it has to do with tolls, but it is not a matter that comes within the purview of my duties. I shall take it as notice and bring it to the attention of the minister concerned.

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might direct a supplementary to the Minister of Transport who may be in a position to tell me if the Carr report on tolls on the St. Lawrence Seaway has been published or will soon be?

[*English*]

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the first report of Carr and Associates has been received. It is only a partial report and we are waiting for the final document. At that point we will assess it. There is an obligation on our part to consult with the United States in terms of the operations of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Subsequent to that we will make a decision whether the document or parts of it can be made public.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Transport.

Inquiries of the Ministry

May I ask the Minister to assure the House that reports on the Carr survey will also be submitted to the House for study?

[*English*]

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, I feel quite certain it will be possible for the House to study the whole question of the future of the St. Lawrence Seaway and its operations in, for example, the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications when the estimates or some other matter dealing with the Authority are before the committee. In addition, it is possible that we could have discussions on the basis of the Carr report or at least the findings which emerge from that report. I will be glad to consider it.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

DESTROYER CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM DELAY—RELATIONSHIP TO ANTI-SUBMARINE ROLE

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. It is in connection with questions that have been asked with regard to the destroyer construction program. Will the minister give every assurance that the delay is not due to a complete change of policy with regard to the anti-submarine role?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will give that assurance.

Mr. Bell: Will the minister also give an indication of the definite date when a decision will be made, because the slippage of time and money continues at an alarming rate each day in the absence of a definite decision?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The hon. member took the words right out of my mouth, Mr. Speaker.

INQUIRY AS TO TABLING OF WHITE PAPER

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Can the Minister of National Defence say when the government intends to table the white paper on defence referred to in the Speech from the Throne?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): I expect some time after the turn of the year, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Stanfield: Turn of what year?

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

BRAZIL—DETENTION IN JAIL OF CANADIAN CITIZEN

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): I intended to direct this question to the Minister of Justice or the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Possibly the Prime Minister or the Acting Minister of Justice could

answer it. A Canadian citizen by the name of Mrs. Chao has apparently been held in jail, without charge, in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, for a number of weeks. Will the Prime Minister or the Acting Minister of Justice investigate this matter and make a report to the House? Mrs. Chao is a Canadian citizen from Vancouver, British Columbia.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I will take the question as notice and direct it to the minister who is responsible.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

INQUIRY AS TO TABLING OF WHITE PAPER

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): My question is for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Before asking my question I wish to congratulate him on his appointment to that important post. Is the white paper on immigration mentioned in the Speech from the Throne ready? If not, will it be ready soon so it can be examined by the appropriate committee of the House in order that the urgently needed legislation and changes in the regulations can be introduced at an early date?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the white paper is not ready. Certainly we consider it an important matter and therefore we will attempt to bring it forward as expeditiously as possible.

APPEAL BOARD CASE BACKLOG—AVAILABILITY OF STUDY

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): In view of the many cases being referred to the Immigration Appeal Board, the number having reached serious proportions with the backlog increasing at the rate of 300 per month, can the minister advise when the study of this serious problem undertaken by Mr. Joseph Sedgwick, Q.C., will be available?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): It is expected that this report will be available within a month.

Mr. Alexander: Will the minister at his earliest convenience make a statement on motions as to the steps his department has taken in the meantime to reduce this serious backlog?

Mr. Lang: I will certainly give consideration to that suggestion. I am not sure that a statement on motions would be the most appropriate method of conveying the information, but I will certainly look into the matter.

* * *

[*Translation*]

TAXATION

WHITE PAPER ON REFORM—CAMPAIGN AGAINST CAPITAL GAINS TAX

Mr. Pierre De Bané (Matane): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance whether he is aware of a campaign being carried on by province of Quebec radio stations jointly with Chambers of Commerce against taxation of capital gains? Are the Minister or the Government conscious of this violation of the Broadcasting Act, and of the injustice being perpetrated against those who would benefit by the measure, i.e. the silent majority? What steps does his department intend to take in this regard?

[*English*]

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): I cannot answer that question—I do not believe the translation came through in English—but I will be most pleased to look into it.

Mr. Speaker: My suggestion is that the minister take notice of the question asked by the hon. member and answer it in due course.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

ACTION TO PREVENT SALE OF TEXTBOOK PUBLISHING COMPANIES TO FOREIGN CORPORATIONS

Mr. S. Perry Ryan (Spadina): I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that only three publishing houses in the English textbook field are in Canadian hands, does the government intend to introduce legislation to protect our publishing houses from being sold to foreign corporations?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): This matter was dealt with a few days ago at some length by the Minister of National Revenue who is looking into the question of foreign ownership on behalf of the government. I have nothing to add to what he said at that time, though I would remind the hon. member that my colleague did say he would be taking up the particular subject of textbooks with the relevant provincial authority. As the hon. member knows, the provincial authority, in the field of education, can take action in this area.

Mr. Ryan: Of course they can, Mr. Speaker, but so can the federal government. This is a publishing matter, it is an elementary—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has been given the floor for the purpose of answering a supplementary question, not to make a speech.

Mr. Ryan: Is the government aware that another publishing house, Ryerson Press, is being looked over by a foreign buyer, an American buyer?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I take the liberty of reminding hon. members that it is not in order to ask whether the government is aware that something is being done, not being done, or might be done.

HOUSING

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON MEASURES TO OFFSET DECLINE IN STARTS

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): My question is directed to the Prime Minister. In view of the serious decline in housing starts in the first nine months of this year, what immediate steps does the right hon. gentleman intend taking to help solve this serious problem other than setting up a ministry of housing and urban affairs?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I suggest to the hon. member that he is inviting a general statement which should not be made during the question period.

Mr. Gilbert: I wonder if I might ask a supplementary question—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member cannot ask a supplementary to a question which has been disallowed, but the Chair will permit him to ask another question.

Mr. Gilbert: Would the Minister without Portfolio responsible for housing make a statement on motions with regard to the serious problem arising from the decline in housing starts and tell us what immediate steps he proposes to take to deal with it?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): I shall be glad to refer to the matter during the remarks I hope to make in the course of the debate on the address. I shall probably allude to the fact that housing starts are taking an upward turn and that September starts were at the rate of 185,000—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

POST OFFICE

TERMINATION OF LEGAL ROLE OF MINISTER OF COMMUNICATIONS AS HEAD OF DEPARTMENT

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the Minister of Communications is still the Postmaster General of Canada and that the hon. member for Longueuil has the problems but not the portfolio, can the Prime Minister advise us whether we may soon expect the introduction of legislation to correct this seemingly imperfect situation?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I thank the hon. member for being so helpful. We did announce yesterday through the mouth of the Governor General that we would be asking the House to approve a minister of state system, and it would be my intention to ensure that my hon. friend from Longueuil shall at that time be a minister of state in charge of the Post Office. I hope the opposition will co-operate with us in expediting this arrangement.

Mr. Hees: Don't you worry about us.

Inquiries of the Ministry

RURAL CLOSURES—AMELIORATION OF POLICY

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): My question is for the Minister without Portfolio with responsibility for the postal services. Under the new and more humane approach he announced, will he be reversing government policy on the closure of rural post offices which has had such a devastating impact on the stability of rural communities?

Mr. Speaker: I am not sure that the question has been asked in the proper terms. But the minister, I am sure, is anxious that he be given an opportunity to reply.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I cannot quite accept the assertion of the hon. member that the closing down of some post offices has had such disastrous consequences. But as I took over the department I decided that no more post offices would be closed until that matter has been reviewed.

[*English*]

Mr. Craig Stewart (Marquette): My supplementary question is directed to the minister in charge of the Post Office. Will the present criteria continue to be used in considering the closure of rural post offices?

Mr. Speaker: Order. It seems to me that the minister's reply covered the question now being asked by the hon. member.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Transport.

In Hull, not very far from Parliament hill, there is a federal wharf where boats can be put afloat. However, as the "Escale" is anchored there, nobody can use it.

Is the minister taking steps now to get the old "Escale" out of the way?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has made a representation and he must take it for granted that the minister will consider the matter.

* * *

[*English*]

URBAN AFFAIRS

PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. In keeping with the new thinking which the government has now adopted in relation to urban problems—a change which I suggest, with all respect, has

come about as a result of the prompting of the opposition—I ask the Prime Minister whether he will say now that the government intends to implement a procedure under which a standing committee on housing and urban affairs can be set up?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I would prefer that this matter, if it is to be dealt with at all, be touched upon by the minister responsible. I can say at this stage that there is no intention in my mind of recommending the establishment of such a committee. However, as the hon. member knows, I have an open mind on all these things.

Mr. Alexander: I am glad to learn that the Prime Minister has an open mind on this question. He will understand that in the absence of a standing committee on housing and urban affairs the new portfolio he is developing will have no credibility whatsoever in terms of participatory democracy.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

RETIRED EMPLOYEES' PENSIONS—ACTION TO IMPLEMENT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR INCREASE

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Will the government take steps, or has it already done so, to bring to the attention of the Canadian National Railways the recommendation of this House set out in the fourteenth report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, tabled and concurred in a few days ago, concerning an increase in the pensions of Canadian National employees, in the hope that action on this matter might be taken at an early date?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I will undertake to do that formally, but the slight tremor noted in Montreal on Tuesday seems to be pretty clear evidence that the CNR already knows of the action taken by this House.

FAILURE OF CHATEAU LAURIER HOTEL TO COMPLY WITH MINIMUM WAGE LAW

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question along the same lines. Has the Minister of Transport told the president of the CNR to have the Chateau Laurier and other CNR hotels pay the minimum wage in effect of $1.65 an hour and to stop trying to cut down on the payment of its employees?

Mr. Speaker: Order. It seems to me that that question has already been asked.

[Mr. Alexander.]

POLLUTION

OTTAWA AREA RIVERS—ESTABLISHMENT OF WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT AREA

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Would the minister advise the House whether any steps have been taken toward establishing a water quality management area under the jurisdiction of the Canada Water Act to facilitate the cleaning up of rivers in the Ottawa area?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, discussions are going on with the province of Ontario and the province of Quebec under the aegis of the consultative committees appointed pursuant to the philosophy of the Canada Water Act, both provincially and federally. I am very hopeful that we can achieve an agreement in the not too distant future which will embrace the two provinces and the federal government.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

PURPOSE OF TROOP MOVEMENT FROM QUEBEC TO MONTREAL

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, I should like to inquire whether the Prime Minister or the Minister of National Defence is in a position to enlighten the House as to the purpose of moving 30 truck loads of troops to Montreal in the middle of last night, I believe it was. Was this just an exercise, or since it is alleged that most of the vehicles were of a medical services nature has the government of Quebec asked the federal government for assistance in connection with the provision of medical services in that province?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, this was a night training exercise between Canadian Forces Base Valcartier and Canadian Forces Base Camp Bouchard, and was not at all in relation to the situation referred to by the hon. member.

Mr. MacLean: I thank the minister.

* * *

CANADIAN WHEAT BOARD

INQUIRY AS TO APPOINTMENT OF NEW CHIEF COMMISSIONER

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. How soon does he or the government expect to announce the appointment of the new chief commissioner of the Canadian Wheat Board? In addition, can he assure the House that whoever is appointed will not be someone who was either formerly or is at present in the private grain trade?

An hon. Member: How about me?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, it seems that we have volunteers right here. We will certainly try to see that the best possible candidates are examined for the position of additional commissioner, but I have no prediction to make at the moment as to when the appointment will be made.

* * *

GRAIN

BARLEY—ACTION TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF EXPORT OPPORTUNITIES AND STIMULATE DELIVERIES BY FARMERS

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, in view of persistent reports that the Wheat Board is not offering barley for sale on the export market because of uncertainty as to how much barley farmers will deliver, can the minister responsible for the Wheat Board inform the House what action is being undertaken to take advantage of export opportunities so that farmers will be encouraged to bring the grain forward?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the Wheat Board, of course, has this question very much on its mind in deciding what in fact will be available for sale. I know the commissioners are reviewing the situation daily, and I am sure we can be confident in their ability to handle the question.

[*Later:*]

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. May I ask the minister in charge of the Wheat Board whether he will consider increasing the initial price of barley so as to assure that there is a sufficient supply of barley to the Wheat Board for our customers?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I do not think it would be appropriate to consider a change at this stage for this year. It is far too early, of course, to think about the situation for next year.

REQUEST FOR BREAKDOWN OF EXPECTED SALES

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Would the minister responsible for the Wheat Board make an early statement on motions giving a breakdown of the 700 million bushels of grain grown in the crop year that is expected to be sold as stated, and showing for the information of the House how much of the grain is wheat and how much is barley and other grains?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that this would be a subject matter suitable for a statement on motions. When it is possible to provide additional detailed information on sales, the information will of course be supplied, though as I have indicated to the House on previous occasions there is some limitation as to what can in fact be made known because of commercial considerations.

[*Translation*]

AIRPORTS

STE SCHOLASTIQUE—AGREEMENT BETWEEN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND QUEBEC RESPECTING ACCESS ROADS

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

In view of the fact that the construction of a roads network is of basic importance to the development of the Ste Scholastique airport, can the Prime Minister tell the House whether a program has been prepared jointly with the province of Quebec in connection with this project or whether Ottawa intends to disclose shortly the contents of the agreement reached with that Province about this roads network?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this question should be put to the Minister of Transport. I am aware that ministers and officials have met many times in this connection while I have not been involved myself except at the very beginning.

* * *

[*English*]

INDUSTRY

AUTOMOBILES—STEPS TO ACHIEVE PARITY BETWEEN CANADIAN AND UNITED STATES PRICES

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Following a record year for the export of automobiles from Canada to the United States, can the minister inform the House what steps he is taking to ensure that during the coming year there will be price parity in the sale of automobiles as between the two countries?

Mr. Speaker: I think this information should be given to the House in the form of a statement. I would not think it could be replied to by way of an answer during the question period.

Mr. Broadbent: Then may I rephrase my question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister assure the House that such a statement will be forthcoming in the early future?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I am sure there will be many occasions to talk about this particular question, but there is already an indication that the differential, the gap, is closing. I know my hon. friend will not agree with me on these matters, but I expect that and am not surprised. The rise in the suggested list prices in Canada is up by about 3 to 5 per cent over last year. In the United States it is up by about 5 to 6 per cent. In other words, costs are rising faster in the United States than they are in Canada—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Pepin: —and as a result the gap is diminishing.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Inquiries of the Ministry

NATIONAL DEFENCE

CLOSING OF RIVERS AND GIMLI AIR BASES—MEETING WITH MANITOBA GOVERNMENT

Mr. Craig Stewart (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. Can the Prime Minister tell the House whether a meeting between himself and the Manitoba government concerning the closing of the air bases at Rivers and Gimli has been requested and, if so, when the meeting will take place?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there has been some correspondence between the premier of Manitoba and myself on the question of base closures, but I do not believe a meeting with me has been scheduled. There have been a considerable number of meetings at the official level, and also the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion and the Minister of Supply and Services have been involved in the question.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AIRPORTS

STE SCHOLASTIQUE—AGREEMENT BETWEEN FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND QUEBEC RESPECTING ACCESS ROADS

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, in view of the invitation of the Prime Minister to direct my question to the Minister of Transport and the urgency of this question.

We all know that there was a meeting between the Minister of Transport and the Quebec authorities about the development of the Ste Scholastique international airport. Could the minister tell us if, following this meeting, agreements were reached?

Mr. Speaker: At this stage there is no need for a point of order. Besides, if the House allows the minister to answer now the question asked by the hon. member for Joliette, I have no objection.

[*English*]

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I think that the short answer is that the province of Quebec and the government of Canada have agreed to co-operate in the general planning for the area surrounding the airport and for access to the airport.

Studies are under way to determine what is the best means of achieving better access. It may be better highways or a better rapid transit system or a combination of these. These studies are continuing but at the moment in any event no agreement has been reached in the specific sense my hon. friend, I suggest, is implying.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

[Mr. Speaker.]

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The House resumed, from Thursday, October 8, consideration of the motion of Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to begin by congratulating the mover and seconder of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. The hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel) spoke very well and very briefly. That is always meritorious and I think particularly meritorious in respect of anyone speaking in support of the Speech from the Throne that was read yesterday. I must say I would like to follow this example, but since I am speaking from a somewhat different point of view it might not be possible for me to be quite as brief today, Mr. Speaker.

In respect of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas), who seconded the motion, may I say that I enjoyed his remarks. I appreciate the praise he had for his own constituency and I appreciate the praise he had for his government. I sympathized with him somewhat when he was attempting to pay due respect to his government and at the same time give the proper emphasis to the difficulties related to agriculture in his constituency.

Certainly, both members discharged their responsibility very well indeed. As to the Speech from the Throne, I might say it reminds one of the style of the government; words take the place of substance. There is certainly a very stark contrast between the high-flown language in the speech and the actual proposals made which, for the most part, were flat, repetitious and vague. In fact, there seemed to be very little relationship between the high-flown phrases and the proposals.

We were exhorted, we were praised, we were told of a new age, of a world-wide crisis and of the need for bold enterprise. These are fine words. At one place we were told:

> The Government continues, therefore, to direct its efforts in increasing measures to those tasks where Canadian initiative and Canadian competence may prove to be as effective as has other Canadian enterprise in the past.

I do not know what that means, but I consider it to be a reference to the Post Office.

The Throne Speech comes out flatly and unequivocally for such things as human differences and freedom—sometimes called liberty—equality of opportunity, tolerance, and in one never-to-be-forgotten phrase, pride and modesty at the same time. It also mentions favourably in passing, imagination, daring, initiative, ingenuity and warmth. Just in case after all that we might not quite realize what it is all about, the speech tells us that we Canadians are reasonable and wise.

I should like again, Mr. Speaker, to quote a sparkling remark:

—we—

That is Canadians.

—should accept gracefully the fact that we are also more amenable to reason and, perhaps, more capable of wise decision than we are normally willing to admit.

There is a corker, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Hear hear!

Mr. Stanfield: Yes; reasonable and wise, I suppose to have chosen such a government—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: —which in its turn is reasonable and wise in its handling of the administration of this country under its terms of office. I suppose that is the message we are supposed to draw. Its wisdom and rationality, presumably, are demonstrated by the fact that the government seems to find so little to do. There are actually fewer concrete proposals in this year's Throne Speech than in last year's, despite the fact that this was to be the year of big things, big activity.

This year we are treated to vague promises and declarations that the present government believes in tolerance, in freedom, in equality and in several other things.

An hon. Member: Don't you?

Mr. Stanfield: So do we all. But what does that have to do with the serious practical problems this country faces! Mr. Speaker, I have not been able to go back through all the Speeches from the Throne, but I think this one must be the most stupefyingly complacent Speech from the Throne the government of Canada has ever imposed upon the people of this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: If I did not have such a high opinion of the personal standards and conduct of members of the government, I would think they must have been "hopped-up" when they advised His Excellency the Governor General with regard to this speech.

[*Translation*]

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the language used in the Speech from the Throne is so pompous that I am wondering if it was not an attempt to conceal the sad truth behind verbose oratory. The speech was designed to drown us in words, slogans and platitudes.

There were surely worthwhile efforts made in this regard, but if this time the rhetoric is fascinating, we will nevertheless look into the substance of the speech and what we find there is incredible self-indulgence.

[*English*]

For example, Mr. Speaker, I shall quote again:

Let us recognize with pride and with modesty what so many strangers admire and see in us:

I think, Mr. Speaker, some of those fellows opposite must have been spending too much time watching the "Forsyte Saga".

I shall not go on and take the time to speculate concerning what these gawking strangers admire. I am sure there are many things, including the patience of the Canadian people confronted with such fatuity, such pomposity and such foolishness. But I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that the government did, quite unintentionally no doubt, liven up the speech quite a bit with such sparks of unintended humour and unpremeditated wit. But, when a government has aged as quickly as this one has, it is rather cruel to laugh.

The first reaction I had on reading the Speech from the Throne was that it must have been written by somebody who had received a Canada Council grant, but I very quickly came to the conclusion that the scale of asininity far surpassed anything that a Canada Council grant could possibly produce. Only an organization operating on the scale of the Prime Ministers' office could produce asininity on such a massive scale. I do not wish to sound ungrateful, sir, because this Speech from the Throne will long be treasured by those who appreciate absurdity on a grand scale. I am sure it surpasses anything in the past, and I am reasonably confident that we shall never see its like again.

• (12 noon)

Mr. Trudeau: Barring one.

Mr. Stanfield: Obviously, it was the work of a superlatively organized team, the greatest collection of fatuous, pompous and sententious writers ever assembled in this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: Of course, no personal offence is meant.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Stanfield: They seem to be getting stirred up a little. We have not really started yet.

Complacent in its language, the Speech is also complacent as to substance. It brushes off most contemptuously not only unemployment but the very thing the government is claiming to be fighting, inflation. The fight is virtually won in the latter case, it suggests, and as for unemployment, it does not seem to matter very much because as long as people are out of work this kindly government suggests it will look after them. Personally, I find this attitude worse than unacceptable; it is arrogant and it is cold. The complacency does not stop here, it runs through the speech like a thread.

I suggest that probably nowhere is there greater complacency expressed than with regard to agriculture. So far as fisheries are concerned, no doubt some of my colleagues will have something to say on the matter, but I doubt the subject is even mentioned. So far as agriculture is concerned the government says that the problem has been largely solved. There has been some improvement in the west; enough, I think to give some confi-

dence in the future, confidence that certainly the government was lacking last spring and last winter. There has been some progress through diversification, and farmers in the west deserve a great deal of credit for the way in which they have diversified. Recently, I was able to stay on a large grain farm—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Stanfield: A substantial number of farmers are not growing any wheat other than durum and great efforts are being made to diversify, but the situation on farms throughout the west in general is very difficult. The problems are far from over and the cash position is most unsatisfactory. For the government to create the impression in the country at large that the western agricultural problems are largely solved, I suggest, is irresponsible.

As to the speech itself, it proposes some legislation, largely legislation we had in the last session. I hope it is vastly improved, and if it is sensible and positive it will certainly receive full co-operation from this side of the House.

Certainly the government made at least one serious slip in the Speech from the Throne. At one point, in a moment of honesty or perhaps forgetfulness, the speech referred to "the distant ideal of a just society".

Mr. Hees: It is getting more distant every day.

Mr. Stanfield: That is what the government says it has been giving. I thought during the last couple of years that was the slogan. It seems that by its own admission the further the government moves in its chosen direction, assuming it has one, the farther the goal recedes from view.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: This is an indication of the achievements of this government. It marches boldly ahead to the sound of its own slogans in no particular direction. But that does not matter. As long as the slogans, of which the just society is the main one, and the pretentious declarations are still there to roll off the tongue, then all is well. It is not a battle against real problems; it is the sententious verbalizing, the glorious preparations, the bands, the parades, the cheers of the faithful, those are the things that count. The government accepts the task in its own style.

We were supposed to get a couple of years of housecleaning, of thinking and of white papers, and then a lot of action. A science policy is pretty important in a modern nation. Here we are, more than two years since the election, with no science policy. We heard the declaration that the government will consider carefully the recommendations of the Senate Committee on science policy and the Science Council of Canada. That certainly shows some profound thinking and some courage.

As to the use of drugs, which is a growing problem, again the government says that we will have to consider carefully the recommendations in the report of the LeDain Commission. Obviously, nothing has been done in this area. As to the abortion, we are going to have a day's debate on it.

We are still being promised white papers, and we cannot even get those in time. Last year we got a couple of dillies: one on tax reform and one on foreign policy. Can you imagine any government spending two years on producing a white paper on foreign policy? Now, when we are supposed to be past the era of white papers and entering the era of action we are promised white papers on communications, citizenship, immigration, national defence, and income security. Last year we were promised seven white papers and we got three. This year the same old white papers are promised, but, ones on immigration and communications have been added. Does communication mean the Post Office? If it does, we were promised a white paper on the Post Office last year. But I can readily understand that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) might ask the Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans) to produce a white paper on communications. It will be a relatively harmless occupation in which to indulge I think.

Here we are more than two years after the election during which the Prime Minister of Canada invited Canadians to come with him. Where has he led them? He has led them further away from the just society. I say that in the past two years this government has dissipated the spirit of 1967. Constitutional reform is not even mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, although last year it was emphasized and so was the importance which the government attached to it. This was the big appeal in 1968. We would have an entrenched bill of rights. Since then we have had failure. I think it is fair to say that in the area of constitutional discussion no progress has been made, with the exception of some assurance with regard to regional disparity. You would think from the speech we heard yesterday that no constitutional problems existed in this country and that no tensions existed. Is this the view of the government? After the Quebec provincial election many Canadians felt that the problem of the relationship between Quebec and the rest of Canada was settled, and that it could be forgotten. Is that the view the government of Canada is encouraging, in spite of an election in which 23 per cent of those who voted supported a party dedicated to the cause of separatism?

• (12:10 p.m.)

Mr. Trudeau: They could not vote for the Conservative party.

Mr. Stanfield: No, they could not vote for the Conservatives, and I hope those people don't start voting Conservative.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: Since then we have had another federal-provincial conference with no visible progress, at least no progress visible to the naked eye. Recently, the Prime Minister of Quebec, Mr. Bourassa, who had previously been emphasizing the importance of creating jobs, and I

am sure is still emphasizing this, nevertheless gave up his portfolio as minister of finance, or provincial treasurer, in order to be able to devote more time to constitutional questions. To me this indicates he attaches an increasing urgency to this matter. But does the Prime Minister of Canada, and do the members of his government? After yesterday I get the impression that the Prime Minister wants to drop the constitutional question.

In terms of tension, we have gone through a period of turbulence. Are we now in the eye of the storm? Have we been in the eye of the storm for the last two or three months? Mr. Speaker, I suggest—and I know I have heard the Prime Minister of Quebec say this—that we have a limited amount of time. But there is no new approach suggested in this Speech from the Throne. The question is not even mentioned.

I was interested to see the Prime Minister of Quebec raise a question that was discussed a number of years ago, one that used to be actively sponsored by my predecessor in Nova Scotia, a famous Liberal, the late Angus L. MacDonald. I refer to the question of delegation of powers. Mr. Bourassa said:

> Within the range of discussions pertaining to a new distribution of legislative competence I further suggest that we examine most attentively the possibility of including in the revised constitution a clause to allow delegation of legislative powers between the two orders of government.

He went on to mention the advantages that this might have, allowing flexibility in rigid distribution of powers, correction of judicial interpretation, the elaboration of programs on a regional basis, and the fact that provisions like this exist in other federal constitutions.

I think this proposal should be considered, Mr. Speaker. I would like to know whether it is the intention of the Prime Minister to pursue this kind of course that might lead to some flexibility. I think it ought to be examined.

[*Translation*]

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we believe that the constitution can be amended, and we are of the opinion that this should be done in a climate of mutual understanding between the provinces and their peoples. We cannot forecast with any accuracy what the final solutions will be. In the meantime, we owe it to ourselves and we owe it to the whole country to pursue our effort in order to find pragmatic solutions in the special fields with which we are concerned: pollution, urban problems and others. We have no wish to interfere with provincial jurisdiction, but, we feel that, at all levels of government, co-operation is possible.

[*English*]

I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that in constitutional terms regional disparity is one of the few areas of progress. But in terms of the just society what has happened? The minister concerned has introduced some new concepts, such as growth centres. I think the government is not applying them too rigidly, but the Speech from the Throne said yesterday that we now see signs of results. I say, Sir, that regional disparity has deepened, deepened because of the general slowdown in the country, which is always particularly hard on areas of slow growth.

You cannot effectively fight against regional disparity while at the same time there exists an economic slowdown and substantial unemployment across the country. This cannot be done.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: The situation, unfortunately, is worse than it was two years ago. In this respect again we are further away from the just society than we were.

Unemployment figures do not show the whole story because strikingly enough, Sir, during last winter and spring when the population of those over 14 years had very substantially increased in the Atlantic provinces the number in the working force had actually decreased, indicating that a very substantial number of people were not even thinking it worthwhile to apply for work.

We need a fully co-ordinated attack on regional disparity in a context of national growth. We have not got it, and there does not seem to have been any recognition by the government that the two are related.

As to the economy generally, after two years of this government again we are further away than ever from the just society. May I quote the Speech from the Throne:

> It would be irresponsible to suggest that the economy is now in a satisfactory condition.

Mr. Hees: That is the understatement of the year.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, consider the kind of strange, twisted minds that would believe it necessary to make a remark like that, with nearly 7 per cent of the work force of the country, seasonally adjusted, out of work. Further, The Economic Council of Canada has told us time after time that we need an annual rate of growth of something like 5 per cent in order to provide a satisfactory level of employment in the country, yet we know the economy of the country is virtually stagnant.

Growth is important. It is essential in the first place to maintain satisfactory employment and to provide opportunities to an expanding work force. But now, for the second year in a row, our rate of growth has fallen away below the rate of growth recommended by the Economic Council of Canada as essential for any satisfactory employment position. What is the government's attitude? As far as we can tell from the Speech from the Throne it does not matter much. The speech says something to the effect that "we will take care of it."

Secondly, dealing with poverty, Mr. Speaker, we are further away from the just society than we were two years ago. Poverty is wasteful economically. It has been deepened by the increasing number of hard core unemployed. We will have to see what the government means by income security when we see its measures.

Thirdly, consider the position of youth, of young Canadians, in relation to a just society. They are far worse off than two years ago. Think of their difficulties, the difficulties they face in securing employment when they leave school or college, or even when they are

trying to stay in school or college. Think of the cost of this to the individuals concerned, and think of the loss to the nation.

Then, there is the cost to government treasuries involved in a long period of slow growth such as this government has encouraged. Think of governments trying to meet the increasing costs of programs in areas of education, health and welfare, with their revenues levelling off as a result of stagnation in the economy.

There has been a lot of concern expressed about the rising costs of these programs. We ought to be equally concerned because the level of revenues is falling off, creating further pressures upon these governments to increase their taxes, or to provide inferior service in important areas such as education. The longer this shortfall continues, the longer we have this relative stagnation in our economy with its affect on unemployment and with its affect on government revenues, the more serious the difficulties become, and yet we have no recognition on the part of the government, in the Speech from the Throne, of these difficulties. This is irresponsible, Sir. Our present situation is the result of deliberate government policies. Relative economic stagnation with unemployment at nearly 7 per cent is the result of deliberately adopted government policies.

• (12:20 p.m.)

In 1968 the Prime Minister said to the people "Come with me". Where has he led them? He has led a lot of them into misery, yet the Speech from the Throne says that in recent months the unemployment rate has not increased significantly. That is not true. That is as complacent a statement as it would have been if it had been true. All this is being done in the name of fighting inflation, yet we have the highest rate of unemployment in the developed world.

The government seems to be happy because international bankers tell them to keep it up. The government is going around saying this is all the fault of the unions and business. The Prime Minister says he is a friend of the little man; some friend, Mr. Speaker. He is some friend to young Canadians looking for work and some friend to older Canadians trying to live on fixed incomes.

This is the modern outlook. This is the outlook of this modern, sophisticated, computerized government. We have 7 per cent unemployment. Is this to continue?

Does the government intend to maintain this slack in the economy? There is no real indication in the Speech from the Throne as to what its plans are. I said in 1967, when I entered this House, that to fight inflation by the deliberate creation of unemployment is inhuman and unacceptable. I say it again and I emphasize it. I deplore the cold-blooded acceptance of the situation by the government of the day. I say that unemployment insurance and income maintenance programs are no substitution for an adequate policy of employment. The government created this situation and the government can undo it. The government can correct it if it only has the will and the intention to do so.

[Mr. Stanfield.]

No country in western Europe accepts the creation of unemployment as an acceptable method of fighting inflation. In Germany, for example, they have something like 4 per cent inflation but they have 700,000 unfilled jobs. The amount of unemployment that exists in Canada today is not necessary, and it certainly is not the view of the Organization for Economic Development that this is the appropriate approach. The *Economist* has repeated time and time again that a policy of deliberately running the economy for a long period of time below its potential just will not work. This unemployment cannot be justified. What is the policy today? Are restraints to continue? I want to make it very clear that I think an economic policy of some sort is necessary in support of monetary and fiscal policy. I have said this for several years. It is clear that it is difficult to work it out, and I admit that. It is very clear that such a policy cannot be imposed on the economy. It has to be worked out in co-operation. Consequently a persistent policy of taxation by the government upon the unions and business is making the adoption of an incomes policy in this country virtually impossible because the government continues to poison the atmosphere.

The importance of growth, of course, suggests debate on tax policy. I will not take the House through this. Again, the Prime Minister invited Canadian people to come with him in this area but fortunately few have been prepared to come. After nearly a full year of debate, at considerable cost and with a good deal of uncertainty, the House of Commons committee has in fact torn up the government's White Paper and thrown it back in the government's face. The report of the committee is, in effect, a new white paper adopting, I would say, some 80 per cent of the views we in this group have been expressing in the House.

The question now is, what does the government propose to do? The language of the committee is polite but there is no question about the review. Will the government listen and will the government heed? I ask again, will the government proceed immediately to give some income tax relief to Canadians with low incomes?

Speaking of the just society, what has been done for the quality of life in Canada? I have spoken about unemployment; I have spoken about poverty and I have spoken about youth. In all these areas, we are further away from the just society than we were two years ago. Housing is well below the need. The government's objective was one million homes in five years. We are running well below that at this time, yet what is the policy? We have seen it reported that the minister responsible is pleading with financial institutions in this country to put more money into housing. What sort of a policy is that? That is merely pleading. The government has used housing, as the Economic Council of Canada warned it should not do, to serve as an economic balance wheel. It has slowed things down and now the people are paying the price. The increasing shortage has increased the price of homes, and pushed up the cost of loans and made student accommodation scarce.

We need some new approaches, none of which were hinted at in the Speech from the Throne. We need a removal of the 11 per cent tax on building materials for housing. We need active programs in conjunction with the provinces and cities to make more serviced lots available in order to bring down the price of lots. We need inducements, not pleas to lenders to put their money into housing. We need an active program.

Let me refer to urban problems. Here again, the best that one can say is that we have lost two years. I think the problem is worse than it was two years ago in terms of urban renewal and assistance to transportation. Again, we have had nothing much except talk as far as the government is concerned. I welcome the appointment of a minister in this area. If the government had been prepared to do this a couple of years ago, the minister who was then in charge might have been prepared to serve the government and push forward a policy. This approach has simply lapsed for the last two years, yet I cannot help but ask—as perhaps that same Member of Parliament is still asking—how much this statement in the Speech from the Throne really means.

One must go back to the statement made by the Prime Minister in this House in a debate on February 14, 1969, when he said:

> Until the constitution is brought into the 20th century, governments are, to a large degree, powerless to solve the problems either by activity alone or in co-operation—

This statement was made during a debate in the House of Commons on urban affairs. To what extent, then, has the Prime Minister's mind really been opened, and to what extent will he really allow the new minister to tackle this problem of the cities with earnestness? We shall have to see.

As to environment generally, we still have no body in this country that is responsible for examining the effects of our total environment. To date, there has been no adequate co-ordination of antipollution efforts within federal services. I welcome the new department. We and many others have been advocating this new department and we hope it will enable the federal government to co-ordinate its own activities within this area of fighting pollution. There is still no suggestion of any adequate authority or mechanism to co-ordinate antipollution efforts throughout the country. There is no suggestion of any body which would have the overriding responsibility for surveying and advising on the protection of our total environment. The department is fine as far as it goes, but we also need an environmental council.

I realize that there are many who are very concerned about the deterioration of our environment but who would also consider the preservation of our environment inconsistent with our economic growth.

I certainly agree that we must not worship the gross national product and that we must have a higher objective than that. But I want to make it very clear that I believe we shall need continued economic growth for some time to come, at least if we are to tackle our problems of unemployment and poverty and if we are to finance the social plans we have adopted, the measures such as educational programs in which we are involved. This does not mean for a moment that we ought not to be examining the environmental effects of certain forms of economic development and growth or, on the other hand, conducting certain forms of examination. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, there is no sign in the Speech from the Throne of any awareness of these problems. We need more than a department. We also need an organ to guarantee the preservation of the total environment in our country.

Sir, there are many other areas I could touch on, areas such as external affairs. Because of the white paper that was produced, probably the less said about that the better. Yet there is a question of great importance, of great concern to many Canadians, that I should like to touch on before sitting down. It is the question of Canadian sovereignty, the question of economic autonomy. What do Canadians want? I think Canadians want to have pride in themselves and in their country. They want to be sure that we have a government that is looking after the national interest, a government that is concerned with the interests of all Canadians taken as individuals and as Canadian citizens. I think we want a Canada that is friendly to the United States while keeping its distance. We want a country that intends to preserve its autonomy. What has the government done?

It has jumped from one position to another—at least, its ministers have. It has gone from insipid continentalism to insulting attacks on the United States, and back again.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: It has gone from an apparently abject fear of the United States adverse reaction on declarations concerning Arctic sovereignty to rather petty squabbling in other spheres. This is a sign of weakness, not of strength. The government has floundered out of its depth on the question of the control of our economy. There are times when it seems to be saying that the question is not really important; but there are other times when one seems to be able to detect some concern on the part of the government. Once again we have a climate of uncertainty. We owe it to our respective investors, we owe it to our economy and, above all, we owe it to the Canadian people to dissipate this uncertainty.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I will not go through all the perambulations of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene). They are pretty well known. As for the Prime Minister, let me say this. When he took over the leadership of his party, it was generally understood that he had a very poor opinion of nationalism. The subject may be of no interest to him. I think it would interest the Canadian people to know what his views are on this question today. Certainly, there is very little in the Speech from the Throne which can give any indication.

What do we propose? I propose an approach based on realism and on the survival of all Canada. We need foreign investment, foreign technology and initiative in order to maintain our prosperity. Yet, surely we can reach a policy which protects the interests of our own country. What I am suggesting is that we need a flexible

approach, one that is sensible, one that is efficient and one that will preserve our autonomy.

Mr. Trudeau: I will go for that.

Mr. Stanfield: It must be an essential priority for the Canadian government and this Parliament, after advice based on careful and continuing study—

Mr. Trudeau: Good.

Mr. Stanfield: —to decide—

Mr. Trudeau: Yes.

Mr. Stanfield: —which are the industries—

Mr. Trudeau: Right.

Mr. Stanfield: —and which are the sectors of our economy—

Mr. Trudeau: Sure.

Mr. Stanfield: —where Canadian ownership is vital—

Mr. Trudeau: Name them.

Mr. Stanfield: —and where it is less so.

Mr. Trudeau: Good.

Mr. Stanfield: The Prime Minister asks me to name them.

Mr. Trudeau: Yes.

Mr. Stanfield: He may be quite content to talk off the top of his head. I am saying that this is a process that we should enter into carefully.

Mr. Trudeau: The hon. member has not done that yet.

Mr. Stanfield: And the decision should be made on the basis of careful and continuing study.

Mr. Trudeau: Good, good. Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: It is the only way we can escape from the present pattern of confusion—

Mr. Trudeau: There is no confusion.

Mr. Stanfield: —and of potential injustice. It is not an easy task, but it must be done; otherwise, we shall continue to go blindly down the path to nowhere.

Mr. Trudeau: Hurray.

Mr. Stanfield: I am suggesting that we must adopt an approach based on the principle of the danger point. There are some areas of business enterprise in this country where I think the importance of Canadian control would be very limited indeed. There are others where, in all aspects, Canadian control would be regarded as vital as in, for example, the control of television and certain areas which have already been designated. There may be other such areas.

Mr. Trudeau: But the hon. member does not know what they are.

[Mr. Stanfield.]

Mr. Stanfield: I am suggesting a pattern we should follow. It is a procedure we must follow if we are to obtain a sensible result.

Mr. Trudeau: The hon. member is suggesting a white paper.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I am suggesting that there are areas in which we need not be much concerned at all and that there are other areas in which we have to insist upon Canadian control.

Mr. Trudeau: But where are they?

Mr. Stanfield: There is a third category, clearly—

Mr. Trudeau: Go on.

Mr. Stanfield: —where, without being exclusively Canadian, a strong Canadian presence is important. Examples of this, presumably, would be in the insurance business and financing business. The main thing is that we should move ahead. I suggest that this is an approach that would work. It would be a positive approach that would not discriminate. Certainly, it would not discriminate against the different regions of the country. There must be consultation and co-operation with the provinces. We must have an approach that allows us to indicate clearly what the policy is in the various sectors of our economy and we must avoid as much as we can in future the kind of retroactive decision we saw in the case of uranium.

The Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, asked me to name various industries. I would deplore it if anybody tried to stand up and categorize, on the basis of limited individual knowledge, what these industries are. What I am saying is that we should start the process. We should establish the mechanism to recommend carefully, after study and continuing study, what our attitude should be.

An hon. Member: That means a white paper.

Mr. Stanfield: It does not mean a white paper. It means that we shall be moving in a tangible and concrete way towards this process.

An hon. Member: No doubt a concrete paper is meant.

Mr. Stanfield: Surely, that is the only sensible way in which to proceed. The fact that the Throne Speech mentions uranium and nothing else in the matter of foreign ownership is illuminating. So far, the government has been reacting to existing situations. It is less than a poor excuse for policy; it is no policy at all.

Mr. Baldwin: That is dishonest.

Mr. Stanfield: I say that it is time the Prime Minister indicated to us what his general attitude is. It is time that we establish in an orderly way a continuing process of categorizing the various industries in this country. There is no other sensible way of proceeding. There is no sense in proceeding in terms of sweeping generalities. We must proceed pragmatically, and I think our approach would work.

In addition to the question of control in Canada, there is the question of the diversity of our trade which I think is just as important to our autonomy as the question of foreign ownership. If the great bulk of our foreign trade is with one customer, then our dependence on that customer, of course, has to be very substantial. The United States is an obvious market for many of our products, not only gas and oil from the west but many refinery and other products from the Atlantic provinces.

• (12:40 p.m.)

In terms of diversification, have we really been trying? At the moment I think we are doing pretty well with the European Common Market. However, in recent years our exports to that market have been growing at about half the rate of growth of imports into the European Common Market. Despite the importance of this, the biggest importing market of the western world, we have had no ambassador in Brussells since February. There has been no ambassador to the Common Market since February.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Stanfield: The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) has been to Europe. I get the impression, from reading dispatches, that the significance of the Common Market, particularly the enlarged Common Market, is now becoming somewhat apparent to him. He is becoming aware of what this means to the traditional concept of multilateralism, namely that if the countries of the outer seven enter the Common Market the developed world will consist of two or three large trading blocs. Outside of these blocs, there will be a few relatively small countries such as Canada and Australia. The world might look quite different with regard to trading.

The minister indicated he would be making a proposal before some international gathering of some concept of agreement between Britain and the European Common Market. The minister has not disclosed any details. I hope he will give us his conception of this in the near future because, in my opinion, time is running out. It is time that we established on the record where we stand with regard to the European Common Market and the methods we are going to use to protect our interests.

During the last two years we have moved farther away from the just society. The slogan of the travel agent is that half the fun is getting there. In this instance, most Canadians would have preferred to stay home. We have had the constitution, regional disparity, growing unemployment, deepening poverty, no science policy and a housing failure. Two years have been lost with regard to the urban problem. We are now getting started on the problem of pollution. As far as Canadian autonomy is concerned, the government has just been messing around. It is time the Prime Minister indicated which decision of "Jumping Joe" is really the position of the government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: What we have been given in the Speech from the Throne is a grab-bag of thin proposals, ones left over from last year, plucked from other sources or areas and which have been laying around waiting to be picked up. It is important to note there is no hint of a general philosophy or a general pattern. If the government really did mean anything by its slogan of a just society, there should have been a precise, recognizable pattern. The government, if it has a direction, should tell the Canadian people what it is. It should fit its acts and decisions into that pattern, because surely that is what a just society means.

I think the just society slogan has now become, justice if necessary, but not necessarily justice.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: We must recognize that the just society is just a slogan.

This was the year that the government had promised to reveal itself after two years of housecleaning and thinking. It has revealed itself. It has revealed itself as largely devoid of constructive ideas. The just society slogan is revealed in its emptiness. As a Canadian citizen I am rather sorry, but at least the position of the government is now clear.

There was one quite unpremeditated touch of realism at the end of the Speech from the Throne and I quote:

> We stand on the threshold of greatness.

At first, I thought that was just another pretentious statement but now I consider it was really a reference to the Progressive Conservative victory in the next election.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: In the Speech from the Throne the government has shown itself to be a fellowship of tinkerers who believe that the basic things have been done and that it must merely adjust a screw here, tighten a nut there, or something like that. I do not think we have yet reached that stage. I do not think the Canadian people believe that either.

We realize, even if the government does not, that there is a great deal to be done. There is a challenge for the Canadian people to build the kind of country that they want. To do so, the first challenge is to rid ourselves of this government. Canadians must get rid of the government so we can really get to work, not just on slogans but on changing the reality of Canada. I therefore, move that the following be added to the Address:

> —but we respectfully regret that because of the indecision and failures of Your Excellency's advisers, the Just Society is now a "distant ideal".

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I had a hunch the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) would not be completely enthusiastic with the Speech from the Throne. That hunch was justified this morning. He has spoken according to a traditional pattern, a feeling of being under obligation to disagree with everything in the Speech from the Throne, except perhaps with the Throne itself. I do not suspect him of downgrading the Monarchy or anything like that.

In his reply to the Speech from the Throne, the Leader of the Opposition was not entirely consistent and not funny throughout. It was better at the beginning than at

the end. The contradictions, Mr. Speaker, were about the only thing consistent in his speech.

First, we heard from the Leader of the Opposition that there was too much philosophy in the Speech from the Throne. Before he resumed his seat he complained that in the speech there was and I quote, "no general philosophy or recognizable pattern". The Leader of the Opposition does not want to see philosophy, then he would like to see philosophy, in the Speech from the Throne.

If we repeat anything that appeared in the last Speech from the Throne it is repetition, left-overs, and the Leader of the Opposition cannot agree with that. If we do not repeat things, for instance, our position on the constitution, then it is because we have lost interest in those things that we do not repeat them. If we do repeat them, we are guilty of repetition. It is a little difficult, Mr. Speaker, to completely satisfy a leader of the opposition. I realize that this is part of the rules of the game. The Leader of the Opposition is playing that game to the best of his ability. I am sure, with a certain amount of years of experience, he will learn to be quite a good Leader of the Opposition.

• (12:50 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Trudeau: I am told some of the opposition members do not agree with the statement I have just made. But there may be further meetings across the country, in secret or otherwise, to discuss the question. The place is not here.

I was scorned because, it was said, I am not a friend of the little man, as the Leader of the Opposition put it, but rather a friend of big business. A very few phrases later I was scorned because I was poisoning the atmosphere by attacking big business and big unions. So, on the one hand, I am too friendly toward big business while, on the other, I am not friendly enough and ruining the chances of having an incomes policy.

Mr. Baldwin: Shows how inconsistent you are.

Mr. Trudeau: These inconsistencies are really not very important because no one expects a leader of the opposition to agree with what is said in a Speech from the Throne. But it is sometimes expected that there will be constructive advice in some areas and that the hon. gentleman will use this important occasion to state some of the policies of his own party. I listened attentively to the scorn heaped on us for not solving the problem of foreign ownership, expecting this would be followed up by concrete proposals. But it was a disappointing performance. We on this side have said, through the offices of a minister reporting to cabinet, that we are in the process of trying to enunciate government policy in this important area in order to avoid a pragmatic or ad hoc approach. But we knew we did not have the support of the opposition on this. They have heaped scorn on our policy of using white papers or policy documents; they have always chided us for our studied approach and the long lead-time taken before we enunciate policy on any precise matters. We have confessed we cannot speak off the top of our head on such important subjects and that we do not intend to lead the country to and fro according to the whims of the day. We want to have as good an enunciation as we can of our policy in this and other areas. So when the Leader of the Opposition chided us for our studied approach to this question of foreign ownership, I thought perhaps he would have finished his own studies and be in a position to say: We no longer need to study this matter; here is our solution.

We did get a number of phrases at that point, though, and no doubt they do represent good advice. I have some of the hon. gentleman's words here in quotes. After hearing him say that the government had no policy I expected that the Leader of the Opposition would tell us what he himself proposed. What he did propose was "a study", a "continuing study", certainly "nothing off the top of the head"; it would be "thought about in an orderly way"; it would be "a continuing process".

Mr. Broadbent: Sounds like the Liberal government.

Mr. Trudeau: Indeed. It sounds like what we are saying we are doing—following an orderly process. There are certainly no grounds here for chiding the government for doing what the opposition says it is in the process of doing.

Some hon. Members: Oh.

Mr. Trudeau: I am glad I have the agreement of the members of New Democratic party. I know they have some difficulty themselves in arriving at a policy on this question of foreign ownership. I understand they have an advantage of the Leader of the Opposition and ourselves inasmuch as they do not need to do any thinking about it. Mr. Watkins has done all the thinking. The trouble, of course, is that the party does not agree with Mr. Watkins and they are therefore in a dilemma which I do not envy them.

An hon. Member: They must miss you.

Mr. Trudeau: Either they reject Mr. Watkins, in which case it appears they, too, will have to embark on a series of studies and continuing studies, or they accept Mr. Watkins and not only the party falls apart but the union leadership ceases to support them. They are in a terrible jam.

Mr. Bell: They are in the Senate, now.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Trudeau: A member opposite suggests that some of them are in the Senate. I cannot promise that I shall be able to put all the friends of the New Democratic party into the Senate but if the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is interested I shall perhaps save a place there for him.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Absolutely no. I decline, absolutely.

Mr. Trudeau: May I call it one o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, before the luncheon adjournment I was able to disagree with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) on a certain number of points on which he had disagreed with us. However, I do want to say now that there is one point on which I wish to join him, and that is in his congratulatory comments to the two hon. members who distinguished themselves yesterday when they moved and seconded the resolution adopting His Excellency's address.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Trudeau: Each brought to the task the experience and outlook of his own region of the country. As well, however, they placed those views and points of opinion in the wider perspective of all Canada, a task which is required of each of us in this chamber.

The two hon. members bring to this debate a happy combination of backgrounds. Both took their seats in this House for the first time following the general election of 1968 and so bring a freshness of opinon to this debate. One is from a rural constituency in the Prairies, the other from a large metropolitan community in eastern Canada. One has pursued an agricultural life, the other has engaged in business. One is English-speaking, the mother tongue of the other is French. Between them, they represent and reflect much of what is Canada.

The hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel) has shown his competence in this House through his active work and contributions to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs and through his membership in the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) has been a very active member of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, a subject with which he acquainted me in delightful fashion when I had the opportunity to visit his farm a year ago.

I listened with interest to the speech earlier this morning of the Leader of the Opposition, and I should like to make a few comments on his participation. First, I most sincerely want to congratulate him on the very statesmanlike attitude which he displayed throughout his European tour this past summer. It was clear from the things he said last July in Europe that the hon. gentleman felt the same pride in Canada and its accomplishments as do all Canadians when they have the opportunity to look back upon their country from abroad.

Indeed, I had assumed, it appears now prematurely, that the hon. gentleman had gained some perspective in his outlook. It was clear, however, from his remarks this morning that all he gained this summer was a good dictionary.

Mr. Stanfield: I need another trip.

Mr. Trudeau: I think the hon. member might feel that I am unfair. I really tend to forget that the Leader of the Opposition has been involved in politics for so long—I choose the word "involved" deliberately; I would not want to use the word "active" because it does not seem quite appropriate—that he can continue to talk in 1970 in Ottawa in the same terms and in the same tone as he employed 10 years ago in Halifax.

I wonder whether he will continue to display this magnificent stolidity throughout the next few years. If so, I am sure that the disappearance of the Progressive Conservative party as a relevant element in Canadian life will then be guaranteed. He may find that his party's platform is replaced by the well-known Dr. Marcuses, because the sum total of his speech this morning and his concluding words were really marcusian in nature: he concluded that the only thing that mattered was to throw out the government.

Mr. Lundrigan: Pretty smart, I would say.

Mr. Trudeau: That shows the readings you have.

Mr. Lundrigan: Your readings are reflected in your writing.

Mr. Trudeau: I think one point is certain, and it is that Canada appears when looked at from abroad—I admit I sometimes have occasion to do this myself—to be not so much a magnificent expanse of geography or a cluster of surging cities; rather it appears as people. Canada is Canadians. The great strength of this country lies in the good nature, the good sense and the goodwill of her men and women. Often, when we see this country from far away, we realize this. We see Canada as others see us.

One of the most touching tributes which was given to our country in this respect was paid by Queen Juliana of the Netherlands, when she told her children that they would like Canadians because they smiled easily. I think that is a beautiful description of Canadians, and I am sure that if her children had been in the gallery this morning they would have smiled very easily.

If Canada's strength is in her people, her vigour is in the future toward which Canadians have turned instinctively for centuries. I personally do not share with any acuteness the sense of regret expressed by some commentators that Canadians pay insufficient heed to their past. The past we must understand and respect, but it is not to be worshipped. It is in the future that we shall find our greatness.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Trudeau: Canada is a young country, and it is in the youth of our country that we seek our future. To the youth the past is of relatively little consequence: their lives are still to be lived.

A poet once wrote that "a land without ruins is a land without memories". Our lack of ruins is in some ways a tribute to our ability in the past to adapt to change.

An hon. Member: As long as it is not the Tories.

Mr. Trudeau: The challenge today is not simply change; it is more the pace and the scale of that change.

Mr. Lundrigan: You are changing our traditions.

Mr. Trudeau: I can understand that the hon. member does not like being described as a ruin.

Mr. Lundrigan: That is correct.

Mr. Trudeau: He may escape that fate, but I cannot guarantee that he will not become a wreck if he stays where he is. I believe strongly that no country is better able to adapt to the present and to the future than is Canada, for no country is more fortunate in its basic attributes.

[*Translation*]

Space on a continental scale; a population which commands immense and near-empty territories, and to which is still unknown the almost universal anguish of overcrowding; natural resources so vast that their inventory is constantly swelling; an enormous economic potential; a very high standard of living; an invaluable asset linked to ethnic diversity and cultural pluralism; two official languages corresponding to two principal mentalities which are among the supreme expressions of western civilization; as the principal of national identity—federalism, the most evolved of political forms; a democratic regime guaranteed by a parliamentary system closely derived from a most admirable model; and peace and freedom. Because of all these goods, because of all these blessings, Canada stands as one of the most happy and enviable facts of the times. Because of all this, our country can be looked upon as a global environment, as an environment exceptionally favourable to the fullness of human development.

This has often been said. Nevertheless it is all the more seasonable to repeat it as too many among us are prone to consider such utterances as a litany of commonplaces unworthy of one's attention. On this solemn occasion, may all Canadians be incited to a renewed awareness of the riches and privileges by the virtue of which they have become such a fortunate people, and which constitute the living scene and the vital implements of their destiny. From either a collective or an individual point of view, no awareness of this kind can be decisive or final. In that connection, we must then have the courage and even the heroism to repeat ourselves. For our commitment to our country is the very style of our commitment to life. Let us all understand that Canada is not made up of a complaisant mass of data, but, rather, results from a priceless and demanding combination of providential gifts.

If Canada is a privileged fact, never has our country recognized itself as an accomplished fact. Knowledge of our national deficiencies and the obvious difficulties of the times protect us against such a dangerous illusion.

We are too young a nation and too enterprising a people to fall into the illusion of final accomplishment. Besides, our history, our very short history tells us that ever since its adventurous beginnings our country is in constant and rapid evolution. And today, vast regions of the Canadian territory are going through an accelerated humanization process, are beginning to acquire a political structure and are preparing themselves for a full identification with the national entity. Canada is in a continuous process of invention and it is as a steady and permanent enterprise that it must be understood.

The foundations and the elements of our country, and its prospects confer to the Canadian project a quality that is extremely stimulating and exciting. In accordance with the contemporary tendency to participation and collective action, all our fellow citizens should espouse eagerly the Canadian design, and get involved as fully as possible in its formulation and in its realization. This can be accomplished through the constant exercise of their right to criticize and demand through the free expression of their feelings and of their thinking to the legislators. A country is truly meaningful if it is the joint undertaking of the legislator and the citizen. Only then does a country become a fatherland.

[*English*]

To be vigorous and forward-looking is not enough to guarantee our future, however. We will be called upon to look upon it with imagination, to approach it with spirit, to plan for it with boldness. Daily problems will always be with us, but the government is not permitted the false luxury of concentrating only on the moment at hand. That opportunity, as was shown this morning, belongs to the Opposition. Governments must deal as best they can with current difficulties; they must discharge as well the responsibility of preparing for the future. This government accepts that responsibility. We shall continue to lay before Parliament the product of our planning. We seek a future over which Canadians will exercise some control, not a series of events by happenstance. Canadians have demonstrated in the past their disenchantment with governments which careened with uncertainty from one crisis to the next.

Mr. Woolliams: They cannot even get a crisis going in this government.

Mr. Trudeau: Exciting as that erraticism might seem to those who are stimulated by the froth and foam of uncertainty, it is not the choice of Canadians. We are called upon to work toward a secure and independent Canada within a peaceful world; a Canada in which social justice and economic growth are norms which apply to the lives of men and women in all parts of this country; a Canada situated within a harmonious natural environment; a Canada in which all Canadians take pride because of the opportunities available to them to participate in its governance and to contribute to its unity. That kind of Canada, that kind of future, we believe in, Mr. Speaker, and we believe the Canadian people find it truly exciting.

The program of this government, Mr. Speaker, is designed to contribute to that kind of Canada. It is a program which is operative in all sectors of Canadian life—political, economic, social and cultural. Through a combination of white papers, of legislation, and of administrative acts, we are seeking to deal with the problems of the present at the same time that we anticipate and minimize those of the future. A good number of those activities have been revealed in the Speech from the Throne, others are contained in the list of legislation which has been tabled in this House. A few examples will reveal the breadth and the depth of our concern:

To improve and strengthen the climate of liberty and the tradition of a fair and just administration of the laws

of this land, we shall introduce provisions respecting bail and pre-trial detention, electronic eavesdropping, statutory instruments and the treatment of young offenders.

To assist the millions of Canadians who are consumers of goods, of services, of credit, there will be introduced measures which will permit them to know more accurately what they are getting for their money and to protect them against unfair and unscrupulous practices.

To enhance the position of members of the work force, we plan legislation which will raise the standards governing terms and conditions of employment in industries within federal jurisdiction, and to improve the quality of the collective bargaining process for the benefit of both labour and management there is legislation providing for a modern, legal framework for relations between them.

To reflect the growing belief within Canada that a rational program of income security is required, a white paper will be tabled shortly which will have a wide and, it is expected, profound impact on Canadians. Complementary to that paper and to the government's thesis that all Canadians should be assisted if need be to help themselves, that they should not be made responsible for economic difficulties over which they have no control, there will be introduced legislation to provide more and better benefits to those persons temporarily without employment. This legislation will place emphasis on assisting persons to become re-employed.

These are among the measures which we propose in order to create within Canada a better society for all Canadians, a society whose strength is derived from the individuals who live within it. For the well-being of those individuals—the men, the women, the youth—government must be concerned constantly and actively. The dignity and self-respect of every Canadian are necessary elements in the kind of Canada of which I speak. Should any of the ingredients of human dignity be absent, we must act. Fortunately, most of them are present in Canada—individual liberty, the several rights and freedoms spelled out in the Canadian Bill of Rights, equality of opportunity. Another ingredient, one that ranks with these but is more elusive of attainment, is the ability to maintain an adequate standard of living for oneself and one's dependants. Some are unable to maintain such a standard because of a lack of education or an absence of the skills necessary in today's world; others are unable to stretch their fixed incomes to meet the increased costs of necessities; still others are temporarily without employment through no fault of their own.

• (2:20 p.m.)

We must understand the needs, and attempt to assist, persons in each of these categories. There is a personal tragedy whenever a person who seeks gainful employment is unable to find it. There is equal personal tragedy whenever the cost of living overtakes and passes the total income of any person. The tragedy in each case becomes the more keen if a contributing factor to the absence of work or the advance of inflation is the greed and over indulgence of other members of the community.

The government took the position a year ago, and was supported by the vast majority of Canadians, that inflation was harmful both to our present well being and to our future economic growth. Reasonable price stability was a key economic goal. Everyone suffers, no one gains, from uncontrollable rise in the cost of living. Pensioners suffer, unorganized wage earners suffer, and by their own admission even the minority of Canadians suffer who form the membership of professional groups and labour unions. These latter are concerned about inflation, they say, yet they express their concern by raising their fees and by demanding higher wages. They are entitled to do so, they claim, so long as corporate profits remain high. This is their belief. They can claim higher wages and fees so long as corporate profits remain high. Since early 1969, however, profits have been falling markedly, and there are obvious limits to this process if we are not to damage the economy's ability to create new jobs in the future through productive investment. Consequently, we say that no one is entitled to take advantage of his fellow citizen. We saw that inflation must be attached with determination by all Canadians for the good of all Canadians.

To this, the Opposition replied with ridicule throughout the last session. At every increase in the cost of living index they trumpeted in this House and outside it as if this increase represented a triumph for their side. I doubt that it was a triumph for them; I know that it was no triumph for millions of Canadians. What do we hear from the Opposition now? What we hear is rather strange. What do we hear from them now that government policies have taken the wind out of the sails of inflation, now that the cost of living index has levelled off? What have they to say in reply to the fact that official OECD figures show that the Canadian struggle against inflation has been more effective than that of any other major industrialized country in the world?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Trudeau: What do they say? They say that we have devoted too much attention to inflation. They say that the price we pay for fighting it is worse than the evil of inflation, and they charge that the government favours unemployment. The kindest thing I can say about these comments is that they are stuff and nonsense.

This apparent readiness to sacrifice our newly achieved and still precarious price stability is surely a very short-sighted prescription for our present problem of unemployment. True, a linkage has been established by economists between the behaviour of prices and wages and the rate of unemployment. But it has also been shown that this trade-off is a short run phenomenon and that sacrificing price stability will not by itself aid in improving a country's long run employment situation. For this reason, the government rejects the argument that only by allowing inflation to run rampant can we reduce the rate of unemployment.

Instead, another less simplistic route must be followed. We on this side claim no magic formula, but we do promise honest attempts to meet the pressing problem of generating a sufficient number of new jobs, not only to absorb the record number of new entrants into the labour market but also to reduce gradually the distressingly high level of unemployment in many parts of the

country. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) will have more to say on this subject when he participates in this debate.

Mr. Bell: We can hardly wait.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, any government is responsible for a society and it assumes and exercises that responsibility according to certain principles, to a certain ideal that it has set for itself.

Now, if the ideal sought by the government is to establish a just society, it is because it believes that this should be the objective of any real democracy. Universal franchise, the equality of everyone before the law, which are the attributes of a democratic system, are obviously imbued with a spirit of justice. But those rights, however valuable they may be, are only illusive if they are not embodied in a still more basic right, which is, for the individual, the right to his vital self-development, according to his talents and capacities.

So when we talk about a "just society", we refer to a justice applied to the reality of every day life, embodied in the life of everyone. There is justice when everyone's essential needs are satisfied. This implies a reasonable access for all to the goods owned and produced by the country. Now, work is the normal mode of access to the goods on which life depends; it therefore cannot be disassociated from the right to live.

But since the state of the economy determines work possibilities, one of the primary expressions of the social philosophy of the government must be its economic policy.

Because of the rate of unemployment, the present economic situation can hardly be accepted; this we all know, Mr. Speaker. The difficult times we are going through exist throughout North America and, frankly, will probably persist for several more months. However, the steps we have already taken allow us to foresee increasing improvement during 1971.

As I have said, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) will have the opportunity to outline what other measures the government is taking and intends to take to strengthen our economy. But that field is so vast and complex that there is no single solution or remedy. Above all, there are no quick and immediate solutions. At first sight, some solutions may seem annoying, when they are always intended to ensure in the nearest reasonable future the economic stability and expansion of the country, for the greatest benefit of all its citizens. May I repeat at this point, Mr. Speaker, that the first step that was imposed to us was the fight against an inflation which had become a threat to the whole economy. Courage was needed to take that step. But it has not prevented the government from being concerned all the time about the problem of unemployment, particularly in the less developed areas of the country. And this government did not remain indifferent to the daily distress of all of our fellow citizens who have been its victims.

We can rejoice today at seeing that the situation, far from deteriorating further, as it would undoubtedly have had we not acted as we did, is beginning to be restored. So much so that owing to our incentive programmes to productivity, owing to our assistance programmes to industry in under-developed areas, the commercial situation being favourable, our exports this year reached an unprecedented volume and, next year, we shall experience a new prosperity leading to a marked decrease in unemployment.

The only true prosperity is that which is equitably shared. However elaborate the distribution, it could not be completed or maintained without the help of a tax reform.

In political economy, taxation is the immediate means for equity, the pre-eminent way of serving justice. For, owing to its taxation power, the state is basically a righter of wrongs. In fact, property spontaneously tends toward concentration and not distribution; in ordinary circumstances, the distribution never happens unless compulsion is exercised by public authority and endorsed by a majority of citizens. But prejudice due to uneven distribution of the national wealth changes in the course of time. Therefore, fiscal means should be modified accordingly, so that the balance of contributions might be adjusted as much as possible.

Public reaction to the proposals of the White Paper on tax reform was strong indeed. The purpose of that paper was precisely to prompt public opinion to express itself. On the other hand, a Senate committee and a House of Commons committee, appointed to study the White Paper proposals, have just turned in their reports. These reports, as well as the criticism voiced by the public, will be seriously considered. We are willing to amend certain proposals, those, for instance, that might, after consideration, prove detrimental to our industrial growth. This is what we did in the case of the mining industry.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of our action should be kept in mind. During a long debate which answered very well our expectations of an active democracy, several groups and many citizens defended their interests intelligently and vigorously. That is gratifying. It is now up to the government, bearing in mind the general interest of the citizens, to bring before the House some amendments to our tax system, which we feel would achieve the two-fold objective of ensuring a more equitable distribution of the tax burden and a high rate of economic growth, without which our society cannot develop.

• (2:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

A number of ministers will be speaking in this debate, Mr. Speaker, and they will deal in some detail with those areas within their responsibility. For my part this afternoon I should like to touch on only a few further matters. I do so because of the emphasis that the Leader of the Opposition has quite properly given to them. These areas of which I speak are of concern to Canadians and are, to a degree, products of the rapid changes which have been visited upon us in recent years. Some changes are wonderful in their promise; others bring bitterness in their wake. We should not assume, however, the results of change to be preordained. To guarantee beneficial conse-

quences, it is necessary that we plan and work; to prevent unwanted consequences, it is necessary that we plan and work.

I shall deal first with the environment. How many members of this House, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, have walked through the main entrance of this building over the years either accepting without question, or failing to notice, the words carved in the stone above the doorway? How many today could agree with the language employed there? The inscription reads:

The wholesome sea is at her gates; her gates both East and West.

Wholesome though those seas may have been when the sculptor was at work, the excesses of shipowners and operators, combined over the years with the complacency of public and government, have led to foul water, unfit in places for any but the lowest forms of life.

These are the kind of changes that must be resisted. Today, when we look to the seas at our gates, we gaze not in two but in three directions. Our third, northern, sea must not be permitted to lose its present wholesome state, and to that end legislation was introduced into this House last session. Hon. members on all sides accepted the necessity for and the wisdom of this legislation and passed it through the House in a rare display of unanimity. I am grateful to them for doing so. Steps are now necessary to contain and remove the conditions of pollution on our western and eastern gates, and legislation to that end will soon be introduced. The battle against pollution elsewhere than in our coastal waters is to be waged with increasing vigour and efficiency. The waging of that battle will be intensified by the new departmental structure mentioned in the Speech from the Throne.

The government will shortly be taking steps towards the establishment of a new department by assigning to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) the responsibilities and related elements of the public service which would permit him to take a broad ecological perspective in the discharge of his responsibilities, and in particular to take the lead in the enhancement of the quality of our environment.

A bill relating to the organization of the government will also be introduced shortly, proposing the establishment of a department concerned with renewable resources and environmental affairs which would have as its core the Department of Fisheries and Forestry, whose functions will be expanded to bring under the direction of a single minister the principal governmental activities relating to environmental quality in general, and pollution in particular.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: By transferring to the Department of Fisheries and Forestry elements of the meteorological branch of the Department of Transport and the general responsibilities related to air pollution of the Department of National Health and Welfare, the principal governmental activities relating to the fight against atmospheric pollution will be brought together within one department. The transfer of the bulk of the water sector of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, and the transfer of the responsibility for the Canada Water Act from the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry will combine under the direction of one minister and his department general responsibility for the development of our water resources and the more particular responsibility of the protection of the water habitat of our marine life.

Finally, the transfer of the Canadian Wildlife Service from the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to the Department of Fisheries and Forestry will bring together in one department responsibility for our renewable resources including, notably, the related research activities required for the effective discharge of these responsibilities.

The establishment of the new department that Parliament will be asked to approve through the enactment of a government organization act will not result in the creation of a super agency to be responsible for all matters relating to the environment. The fight against the pollution of our environment is far beyond the capacity of one minister and his department. Indeed, it cannot be waged effectively by the federal government alone, or the provinces individually, or even just by Canada. It is a fight that must be waged by all ministers, all governments and all people.

There are many departments in the government which have and will continue to have important responsibilities for the preservation of the quality of our environment. These departments will co-operate with the proposed Department of the Environment which will have the principal tools to lead the fight against pollution and to help co-ordinate the efforts of others.

These transfers are not to be regarded simply as a re-tuning of the present apparatus. They are part of a carefully balanced, freshly designed effort for environmental protection.

It should be clear, however, Mr. Speaker, that when the Leader of the Opposition says, as he has, that the government hasn't done much in the way of the environmental control, that such statements do little more than contribute to pollution—noise pollution.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: Perhaps the hon. gentleman was elsewhere when the several statutes relating to the environment passed through this House last session.

Mr. Woolliams: What about the million and a half tourists pouring raw sewage into the river at Banff?

Mr. Trudeau: Indeed, what about it!

A complementary aspect of environmental management is resource conservation. Both the present and future growth of our economy, as well as the preservation of our environment, emphasize the increasing importance to Canada of our energy and mineral resources. The responsibilities of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources for the development of co-ordinated and comprehensive policies in these areas have become substantially greater in the last year or so. Indeed, the burden of the work which led to the presentation in the

House last session of the Canada Water Act was borne by that department. There is an inherent conflict of interests, however, Mr. Speaker, between those who are seeking the exploitation of non-renewable resources and those who are charged with the responsibility of protecting the environment. This conflict is not irreconcilable, nor is there anything evil in it. Nevertheless, the government is of the opinion that these differences are better debated and resolved by ministers in council and not by officials within a single department. For that reason, certain responsibilities have been transferred from the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, as I mentioned a few moments ago.

• (2:40 p.m.)

The transfer will permit that department, which has been increasingly engaged in recent years in the formulation and administration of energy policies, to concentrate even more on this important work. Should additional strength and resources be required for it to meet the increasing challenge of this work, they will be provided as a matter of high priority. Our goal must be a national policy which will balance adequately our economic objectives and our environmental values.

I wish now to say something about the cities. Let me make crystal clear at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that the government is deeply conscious and aware of the constitutional responsibility and role of the provincial and municipal governments. Proposals of the federal government in the area of urban affairs should not be interpreted by the other levels of government as a desire or an intention to act other than within clearly defined federal jurisdiction.

Let me say as well that it is false to suggest that the federal government has not been active and welcome in the cities of this country for many years. More than 20 departments of the federal government are now present and engaged in the cities. And some of them are very active. In the field of low income housing, for example, 44 per cent of all the activity undertaken in Canada since 1950 has been achieved in the past two years.

The cities, Mr. Speaker, are as much a part of Canada, and as much a concern of the federal government, as is the countryside. The federal government is a partner with the provincial governments in this respect, and can in many instances perform in a catalytic role to assist in the attainment of agreed goals. The constitution gives to the provinces the responsibility for municipal government; it does not deny that city dwellers are as qualified to seek the assistance of the federal government in the solution of their problems as are rural dwellers.

This government has not been unaware of the need to offer more assistance to the cities, Mr. Speaker, as the housing statistics I mentioned a moment ago prove. Nor has it rushed into the cities like a bull into a china shop, as the opposition has urged us to do.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Trudeau: Do you want to say something about it?

An hon. Member: I have never heard anything like it. It's a lot of bull.

[Mr. Trudeau.]

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: Mostly static.

Mr. Woolliams: You need a new scriptwriter.

Mr. Trudeau: No, I don't need a new scriptwriter, I need a better memory. I wish I could give the date when the Leader of the Opposition spoke so firmly of the need for this government to rush forth into the cities and do more. The next day he was disowned by the Premier of Ontario.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: Didn't Ivan Head put that in the speech for you?

Mr. Trudeau: Of course, the NDP doesn't have this problem because they do not have to worry about getting elected.

An hon. Member: That's just whistling in the dark.

Mr. Trudeau: The reorganization of our urban activities is the result of detailed consultation and planning with other levels of government. They will be directed by a minister whom we propose to designate as a minister of state, who intends to participate in this debate.

Ministers of state are a new concept, Mr. Speaker, and are intended to permit government more effectively to deal with modern conditions. The proposed legislation regarding governmental organization will contain provision for the creation by order in council of offices of ministers of state for designated purposes; they will have a status and a salary equal to a minister with a department. These ministers of state generally will be responsible for developing new and comprehensive federal policies in areas where the development of such policies is of particular urgency and importance. The mandates of these ministers will be of a temporary nature, of such a duration as to enable them to come to grips with the policy problems assigned to them. They will not generally have departments, but only relatively small secretariats with no program responsibilities. The new system will give to the Prime Minister more flexibility in assigning senior ministers to tackle important problems that require policy development.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the legislation planned for this session flows naturally from the programs of the government in the past two years. Part of the legislation is an extension of our earnest belief in the need for rational, relevant criminal laws; part of it is a product of our affirmation of the need for a humane and sensitive, but stimulating and enterprising, social system, part of it is a desire for a burgeoning, well-distributed economy. All of it is a consequence of careful examination and preparation. Through the medium of white papers, we shall continue to reveal, to a degree unmatched by any previous Canadian government, our analysis of problems and our proposed solutions. We shall continue to offer legislation based upon those white papers. We shall do so in the belief that the people of Canada desire to participate in the preparation of sound policies; we shall do so undeterred by a Don Quixote racing across the land

from luncheon table to luncheon table vainly seeking confirmation that he has sighted a dragon.

We have been reminded in recent days that the violence which is now so familiar to so many countries is no stranger to Canada. We have seen evidence in Canada this past summer of challenges to some of our most cherished concepts. We have been told by some that the air that we have so long believed to be as free as any in the world, that the equality which we thought was so widespread in practice, that the simple tolerance and goodwill of one Canadian to another—that these beliefs and these criteria are misleading or false. We are challenged and we must respond. The response cannot be a forfeiture of our values, but it must include a sincere attempt to ensure that all Canadians have available to them effective avenues for social change and political action. It must include as well, however, an expression of our strong belief that liberty and anarchy are contradictory, that democracy and violence cannot co-exist, that our freedom is dependent upon wise restraints.

If Canadians are unable to pursue a system of peaceful resolution of problems, then what persons are? If we, who associate one with the other within a framework as flexible as is federalism, who are predisposed to tolerance, and who enjoy the benefits of linguistic and cultural differences—if we still depart from reason, then surely we are in no position to criticize other countries for their social difficulties.

I believe that we can profit from the knowledge that violence begets violence, that the experience of man demonstrates with blinding clarity that in a jungle all are not equal, but all are vulnerable.

Freedom and liberty are neither gained nor retained without cost. The cost takes the form of a burden which demands of us all the human elements of responsibility, trust and common sense—responsibility, because every Canadian is a participant in the democratic process; trust to promote reasonable, reasoned argument; common sense to enable us to see what is, and what is not possible and desirable.

In these respects, we here in this House have both the opportunity and the responsibility to demonstrate to all Canadians that in our common commitment to Canada and to the democratic process we are capable of producing enlightened debate and wise decisions. I look forward, Mr. Speaker, as I know do all hon. members, to a session which will bring distinction to this Parliament and to those who have the honour to sit within it, and which will contribute to a better Canada in a better world.

• (2:50 p.m.)

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted, at the outset, to extend my congratulations to the mover and seconder, and to say that we all enjoyed the speeches made by the hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel) and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas). I assure the hon. member for Assiniboia that I, and I hope many hon. Members of Parliament, will accept his invitation to return to Saskatchewan next year. The hon. member said that we might see the fields of waving grain. I was in the hon. member's constituency this fall, and mostly I saw waving fields of summerfallow, some of which had been summerfallowed two years in succession because that is the only way those farmers could obtain the quotas which would enable them to sell the grain they had on hand. I must say that I could not find the same satisfaction with the government's policies or the same optimism for agriculture which the hon. member described in his speech yesterday.

I listened with interest to the Prime Minister's speech which, I thought, could have been entitled, "Canada as seen from the Caribbean, British Guiana and the Mediterranean." It was the usual elitest speech on Canada seen from the seats of affluence. That speech, Mr. Speaker, like the Speech from the Throne which I imagine came from the same author, was long on platitudes and short on policies.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The people in this country want programs and they are being given clichés and purple prose. In this Speech from the Throne, the government poses all the right questions but does not supply any of the answers.

An hon. Member: Let us have them.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The speech, for instance, says, "...a society which is not inspired by love and compassion is not worthy of the name." I suggest that love and compassion are meaningless sentiments unless they are expressed in social action based on social justice.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The Speech from the Throne states a great many problems but it offers very few solutions. For instance, it says, "It would be irresponsible to suggest that the economy is now in a satisfactory condition." Mr. Speaker, that can go down as the understatement of the year. The speech goes on to say, "When costs rise more rapidly than productivity, when men and women are unable to gain employment, when a reasonable distribution of the wealth of Canada is denied to certain sectors or regions, then these are matters for deep concern." Mr. Speaker, they are not only matters for deep concern; they are matters which call for immediate remedial action. There is nothing in the Speech from the Throne to indicate that some remedial action will be forthcoming.

The stagnant state of the economy and the consequences which flow from it is the No. 1 issue facing the Canadian people and there is nothing in this Speech from the Throne which even indicates that the government has any intention of taking steps to activate the economy and get it moving again. This document is full of perfumed rhetoric that speaks glowingly of desirable goals without delineating any plan for achieving them or any commitment for their realization. This is cheap soap opera psychology which dangles the vision of a just society before the eyes of the public and, at the same time, the govern-

ment is pursuing policies that will make our society less just, less equitable and less free.

The just society has now been reduced, in the Speech from the Throne, to "a distant ideal". The fact is, of course, that this government cannot build a just society because it is committed to operate within the framework of an economic system that is the antithesis of social justice and economic equity. This government is trapped in one of the glaring contradictions of our corporate controlled society. Never has this contradiction been so apparent as it is at the present time. There is a high level of economic activity throughout the western world. Canadian exports have reached an all-time high. Our balance of payments is favourable and our trade position with the United States shows the largest surplus in our history.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): According to the economic theories propounded by the Liberal party for decades, these conditions should produce prosperity, economic growth and full employment.

Mr. Trudeau: And inflation.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Instead, we find that unemployment in Canada is the highest in the western world. Unemployment in this country is at 6.7 per cent, seasonally adjusted. That only tells part of the story, because there are thousands of students who did not register and there are many people who got tired of going back to the manpower offices. Unemployment is even higher than statistics produced by the government would indicate. Moreover, our economic growth has now been reduced to almost zero and Canadian businessmen are experiencing a period of economic recession. Data for the last two months which is available, the months of June and July, shows that industrial production in this country has not only not increased, but that it has actually declined.

How does a Liberal government explain the anomaly of high exports and the favourable balance of trade with the unemployment and economic slowdown which is blighting the Canadian scene.

I suggest that there are two major reasons for this contradiction. First, the economic slump is due in part to the government's policies of fiscal and monetary restraint. The government has deliberately fostered an economic slowdown, under the euphemistic phrase "cooling off the economy" in its effort to check rising prices. Mr. Speaker, creating a recession in order to stop inflation is like cutting off your head to get rid of dandruff. Is the government telling the people of this country that Canadians must choose either unemployment or inflation? The Prime Minister this afternoon boasted that, according to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, we have done better with the problem of inflation than any other country has.

Mr. Stanfield: They do not say that.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): But, did he tell the House at the same time that the OECD has pointed out that we have the highest rate of unemployment of any country in the western world? Is this the choice we have to face? Does this mean when the economy begins to move again we can once more anticipate a renewal of price increases and rising living costs? Does this mean that the government has forsaken the objectives set out in the Green Book Proposals at the end of World War II, when all Canadian governments committed themselves to a program of full employment and a high level of national income with attendant price stability?

• (3:00 p.m.)

Five years ago the Economic Council of Canada outlined the targets which they thought were both realistic and essential. They were an economic growth rate of between 5½ per cent and 6 per cent in constant dollar terms, unemployment at a rate not higher than 3 per cent per annum of the labour force, and price increases not greater than 2 per cent per annum. Has the government decided that these targets are unattainable? Are they reconciled to the proposition that when we have full employment we must have galloping inflation, and that when we have price stability we must go through the agonies of a recession?

The New Democratic Party has repeatedly requested the government to adopt measures to stimulate Canada's wealth production as the best means of raising living standards, creating jobs and providing adequate social security for all Canadians. We have discussed our proposals many times in the House and I will not go into them now. I will just enumerate them lest anyone should suggest we have not put them before the House. The five points are as follows:

1. An expansionist program which would involve large scale investment in housing, urban renewal and other socially desirable projects such as construction of hospitals, recreational facilities and a major attack on pollution.

2. Investment controls designed to direct our available capital into socially essential projects while postponing investment on the more prestigious and less essential undertakings.

3. A redistribution of income by tax reforms which would transfer some of the tax burden from the lower and middle income groups to those corporations and individuals who, with the connivance of successive governments, have been able to evade their just responsibilities.

4. If necessary, we are prepared to support price and income controls provided these measures apply to all forms of income such as prices, profits, interest rates and rents, and not merely to wages and salaries.

5. Make our economy less susceptible to the inflationary pressures of the United States by using our very considerable natural resources to develop a viable industrial complex.

However, there is another major reason for the contradiction of employment and economic stagnation existing side by side with increased exports. The present economic slowdown is largely due to the unbalanced structure of our economy. More and more Canada is becoming an exporter of raw materials and an importer of finished

products. We ship out our raw materials such as lumber, iron ore, lead, copper, zinc, aluminum and pulp to be processed in other countries and then sold back to us in the form of manufactured goods. The effect of this is twofold. First of all, we are exporting jobs. The extraction industries have a high capital content but a low labour content. These industries are highly automated and are becoming more so. They will not provide enough jobs for the thousands of young Canadians with academic and technical training who are entering the labour market each year.

The second effect of our structural imbalance is the price differential between raw materials and finished products. Since the end of World War II the price of manufactured goods has risen much more sharply than the price of primary products. This explains the widening gap between the "have" and "have not" nations. Primary producing nations like Canada find themselves having to export more and more raw materials in order to pay for the manufactured goods they import. It follows that if Canada is to have full employment and a high level of national income, we must process more of our raw materials into finished or semi-finished goods rather than being content to be a nation composed of "hewers of wood and drawers of water".

The effect is that Canada is rapidly becoming an economic hinterland for the American industrial complex. According to the figures given in the House by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin), United States corporations have secured almost complete control of our extraction industries. At the present time they own and control 82.6 per cent of the oil and gas-wells industry, 84.9 per cent of primary metal smelting and refining and 99.9 per cent of oil refining.

Mr. Pepin: You were Premier of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I will discuss the province of Saskatchewan any time my hon. friend wishes. It is the only province in Canada that took its proven oil reserves and turned them over to the co-operatives so that the people could own the source of their own oil supply.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): That is something no Liberal government in Canada has ever done. If every other government in Canada had followed the same course, we would not now be completely at the mercy of the giant oil corporations of the United States. It should be remembered that these United States corporations did not invest in Canada as an act of Christian charity, but rather to assure a guaranteed supply of raw materials to feed the voracious appetite of American industry. I do not blame the Americans for seeking to guarantee their sources of supply, but I am concerned about what it is doing to Canada. These extraction industries provide less jobs per dollar invested and pay less taxes per dollar earned. The result is that we have to sell more and more raw materials to buy back the finished products. The government glories in the abundance of our exports, but the unbalanced structure of our economy has left half a million Canadians without jobs and five million Canadians living on or below the poverty line.

Canadians will have to decide whether Canada is to be relegated to the same role as some of the Latin-American countries which exist almost solely as a source of raw material for the United States. If we accept this role we are locking Canada into the U.S. economy, and by doing so we condemn this country to permanent unemployment and continuing inflation. Having acquired control of our raw materials, the United States industrial complex now wants the energy resources with which to convert our raw materials into finished products which they can sell back to us at ever higher prices. Canada's energy policy is like 'the peace of the Lord which passeth all understanding."

• (3:10 p.m.)

We have vast quantities of coal, yet Canada is an importer of coal. We have huge reserves of oil, yet Canada is a net importer of oil. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has uttered brave words about keeping Canadian ownership of the uranium industry at 40 per cent, but the recent decision of Gulf Minerals to develop reserves in Saskatchewan is making a mockery of his words. In the past two years spokesmen for the United States government have been using the bait of increased access to the U.S. market for Canadian oil as a means of getting their hands on two commodities which they desperately need—natural gas and water. They have won the first battle and I predict that victory in the second will not be long in coming. Anyone who is led astray by the assurances of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) need only remember similar assurances which were given by the Liberal party and the Liberal government in 1963 before reversing itself to conclude the Columbia River agreement, which gave one of the largest rivers in Canada over to the complete control of vested interests in the United States.

As I said, the government has lost the first battle because it has approved the export of 6.3 trillion cubic feet of natural gas to the United States. I point out that this action was taken without any reference to Parliament and in the absence of any statement by the government regarding its long-term energy policy. The government has no coherent policy setting forth Canada's long-term energy needs, nor has it made clear how our vast energy resources are to be utilized for the benefit of the people of Canada. Instead, we are allowing our energy resources to be picked off one by one, with the Americans taking what they need while at the same time restricting their markets where it is to their advantage to do so. We of the NDP believe that the government's decision to allow the export of 6.3 trillion cubic feet of gas to the United States is contrary to the best interests of the Canadian people.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In the first place, it will increase the price to the Canadian consumer. Indeed, it has already had that effect in anticipation of the sale being approved. Prices in Canada will follow those on the American market. Moreover, if we

sell the accessible gas to the United States, as we are doing, Canadians will have to depend increasingly upon gas produced in less accessible areas and the cost of the gas will consequently be much higher.

We are opposed to this decision because we believe that inadequate consideration has been given to Canada's long-term energy needs. Under the arrangements which the government have approved, Canada will be selling to the United States more than half our total gas production, and by 1990 we shall be selling two-thirds of our total gas production to the United States. The National Energy Board estimates that we are now supplying to the United States 3 per cent of its total consumption and that by 1990 we shall be supplying 15 per cent.

Of even more significance, the board estimates Canadian consumption per capita in 1990 to be at the same level as per capita consumption in the United States in 1975. In other words, the National Energy Board and the government seem perfectly prepared to see Canadian consumption per capita lag 15 years behind that of the United States, despite the fact that we were late in utilizing gas and that we have a cold climate. We believe that future Canadian long-term requirements have been grossly underestimated by the board. On the basis of a mere 10 per cent increase per annum—I believe the increase will amount to more than that—we shall have reached in 1981 the consumption which the board estimates for 1990.

The National Energy Board and the government have overlooked two important factors in estimating our long-term needs. First, they have overlooked the necessity for conversion to gas, particularly for the generating of electricity, bearing in mind that gas is the least polluting form of energy.

Mr. Pepin: They have not overlooked it.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The second is that a very large requirement for natural gas will exist in Canada if we are to embark upon a program of processing more of our own primary products in this country. The effect of the government's decision to approve this tremendous sale of natural gas to the United States is to tie Canada even more closely into the American economy; it is one more step in making Canada an economic dependency, a military satellite and a cultural colony of the United States. I tell the government that they may sit here in their ivory tower and toss about finespun theories, but the Canadian people are becoming alarmed at this situation, as is shown by the statements of one of the government's former ministers, Hon. Walter Gordon, and others, as well as by editorials appearing in newspapers and periodicals across the nation. I warn the government that the time will come very soon when the Canadian people will no longer allow a cynical and supine government to barter away our birthright in the name of continentalism.

We in the New Democratic Party believe that the first call on our energy resources should be the development of a viable Canadian industry which will convert our raw materials into processed and manufactured goods. The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources in a speech he was to have made in Portland, Oregon, on September 23, but which was read for him by his Parliamentary Secretary, set forth two conditions for supplying the United States with natural gas: first, free access for Canada to the United States' market for Canadian oil and, second access to the United States' market for Canadian manufactured products. We did not get either of these concessions.

We do not object to selling to the United States any of our surplus energy resources, subject to two provisos. The first is that Canada's long-term needs as an expanding industrial nation have been fully taken into account, and the second is that we gain access to the United States market for Canadian semi-processed and finished products. Neither of those provisos has been met and the government has betrayed the best interests of the Canadian people by entering into an agreement which will perpetuate our economic dependence upon, and exploitation by, the United States.

Mr. Woolliams: We are good whipping boys.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In his speech, the Prime Minister made reference repeatedly to the need for more planning. At times he suggested that we had not enough planning in Canada. That is not true; we do have planning. As a matter of fact, Canada has been the victim of corporate planning by United States-based multinational corporations. We have had planning, but it has been planning by and for corporations rather than planning for the well-being of all Canadians. Corporate power has been expanding steadily in our society. Corporations have been able to insulate themselves from the free forces of the market place. By setting administered prices they have virtually taxed the public on the consumer goods they buy in order to secure the necessary funds for their capital requirements, thus insulating themselves from the effects of any monetary policy the government may impose. These corporations control their sources of supply, set their own prices and by expensive advertising programs, influence consumer buying patterns.

• (3:20 p.m.)

The effect of this corporate domination is all too evident in our society. It sets the social priorities, with the result that we have a superabundance of private goods but a famine in public goods. We are able to spend $1.2 billion a year in advertising, but we lack the funds to combat pollution effectively. Commercial construction is up, but the building of houses for low and middle income groups is down. Money can be found for prestigious office buildings and high-rise apartments, for a third supermarket in each shopping centre and for a fourth gas station at each street corner, but money is lacking for public housing, nursing homes for the aged and schools for the mentally retarded.

The Speech from the Throne calls for "a society in which life is measured in qualitative, not quantitative, terms". This is unmitigated hypocrisy when the Canadian people have to endure the pollution of their atmosphere, water and soil, and the government sits supinely by when the financial institutions ignore their pleas for larger investment in residential housing.

The New Democratic Party believes that planning must be public rather than corporate, and must be subject to the control of the people through their elected representatives. We must establish priorities that will make more effective use of our nation's resources, so as to create a viable industrial economy, increase our wealth production and provide employment opportunities for our people. We must not only share the benefits of increased production with all sectors of our population; we must also insist that the tax burden of this country be imposed on a more equitable basis. Under the guise of promoting economic growth, the government—particularly its members on the Finance Committee—are seeking to ease the burden on the corporate sector at the expense of the salary and wage earners of Canada.

If this country is ever to enjoy economic independence, then the decision-making power in our economy must be restored to the Canadian people and exercised by their government. Up until now the government has been content to allow the major decisions affecting the lives of all Canadians to be made in the boardrooms of foreign corporations. The time has come when that decision-making power must be transferred back to Canada, for if it is not we face the loss of Canadian sovereignty. At the accelerated rate of American takeovers we have only a few years left. The challenge which faces this government is to act boldly and to act now.

An hon. Member: Sounds like the Wafflers.

Mr. Gillespie: Is this the Waffle group?

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I interpolate to say that the subject I have been discussing should be of great interest to the two members who have just regrettably interrupted me. I shall be glad to listen to their views, and I hope they will be as courageous in the House as they have been outside the House.

I move, seconded by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis):

That the amendment be amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma, and by adding immediately thereafter the following words: "and we regret, in particular, the government's failure (1) to deal effectively with the threat to Canadian independence created by the growing foreign ownership of our economy; (2) to provide policies to reduce the high rate of unemployment, which is now expected to reach disastrous levels this winter; and (3) to introduce a guaranteed income below which no Canadian family will be allowed to fall, so as to eradicate the poverty which now afflicts at least five million Canadians."

• (3:30 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, we have to deal with four different items: the Speech from the Throne, the Address in Reply, the amendment proposed by the Conservatives and the one moved by the New Democratic Party.

Before discussing the proposed amendments, I first wish to congratulate warmly the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne (Mr. Trudel and Mr. A. B. Douglas) as they have made superhuman efforts to camouflage the commonplaces and platitudes contained in the Speech from the Throne and to give a high lustre to the intentions expressed by the Liberal government in the speech which was read yesterday by His Excellency the Governor General.

As regards the authors of the Speech from the Throne, the government advisers, they deserve little recognition as they only arouse feelings of wretchedness and disappointment.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said a moment ago that our standard of living was among the highest in the world, then, in a subsequent sentence, he deplored the great difficulties facing several sectors of the Canadian economy.

True, the authors of the Throne Speech have succeeded in reaching pathetic heights by using the same old phrases, already heard hundreds of times, the better to put the people to sleep.

When, for example, we find in the Throne Speech, words such as the following, and I quote:

—Canada continues to enjoy social stability to an exceptional degree—

We truly wonder whether government advisers have eyes to see with and ears to hear with.

It is truly pitiful to hear the government say that Canada enjoys social stability to an exceptional degree when, at the present time, all the country's police forces are searching for those who kidnapped a British commercial attaché and whose ambition is neither more nor less than to overthrow, through murder, assassination, force and blackmail, all forms of established power in short to have the revolutionary forces prevail and destroy values cherished by all Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, we had only to hear the famous FLQ manifesto, broadcasted last night by the CBC and which was reproduced in full in today's *Montréal-Matin* to become aware that in the Canadian metropolis, where complete social stability exists, there are heartless people and cowards who are ready to kill in order to serve their revolutionary purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that Canada is enjoying social stability to an exceptional degree when we are seeing at home what has happened in Algeria, South America and in some other countries over the past 25, 30 or 50 years if we refer to Russia as a basic example. When we witness these people proclaim in their manifesto the freedom to take freedom away from others—this is their entire and complete program—or blame industry and those who show initiative—we might ask those young, or not so young, people what prevents them from establishing industries in their country, Canada, if they really love it. I have no pity at all for those who resort to blackmail and harm people who never did them any wrong.

Mr. Speaker, the only argument that the government advisers can put forward to suggest that Canada enjoys an exceptional social stability, is that they probably had in mind the social stability which allows big finance to crush the Canadian economy and to deprive most Canadians citizens of a higher standard of living that

would ensure them a better use and distribution of our national wealth.

It is all very well to suggest that Canada enjoys the highest standard of living in the world, the unemployed and the large families who live on welfare find this is not so. That is the kind of stability that we know.

There is another exceptional sentence, a flash of genius from the government's advisers in the Speech from the Throne, which reads as follows:

> The conviction is growing throughout the world that if man is to survive he must strive without delay to regulate his future. This is a task which presupposes a fullness of freedom and an extensive field of human experience.

What does that mean exactly? A fullness of freedom, what is it? An extensive field of human experience, what does that mean?

According to the government, would a fullness of freedom mean making the laws on abortion even more liberal, as suggested in the Speech from the Throne? If it is such a parody of freedom the government has to offer, we of the Ralliement Créditiste will continue to fight the Liberals' proposals on abortion, just as we did during the first session.

One of the last sentences of the Speech from the Throne is typical of the present government's attitude of Liberal promises over the years:

> "We stand on the threshold of greatness".

How exhilarating! We stand on the threshold of greatness! That calls to mind the rhetoric of the Hon. Jean Lesage in Quebec in 1960. We stand on the threshold of the just society! The Liberals have been promising us that greatness for years. The Liberals, along with the Rt. hon. Prime Minister, promised us the just society to which all Canadians aspire. But they now admit that they were unable to give us this greatness and this just society. We still are at the threshold of a just society and of greatness.

Mr. Speaker, what should we do to attain this just society and this greatness?

The Speech from the Throne is quite clear on this point:

> We must accept . . .that the most drastic reality is change.

To us this is the most significant sentence in the Speech from the Throne.

In my opinion, what needs to be changed first is the present government, and it will not do simply to put in its place the party on the other side, a Progressive Conservative government, because we have had one before and we were not better off. There is no difference between a Conservative and a Liberal apart from the fact that—as a Conservative put it on a television program—one is blue and the other is red.

The Liberal administration of the Right Hon. Louis St. Laurent was replaced by the Conservative administration of the Right Hon. Member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker). The Conservative administrations were replaced by the Liberal ones of the Right Hon. Mr. Pearson and of the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

We have changed only the driver of the cart pulled by a tired old horse whereas it is not the driver but the cart and the tired old horse which should be traded in for a modern car with a powerful engine.

This is what has to be changed. In other words, it is not the fact that we have a new driver or a new government that is essential to the economic and social development of the Canadian people, but rather the fact that we have a new engine, or, still better, a new financial system since the one now in use renders our resources barren, freezes them, taps them and turns them to its advantage.

Mr. Speaker, I am not the one who is responsible for this situation. It has been completely brought about by those who run the show. A federal-provincial conference was held here in Ottawa a few weeks ago. The ten premiers of Canada, along with the Prime Minister of Canada, got together to tackle certain problems. The constitution was discussed. Has it changed anything? No. The premiers did not know exactly what to put forward as amendments to the constitution.

The premier of Quebec said that roughly 50 or 60 per cent of the present constitution needs to be amended, but that they did not know exactly what to amend.

The Prime Minister of Canada tells us on television: We have made progress. The ten provincial premiers tell us: We have made progress. Progress where? Nobody knows. In what area have we achieved progress? God knows, but as for ourselves, we do not know.

However, all spoke to the Prime Minister of Canada of a common concern. In fact, British Columbia asked for an extra $500 billion a year; the province of Quebec is asking that the constitution be amended in order to get a bigger share of tax revenue. The NDP government of Manitoba wants the same thing. Without exception, all have financial problems, and they have all told the Prime Minister of Canada so. The Prime Minister, who has his own way of saying things, in his own style of reply, told them: Gentlemen, I am happy to see you. You are short of money and I appreciate your position. It is unfortunate, but I have no money either. The only means I have to find money, is to get it out of the Canadian citizens' pockets. We administer with the revenue we have.

The premiers left for their respective provinces saying: Thank you, Mr. Prime Minister, we understand that you are as "broke" as we are. You have no other means than we have.

And yet, the Prime Minister is conversant with constitutional law. He understands the Canadian constitution, and he knew it thoroughly even as a young CCF supporter in 1940, 1941, 1942. In fact, he remembers that time so well that he has just appointed an eminent member of the NDP to the Senate. Incidentally, he has not forgotten to appoint the former premier of Alberta, Mr. Manning, a Creditist.

Mr. Trudeau: There is still room for you.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister of Canada is crafty; he is polluting Canadian politics by using the other parties in an attempt to surround himself with a somewhat sensible entourage.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Trudeau: There is still room for you!

Mr. Caouette: I thank the Prime Minister for his kindness towards me but, as a Creditist, Mr. Speaker, I would refuse the post even if the Prime Minister were to offer it to me because we have far more important work to do here in the house of Commons. Besides, the Prime Minister—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Caouette: I am happy to see my colleague for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) applaud. He calls for the abolition of the Senate yet he has not said a word against the appointment of his friends from the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Speaker, one can check by looking at subsections 14, 15 and 16 of section 91 of the British North America Act to see whether the Prime Minister is right when he says to the provincial premiers: Gentlemen, there is but one means available to us to secure the funds we need, it is taxation? We must get it in the pockets of the taxpayers.

—the exclusive Legislative Authority of the Parliament of Canada extends to all Matters coming within the Classes of Subjects next herein-after enumerated; that is to say,—

I now quote subsections 14, 15 and 16:

14. Currency and Coinage.

15. Banking, Incorporation of Banks, and the Issue of Paper Money.

So this is something else than going through the pockets of the Canadian taxpayers,

I now quote subsection 16;

16. Savings Banks.

But the central government has the power to legislate on monetary as well as fiscal matters. And the Prime Minister say, as he did earlier, that revised taxation will help us solve our problems.

Nonsense! Last year's Throne Speech referred to White Papers—it was a White Paper session. This year, White Papers are again mentioned in every possible way, along with those on taxation, unemployment insurance, social security and economic growth.

The Prime Minister is talking about fiscal reforms as a means to achieve justice. What kind of justice? As the Prime Minister said on television not so long ago: It is a matter of taking from the haves to give to the have-nots. Is that justice?

The Prime Minister may believe that, but if we discourage personal initiative, if we stifle personal ambition, we will end up like many other countries in the world: we will lose our economic vitality, our enthusiams to create or organize.

The Prime Minister knows that. His policy consists in taking away from some people to give to others. Nonsense, Mr. Speaker! That way, as was stated in English:

• (3:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

By taking away something from those who have and giving something to those who have not, we will end by having all kinds of people who have nothing and no more people who have something.

[*Translation*]

We know that our national production could be increased—the Right Hon. Prime Minister said so himself—if all our 600,000 unemployed were put to work.

In Canada there is enough wealth for all people without depriving anyone. But how hard it is to make people understand this! We do not understand it, neither do the provincial premiers. They come to Ottawa begging and Ottawa says no. This is the reply they received at the federal-provincial conferences in February and in June. When other similar conferences are held, the Prime Minister will once more say to the premiers: "Gentlemen, we have no money, that is the trouble."

Although it is stated in the Throne Speech that the third session of the 28th Parliament commences in the decade of the seventies, a decade which we dare not assume will be a continuation of the past, there will be no change and no progress as long as the present financial monopoly remains in the hands of a few hoarders who manage money and credit to their own advantage, without giving any thought to the real producers of wealth, that is the contractors, the manufacturers and the workers of Canada.

The great change that is needed, the grand change that the political men of this decade must bring about, the reform to be undertaken, the most urgent reform, because it is a prerequisite of all other reforms, is monetary reform.

The Prime Minister may introduce tax reforms, dozens and hundreds of White Papers, but, as long as the monetary system has not been improved, neither him, nor this government, nor the opposition nor the New Democratic Party will be able to change anything whatever in this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Caouette: In the Speech from the Throne the government recognizes that we are entering a new era where prevailing forces tend to modify past values and positions, that this conflict between new values and those of former years lead to frustration for present generations who refuse to question the old financial assumptions and system and that the rising generations will not accept the yoke of the financial system which prevent all economic and social progress, in short social justice.

Mr. Speaker, I said earlier that the first reform to undertake has to do with the financial system and not with taxation. The first change, the most pressing one is the present monetary system.

The proof of what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, lies in the list of the bills mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, and I quote:

1. A bill to amend the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act.

Grants are needed so that the companies can operate gold mines, and let us note that it is necessary. It is a financial measure. I go on with the quotation:

2. A bill to amend the Established Programs (Interim Arrangements) Act.
3. A bill to amend the Small Business Loans Act.
4. A bill to amend the Farm Improvement Loans Act.
5. A bill to amend the Fisheries Improvement Loans Act.
6. A bill respecting Investment Companies.

7. A bill respecting the Canada Development Corporation.
9. Veterans Pension Legislation.
10. A bill respecting the C.N.R. Financing and Guarantee, 1970.

—or deficits paid up by the government.

11. A bill to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act.

About monetary reform, the Prime Minister claims that we spend our time talking about money. What are the Speech from the Throne or the bills all about? Money and control by the government and the present Canadian banking institutions. Nothing else. I continue the quotation:

12. A bill amending the Interest Act and the Small Loans Act.
13. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act.
14 and 15. Bills to amend the Canada-Finland-and-Canada-Jamaica Income Tax Agrements.
16. A bill amending the Crop Insurance Act.
17. A bill respecting Co-operative Credit Associations.

Those 17 bills are financial measures for the purpose of remedying the patent evils and the most flagrant injustices of the present financial system.

But that is not all. There are other measures covering control of atomic energy, pollution, development of imports, textiles, resource management, the anti-dumping act, budget estimates, the Auditor-General, the marketing of farm products, a commercial agreement with Australia, altogether 12 measures dealing with the operation, administration, and protection of the present financial system and of its power over trade, commerce, industry, agriculture, in short over everything. Thus, almost two-thirds of the bills the government intends to introduce have a marked financial orientation. The Prime Minister is aware of this.

We of the Ralliement créditiste are therefore justified in demanding that priority be given to financial reform, in saying that we must first achieve this reform instead of trying to curb its ill effects, in other words we wholly reject this whole policy of a poultice on a wooden leg which is the basis of the reforms proposed by this government and by the preceding ones.

The poor situation created by the financial system has had disastrous effects on the Canadian economy in general and on the welfare of the individuals in particular.

The Prime Minister, after telling us we had the highest living standards in the world, admitted a while ago:

It would be irresponsible to suggest that the economy is now in satisfactory condition. When costs rise more rapidly than productivity, when men and women are unable to gain employment, when a reasonable distribution of the wealth of Canada is denied to certain sectors or regions, then these are matters for deep concern.

Fortunately, our population, the number of Canadians engaged in productive employment—

increase

—the total volume of goods and services which they produce, and Canadian exports all continue to grow.

That is the statement of the government. Mr. Speaker, that is the way the government advisers analyse the present economic situation, according to the Throne Speech read yesterday by His Excellency the Governor General.

Further on the Speech mentions again the problem of exports:

Our exports in past months have achieved record heights.

That is the old liberal slogan, Mr. Speaker. We must export or perish. If our exports are growing, we will be prosperous! If they are declining we will be miserable!

23 years ago, on the 23rd of August 1947, a then liberal member, Mr. Azellus Denis, who is now a senator, said on Montreal station CKAC in a broadcast paid for by the federal liberal party, and I quote:

Whatever demagogues who are more than shortsighted may say, the liberals do not give anything to foreigners, because Canada produces 40 times more than Canadian can consume; and without exports and loans—when necessary—we would have overproduction, factories would close down, we would end up with starvation, unemployment and misery.

That is what the Liberals said in 1947! That is what they are repeating today while they are asserting somehow triumphantly, and I quote:

Our exports in past months have achieved record heights.

And they add that this is to be taken as a good omen for economic prosperity.

Let us see, Mr. Speaker, the value of those assertions on the part of the Liberals.

• (3:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I regret to inform the hon. member that his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there consent that the hon. member continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their courtesy towards me. I will try to be brief.

Mr. Speaker, as far as Canada's foreign trade is concerned, here is what we could read in the September 22 bulletin of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and I quote:

During the first half of this year, the strong foreign demand for Canadian products (and I purposefully underline the word "products") played an extremely important part in softening the impact of the limited demand in several important areas of this country, especially as regards consumers' individual expenses.

Which means, Mr. Speaker, that the demand for products—I mean the demand on the part of Canadian consumers—slowed down in Canada. We may ask ourselves why there should be such a slowdown of the demand on the part of Canadian consumers. Is it because all the needs have been met? Why then do so many families that live on the meagre benefits of unemployment insurance and on welfare have to tighten their belts? Simply because they do not have the required purchasing power.

But that means nothing to government advisers, all of whom advocate economic growth for the sake of growth, as well as full employment, accepting it as the end of economic activities and the main concern of governments.

According to government advisers, trade has shored up our economy. This is what the bulletin of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics for September 22nd 1970, has to say:

In the first six months of 1970, Canadian export trade of goods has been outstanding; exports have exceeded imports by

$1,296 million, that is four times more than in the comparable period in 1969.

At that rate, if the government experts are right in their claims, Canadians, who have had a trade surplus four times as great as in 1969, should enjoy a higher standard of living, unemployment should decrease, the actual salaries of workers should go up, while industrial and commercial undertakings should know greater prosperity.

But that is not the case, Mr. Speaker. Except for the fantastic increase in the profits of financial and banking institutions, industrial profits are lower—the Prime Minister made mention of it a while ago—while the true domestic production has decreased.

This, Mr. Speaker, is no unfounded statement. The bulletin of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics tells us clearly, and I quote:

The seasonally adjusted index for domestic production in Canada increased by 0.4 per cent in July. The increase is due to a higher productivity in the service industries, whereas in the goods industries, there was a decrease of 0.5 per cent.

Such are the facts, Mr. Speaker. In Canada, the production of true wealth is going down whereas exports are increasing at a high rate; exports were worth $4,525 million during the first 6 months of 1970, against $3,809 million during the first 6 months of 1969. This means an increase in the export of goods produced by the Canadian people of over $700 million, or $300 for each citizen.

Meanwhile, inflation is denounced and workers are blamed for demanding the higher wages required to meet the ever increasing cost of living.

• (4:00 p.m.)

What hope is there that prices will go down in Canada if the production of goods and wealth does not increase, and if the amount of goods and wealth exported keeps going up? Increasing exports and production at a standstill can only result in a scarcity of goods for the Canadian people and thus cause prices to rise because of the demand of consumers still able to afford those goods.

They want to solve the problem of inflation, but actually the methods used only make it worse, because while production remains at a standstill, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) makes every effort to export as many goods as possible. In so doing, he creates a scarcity of goods. On the other hands, he allows entry into Canada of a foreign purchasing power which can only contribute to step up inflation.

The Canadian government announces in the Speech from the Throne its intention to amend the Export Development Act. We do not know yet what is in the mind of the responsible minister or what the intentions of the government are.

If through this new legislation the government wishes to increase exports further, thus depriving Canadians of the goods they produce and bringing about a new increase in prices, all the Canadian consumers will lose their shirt because, with incomes frozen, as it were, by the Prices and Income Commission, they will have to be satisfied with a smaller quantity of products, which in turn will naturally produce a new increase in prices.

Another problem relating to our transactions with foreign countries is that of foreign investments in Canada. While it is feared all across Canada that financial domination will also bring about political domination, it is rather disappointing to realize that the latest figures bear out that the movement, started a few years ago and promoted by the preceding governments, both Liberal and Conservative, is only increasing under this government, so that Canada becomes more and more dominated by foreign finance to ensure its own expansion. This country is becoming more and more enslaved by foreign finance. Indeed, Canadian industries become more and more the property of foreign investors and our natural resources are falling into the hands of foreign powers.

We understand very well the policy of the Canadian government to introduce a bill to amend the Atomic Energy Control Act. Atomic energy will be tomorrow the most important source of energy in the world, and as we have in Canada natural resources which permit us to hope that that energy will be available to Canadians, our government is taking the right step to ensure that that energy remains available to Canadians and under Canadian control at that.

But why, at the same time, does the Canadian government not do the same in connection with the other energy sources which it surrenders to the greed of foreign interests, mainly on the international level? Why does it not do the same with respect to the oil and natural gas resources? Why does it not do the same with respect to Canadian water and energy which are about to be controlled entirely by foreign interests?

Not a month go by, Mr. Speaker, without Hydro-Québec, for instance, calling on American investors. As late as yesterday, the Premier of Quebec went to the United States to ask American financiers to come and invest in the province of Quebec, thus letting them take over the control of Quebec wealth.

The same thing is done by the federal government when it appropriates the greater part of the revenue from our natural wealth. Out of each dollar paid to Hydro-Québec for the consumption of electricity in Quebec, more than 25 per cent is used to pay interest to American and European financiers.

But why does the federal government not warn the Liberal government of Quebec against giving control of water and power resources in the Bay James basin to American interests? Perhaps Premier Bourassa would be interested in developing and harnessing those resources.

Indeed, as time goes on, control by foreign finance weighs ever more heavily on our economy. The statistics published by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, on September 22, 1970, are quite explicit in this connection. At a time when experts find deplorable this domination by foreign finance, we have to conclude that foreign finance has more and more power on this Liberal government.

• (4:10 p.m.)

I quote from a report of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics:

In the second quarter of 1970, the transactions (direct investments) with non-residents resulted in a net $165-million increase of direct investments in foreign-controlled companies

established in Canada. American investments accounted for about 85 per cent while the United Kingdom and continental Europe were responsible for the balance.

The Throne speech states that it is time, in 1970, to bring about changes. We of the Ralliement créditiste say that 1970 is the best time ever to change the financial system which is strangling us, which imposes upon Canadians the scarcity of consumer goods, which yields to foreign financial interests the control of our natural resources, of our production and, I dare say it, of all our institutions, including our political institutions, that is the governments in power.

A change is needed. There must be a change, as the Quebec Liberals used to say in 1960, because tomorrow it will be too late.

To conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, this is how I consider the changes needed so that Canadians may truly enjoy their production, control it and fully profit by our natural resources.

Here is the first question which must be asked. Why a financial system? What part must it play?

The answer is simple enough: A financial system is supposed to finance firstly the production of goods, in order to meet needs and secondly, the distribution of those goods, according to needs.

A financial system which finances the production of goods and also succeeds in distributing them is efficient. If it does not play that part, it is inefficient and even harmful.

Well, Mr. Speaker, at the present time there are goods required by the population which we fail to produce because under our financial system the capital is diverted from its primary purpose. Certain products lie on the shelves, some are even destroyed, although a number of needs remain unsatisfied.

We must therefore conclude that the present financial system does not fulfill its purpose which should be to finance the production and distribution of goods. And what we are asking the government and the Prime Minister to do is to find a solution to financial problems.

Then we will no longer witness incidents such as the one which has just taken place in Montreal. Being deprived of the security and the freedom to which they are entitled, some people rebel against the established society. Those who cannot adapt themselves to a society, Mr. Speaker, try to destroy it.

So, let us establish in our country a social and economic context in which all Canadians will find a place for themselves and feel that their country belongs to them, and which could also serve as a model for all the world to follow.

[*English*]

On motion of Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale), the debate was adjourned.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate requesting this House to unite with the Senate in the appointment of a Special Joint Committee to examine and report upon proposals, made public, on a number of subjects related to the Constitution of Canada and also to select members of this House to act on the proposed Special Joint Committee.

* * *

CONSTITUTION OF CANADA

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE—TERMS OF REFERENCE

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, earlier this week the Special Joint Committee on the Constitution submitted its reports on its activities, indicating that it would like to continue those activities in the new session and, in particular, that certain arrangements had been made to visit eastern Canada for the purpose of carrying on discussions. I wonder if the House would be agreeable to reconstituting the Special Joint Committee now in so far as this House is concerned by conferring on it the same powers that it had previously, and by stipulating:

That the following members be appointed to act on behalf of the House of Commons on the Special Joint Committee, namely, Messrs. Alexander, Allmand, Asselin, Breau, Brewin, Dinsdale, Fairweather, Fortin, Gibson, Hogarth, Hopkins, Lachance, MacGuigan, Marceau, McQuaid, Osler, Ouellet, Roberts, Rowland and Woolliams; and

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours thereof.

I wonder whether the House would be agreeable to an order in those terms, so that the committee may continue its work as requested.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, am I to understand from the minister that the terms in which the consent is sought are as laid down in the formal order which he and I have discussed?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Yes. I am afraid the hon. member was not in the House, but I sent a copy of it to his colleague, the whip, earlier and I understood he was agreeable to it. If the hon. member wishes, I will read it in full.

Mr. Baldwin: Yes.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): The order would be as follows:

That a Special Joint Committee of the Senate and of the House of Commons be appointed to examine and report upon proposals, made public, or which are from time to time made public by the government of Canada, on a number of subjects related to the Constitution of Canada during the course of the comprehensive review of the Constitution of Canada, which review was agreed upon at the Constitutional Conference of the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premiers and Prime Ministers of the provinces in February, 1968, and alternative proposals on the same subjects;

That the committee have power to sit during sittings and members, such sub-committees as it may deem advisable or necessary;

That the committee have power to sit during sittings and adjournments of the House of Commons;

That the committee have power to report from time to time, to send for persons, papers, and records, and to print such papers

and evidence from day to day as may be ordered by the committee;

That the committee have power to adjourn from place to place within Canada;

That the quorum of the committee be 17 members, whenever a vote, resolution or other decision is taken, so long as both Houses are represented and that the joint chairmen be authorized to hold meetings, to receive evidence and authorize the printing thereof, when 7 members are present so long as both Houses are represented;

That the committee be empowered to retain the services of three specialists to assist it in its work; and that it also be empowered to retain the clerical and stenographic help deemed advisable by the joint chairmen;

That the papers and evidence received and taken on the subject in the preceding session be referred to the committee and made part of the records thereof; and

That the following members be appointed to act on behalf of the House of Commons on the Special Joint Committee, namely—

The names of the hon. members already alluded to are listed. Finally, the order would read:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours thereof.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I find that I cannot accept one clause of the proposal, that providing that the committee shall have power to adjourn from place to place in Canada. That would be done without our having discussed it. I assume that the minister has now moved a motion to have that proposal from the other place accepted.

I should like to indicate my position on this issue. Mr. Speaker, we must have general support for the proposition that this committee be established.

We have made known our views in this regard. Actually, we were the first party to propose this step some time ago. Unfortunately, events of the last year have qualified the situation and circumstances have caught up with us. The Federal-Provincial Conferences which have been held have become, unfortunately, to an extent in the minds of some Canadians, the great "laugh-in" of public affairs of this country. There is probably more need now than ever before for a committee to ventilate these issues and discuss them with the people of Canada. Whether we are too late or not, only time will tell.

However, Mr. Speaker, it is my view and, I think, the view of some members of my party, that we must take a very searching, close look at the question of committees, the committees' structure and their work. The situation could arise—it almost arose during the previous session—in which we would find this House short of between 50 and 100 members. The onus of adjourning from place to place in Canada is one that should fall upon the committee, which should report to this House as to the need and advisability of its adjourning and travelling. Only in the House can that onus be sustained. In addition, there should be a responsibility on the government—I say this because I am fully aware of what it may involve—of co-ordinating the efforts and travel of committees. We must not forget, Mr. Speaker, that this House is the place where decisions are to be made and where deliberations are to be concluded.

The use of committees to clarify and explain matters and interrogate witnesses simplifies the work of the House. We think those activities are essential. We support these purposes. Nevertheless, we are becoming increasingly alarmed at what appears to be a tendency of stressing the work of the committees as an alternative to the work of this House. We on this side of the House raised this matter on several occasions last year and Mr Speaker at one time was good enough to suggest that the question might well be referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure.

Having said that, and having left myself free to pursue the matter another time, may I say that if the government agrees with me—and I have every reason to hope it does—this clause might well be removed and the committee might well make a report and bring it before the House. We would then have an opportunity to meet and discuss this matter. I realize the committee has made certain commitments. This is not an issue to be lightly dealt with in this way and at this time. We have a very heavy responsibility to operate this House efficiently and to ensure that it does the work the people of Canada expect of it. Our operations should not be dissipated and dispersed through committees operating in many instances outside the House, consequently gravely interfering with the proper function and decision-making of the House of Commons.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, although I agree with the general proposition stated by my hon. friend for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) that we should be careful about giving permission to committees to travel throughout Canada or outside Canada, I regret that he objects to permission being granted in this case. This is an important committee. While I might agree with his not too favourable comments about some of the recent Federal-Provincial Conferences, I think the members of the Special Joint Committee on the Constitution feel that their work has been most worth-while.

At this point I think it would be most unfair, not just to the members of the committee but to certain sections of Canada, for the committee, having travelled to various parts of Canada not to be permitted to go to other parts of the country. I hope, therefore, that the hon. member for Peace River will enter a caveat, which I will support, that the practice of committees travelling be looked at very carefully but nevertheless, having stated his objection, he will let that permission be granted as far as this committee is concerned.

The entire motion as read by the acting House leader is in the form in which he showed it to us a couple of hours ago. I checked with our members of that committee and other members of our group. We are quite prepared to endorse this motion as it is today. If there is to be a modification, we will go along with that as well. I hope we will not discriminate against those parts of Canada which the committee has not yet visited. Why deny this permission at this time? This is the view we take with respect to this motion.

Mr. Baldwin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I must correct the impression the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has gathered from my remarks. We are not opposed per se to this or any other

committee adjourning from place to place in Canada as circumstances may warrant. We feel that blanket authority should not be granted. I know these are the terms upon which authority must be granted, but we say there should first be a statement in this House by the chairman of the committee, on instructions from the committee, with some indication as to the intention of the committee, why and where it proposes to travel and what is involved.

If that is done, as I hope it will be in this and any other case, and the chairman of the committee meets the onus which we suggest is upon him, this party will then give its consent. We do not think that onus has been discharged and we would like to see that done. We are prepared to give our consent, with the proviso that the chairman will explain in the not-too-distant future what is involved in this clause of the recommendation.

Mr. Douglas A. Hogarth (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I serve on this committee. We just finished a sojourn of about ten days in the province of Manitoba and in the Yukon Territory. In my respectful submission there are a great many matters concerning the Constitution of Canada that can only be dealt with if the committee goes to the people in those areas of the country which have these problems. We anticipate travelling the week after next to the Maritimes, including Prince Edward Island. Apparently the people there are expecting us, and are no doubt preparing briefs.

It seems that the hon. member's objection, with the greatest respect, is a little late. In any event, I ask—and I think the whole committee will concur—that we should be allowed to fulfil this obligation. If there is to be an inquiry into the travelling of committees at a future date, possibly it could take place after the commitments of this committee have been met.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we do not have available the proceedings of the last session. My understanding is that the committee has in fact submitted a detailed itinerary. Members of the committee who are now present will confirm that. I wonder, whatever the merits of the general proposition the hon. member makes, whether he has not already obtained the condition he seeks in the sense that the committee made a commitment to travel to Nova Scotia. The committee planned its work in some detail for the coming year. Under the circumstances, I feel these conditions are being met.

Mr. Baldwin: I suggest that between now and next Tuesday the usual and interesting discussions should take place as to the details of this matter. I am sure nothing will be lost over the Thanksgiving weekend. Hon members will be retiring to meditate upon the words of wisdom they heard today. By Tuesday we would then know the precise terms, places and times that the committee has in mind.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I do not accept the suggestion of the hon. member that I join him for Thanksgiving weekend. I will give notice of the motion so that my colleague, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), will not have to read it again next week.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MacLean: Mr. Speaker, before we adjourn perhaps the acting House leader would confirm what I think everyone suspects, that the business for next week will be continuation of the Throne Speech debate.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Yes, sir.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Standing Order 2(2), this House stands adjourned until eleven o'clock Tuesday morning next.

On motion of Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale), the House adjourned at 4.31 p.m., pursuant to Special Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

The House met at 11 a.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. AIKEN—PRESENCE OF ARMED TROOPS IN PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS

Mr. G. W. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege relating to the presence within these buildings of armed troops. I do not believe it has ever been necessary in Canadian history to have troops stationed within the precincts of Parliament. I, as a private member, may not be aware, of course, of all that the government may be, but it strikes me as deplorable that armed troops should be within the building. If it were necessary for the protection of members to have additional security within the building, I would not object, but the physical presence of armed troops revolts me.

• (11:10 a.m.)

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I should like to reassure the hon. member and the House that it was not by design that members of the armed forces were in the building this morning. When it was first communicated to me that, in the course of duties which were to be performed, as arranged last night, for the protection of members on both sides of the House and other members of the Ottawa community, the armed forces had come on to Parliament Hill, I issued instructions immediately that they were to retire and not be within the buildings. I regret that it was through an error that they came within the precincts of Parliament. We are taking steps to make sure that it does not occur again.

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka that perhaps the matter should not be pursued further. I am in full sympathy with the point he has raised and assure him that the presence of armed guards in the buildings was without the authority of the Chair. In view of the action which has been taken now by the Minister of National Defence, I assume that no further action will be required. The protection of members has been the responsibility of the protective staff of the House of Commons, and this situation continues.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ESTABLISHMENT OF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the successful conclusion of our discussions in Stockholm with representatives of the People's Republic of China, reflected in today's joint communiqué which records our agreement on mutual recognition and the establishment of diplomatic relations. The joint communiqué of the government of Canada and the government of the People's Republic of China concerning the establishment of diplomatic relations between Canada and China is as follows:

1. The government of Canada and the government of the People's Republic of China, in accordance with the principles of mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, non-interference in each other's internal affairs and equality and mutual benefit, have decided upon mutual recognition and the establishment of diplomatic relations, effective October 13, 1970.

2. The Chinese government reaffirms that Taiwan is an inalienable part of the territory of the People's Republic of China. The Canadian government takes note of this position of the Chinese government.

3. The Canadian government recognizes the government of the People's Republic of China as the sole legal government of China.

4. The Canadian and Chinese governments have agreed to exchange ambassadors within six months, and to provide all necessary assistance for the establishment and the performance of the functions of diplomatic missions in their respective capitals, on the basis of equality and mutual benefit and in accordance with international practice.

Officials from my department and from Industry, Trade and Commerce will be leaving for Peking very shortly to begin administrative preparations for the opening of a Canadian embassy in Peking. We hope to have the embassy in operation within two or three months.

The establishment of diplomatic relations between Canada and China is an important step in the development of relations between our two countries, but it is not the first step, nor is it an end in itself. We have opened a new and important channel of communication, through which I hope we will be able to expand and develop our relations in every sphere. We have already indicated to the Chinese, in our Stockholm discussions, our interest in setting up cultural and educational exchanges, in expanding trade between our two countries, in reaching an understanding on consular matters, and in settling a small number of problems left over from an earlier period. The Chinese have expressed the view that our relations in other fields such as these can only benefit from the establishment of diplomatic relations between our two countries. They have also agreed in principle to discuss through normal diplomatic channels, as soon as our respective embassies are operating, some of the specific issues we have raised with them.

As everyone knows, the agreement published today has been under discussion for a long time. I do not think it is any secret that a great deal of this discussion has revolved around the question of Taiwan. From the very beginning of our discussions the Chinese side made clear

to us their position that Taiwan was an inalienable part of Chinese territory and that this was a principle to which the Chinese government attached the utmost importance. Our position, which I have stated publicly and which we made clear to the Chinese from the start of our negotiations, is that the Canadian government does not consider it appropriate either to endorse or to challenge the Chinese government's position on the status of Taiwan. This has been our position and it continues to be our position. As the communiqué says, we have taken note of the Chinese government's statement about Taiwan. We are aware that this is the Chinese view and we realize the importance they attach to it, but we have no comment to make one way or the other.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): For greater clarification, Mr. Speaker, could I have the consent of the House to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether the government of Canada is breaking off diplomatic relations with the government of Taiwan?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is it agreed that the Leader of the Opposition may ask a question at this time?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Sharp: I am grateful to the Leader of the Opposition for his question, because I think it is important that it should be answered at this time.

There is no disagreement between the Canadian government and the authorities in Taipeh on the impossibility of continuing diplomatic relations after the government of Peking is recognized as the government of China. Both Peking and Taipeh assert that it is not possible to recognize simultaneously more than one government as the government of China. Accordingly, the authorities on Taiwan and the Canadian government have each taken steps to terminate formal diplomatic relations as of the time of the announcement of our recognition of the government of the People's Republic of China.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I have previously commented on this matter. I have tried to make my position very clear. I have stated and still believe that it is realistic and appropriate to recognize what is in fact the government of a country if it can be done, as I previously said, under decent and acceptable conditions.

The government of Peking has in fact been the government of mainland China for many years. Experience has indicated that in the long run it is better to bring about recognition by the society of nations and to establish working relations with what is in fact the *de facto* government of a country. This, of course, does not involve in any way approval of the purposes of the particular government or the way in which it functions. Canada has diplomatic relations with a good many countries although, to put it mildly, we do not wholeheartedly approve of their method of operation.

Although this is a matter of controversy, I recognize the fact that it is appropriate to establish diplomatic relations with Peking under the proper conditions. I still believe that it is not appropriate to accept as a condition the withdrawal of recognition of the government of Taiwan.

Mr. Sharp: There is no government of Taiwan.

Mr. Stanfield: The minister says there is no government of Taiwan. There has been a government, Mr. Speaker, with which we have had diplomatic relations. There is no question about its *de facto* jurisdiction over Taiwan.

Mr. Sharp: Over China.

Mr. Stanfield: To allow ourselves to be pushed into the position of withdrawing recognition of the government that has been in fact the government of Taiwan in order to achieve diplomatic relations with the bigger fellow is not an acceptable condition. Therefore I do not approve of the government of Canada breaking off diplomatic relations with the government of Taiwan.

• (11:20 a.m.)

If the government of Taiwan breaks off diplomatic relations with the government of Canada because of recognition of Peking, that is its responsibility. I want to be very clear about that. But I want to be equally clear that I do not approve of the government of Canada having bargained with Peking for recognition and exchange of representation on the basis that Canada would break off diplomatic relations with the Taiwan government, which does appear to have been a condition of diplomatic recognition by Peking in this case. I do not approve of the government of Canada having accepted that condition and I wish to make this very clear.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, the members of this party have long urged the recognition of the People's Republic of China by the government of Canada. We are very glad, therefore, that the government of Canada and the government of mainland China have been able to work out the necessary arrangements whereby diplomatic relations can be established between our two countries.

The present government in mainland China has been the *de facto* government of that vast area for some 21 years, and it seems to be ridiculous to go on failing to recognize the existence of a government which controls almost a quarter of the earth's population. It seems to me that the time was long overdue for taking the step which has now been taken. I am convinced that once diplomatic relations have been established we can work out many cultural exchanges and trading relationships to the mutual advantage of both countries. I believe most Canadians will feel that the step the government has now taken is one which is not only in the interest of Canada but one which could be in the interest of world peace. I say that because I do not think one can long keep a large country such as China out of the councils of the world.

With reference to the severing of diplomatic relations with the government or Nationalist China, I would simply point out that when the government in Taiwan is prepared to state that it is the government of that area, and of that area only, it will be time for the Canadian government to negotiate with that government for diplomatic recognition. But as long as the Taiwan government claims to be the government of China, which clearly it is not, it is impossible for the Canadian government to recognize two governments of China. If the government in Formosa should decide to restrict the area over which it claims sovereignty it would then be possible for the Canadian government to discuss with it the question of recognition and the exchange of diplomatic representatives.

I hope that since the government has established, or is in process of establishing, diplomatic relations with mainland China we will now take a much more forthright position with reference to mainland China's entry into the United Nations and her right to sit on the Security Council. I do not think that the United Nations will ever be an effective body for maintaining the rule of law in the world as long as it excludes a country which represents such a vast proportion of the world's population. To have a Security Council composed of the United States, the U.S.S.R., Great Britain, France and Taiwan is ridiculous. I hope that the Canadian government will show some courage at the United Nations by pressing for the admission of China to the United Nations and her right to take her seat on the Security Council of that body.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I find it absolutely incredible and upsetting to see the other parties applaud the statement in which the government announced the recognition of Communist China.

At this time when federal, provincial and municipal governments, as well as all police and armed forces must defend the fundamental freedoms of citizens, the federal government takes it upon itself to recognize a country whose government is composed of men much alike the FLQ members.

Is that logical? Everybody is scared! We are all afraid to leave the Parliament buildings, to go to Montreal or Quebec, because FLQ members could kidnap us and make us join Mr. Cross and Mr. Laporte. We hear the members of the NDP, the Progressive Conservative and the Liberal parties applaud the recognition of Communist China because it will promote the sale of a few bushels of wheat to the Chinese and cultural exchanges.

Have we so great a need for the Communist culture of the Chinese? For 21 years, we have recognized Nationalist China. Today, the minister informs us that Nationalist China no longer exists. We break off all relations with that country and we recognize one government only: the one that was forced on the Chinese people by the revolution.

In Canada, however, we want to pass a law to fight revolution. I hear some laughter; some think this is funny. Taken by the FLQ at 2 o'clock this afternoon, they will say: Try to free the political or ideological criminals that are being held in Montreal.

Mr. Speaker, we do not accept recognition of Red China.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Caouette: Let the government heed our words: we are against revolution. We are in favour of freedom for the human being. We shall not safeguard such freedom by granting recognition to those who spread discord and revolution throughout the world.

This is our position: freedom at home. Yes, but a sound one, one which will permit us to go ahead, to develop our country, not to give it up or to surrender it to people thirsting for blood and revolution in the world.

If we repudiate the FLQ in the province of Quebec, we have no right to recognize Chinese or Russian communists or any others.

I notice that you are about to call me to order, Mr. Speaker, but before resuming my seat, I should like to say that the government is making a mistake in asking us, on the one hand, to stop the FLQ from going wild and kidnapping people and, on the other, to recognize Communist China which is resorting to the same tactics: kidnappings, executions, revolt and selective assassination.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

• (11:30 a.m.)

[*English*]

ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION

ESTABLISHMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, as hon. members know, there was a special committee in existence last session dealing with the question of pollution. I believe there has been discussion among members of the other parties and, with the consent of the House, I should like to move a motion that would have the effect of establishing this committee for this session. I move:

That a special committee of the House of Commons be established to investigate generally the problem of pollution in the waters, soil and air of Canada, and the plans of the federal government in relation thereto, with powers to report from time to time its observations, opinions and recommendations thereon;

That the committee be empowered to send for persons, papers, and records; to sit during sittings and adjournments of the House; to print from day to day such papers and evidence as may be ordered by the committee; to appoint, from among its members, such subcommittees as it may deem advisable or necessary, and to delegate thereto all or any of its powers, except the power to report directly to the House;

That the evidence adduced by the committee during the past session in relation thereto be referred to the said committee;

And that the members of the committee be Messrs. Aiken, Anderson, Beaudoin, Comeau, Deakon, Gibson, Givens, Haidasz, Harding, Knowles (*Norfolk-Haldimand*), Lachance, and Sulatycky.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, now that it appears the government has adopted this outlaw as its own we are prepared to go along with the proposal.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We are happy to support this motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion proposed by the President of the Privy Council. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

[*Translation*]

DOMINION BUREAU OF STATISTICS

TABLING OF QUESTIONNAIRES RELATING TO POPULATION, HOUSING AND AGRICULTURE

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I want to table copies in both English and French of the questionnaires to be used for the census on population, housing and agriculture which will be conducted by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics in 1971.

* * *

[*English*]

CONSTITUTION OF CANADA

MOTION TO APPOINT SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE

On the order:

Government Notices of Motions—The President of the Privy Council:

That a Special Joint Committee of the Senate and of the House of Commons be appointed to examine and report upon proposals, made public, or which are from time to time made public by the Government of Canada, on a number of subjects related to the Constitution of Canada during the course of the comprehensive review of the Constitution of Canada, which review was agreed upon at the Constitutional Conference of the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premiers and Prime Ministers of the Provinces in February, 1968, and alternative proposals on the same subjects;

That the Committee have power to appoint, from among its members, such sub-committees as it may deem advisable or necessary;

That the Committee have power to sit during sittings and adjournments of the House of Commons;

That the Committee have power to report from time to time, to send for persons, papers, and records, and to print such papers and evidence from day to day as may be ordered by the Committee;

That the Committee have power to adjourn from place to place within Canada;

That the quorum of the Committee be 17 members, whenever a vote, resolution or other decision is taken, so long as both Houses are represented and that the Joint Chairmen be authorized to hold meetings, to receive evidence and authorize the printing thereof, when 7 members are present so long as both Houses are represented;

That the Committee be empowered to retain the services of three specialists to assist it in its work; and that it also be empowered to retain the clerical and stenographic help deemed advisable by the Joint Chairmen;

That the papers and evidence received and taken on the subject in the preceding session be referred to the Committee and made part of the records thereof;

That the following Members be appointed to act on behalf of the Special Joint Committee, namely: Messrs Alexander, Allmand, Asselin, Breau, Brewin, Dinsdale, Fairweather, Fortin, Gibson, Hogarth, Hopkins, Lachance, MacGuigan, Marceau, McQuaid, Osler, Ouellet, Roberts, Rowland and Woolliams; and

That a Message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours thereof.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, may I say that it has not been possible to clear up the disagreements or, more properly, reservations in connection with this motion. It may be possible to do so later. With your consent and the consent of the House I should like to suggest that the notice of motion be stood in its place until a later day.

Mr. Speaker: Does the motion stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion stands.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

NATIONAL SECURITY

ABDUCTION OF SENIOR BRITISH TRADE COMMISSIONER AND QUEBEC MINISTER OF LABOUR—PRESENT SITUATION

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether there is any further information he can give at this time with regard to the kidnapping cases? I ask this question in full knowledge of the possible delicacies of the position and responsibilities of the Prime Minister.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the way in which the question was asked and I shall attempt to answer it as best I can. I think the simplest thing to say is there is complete agreement between the government of Quebec and the government of Canada on the position taken by Premier Bourassa yesterday afternoon when he made it quite clear that the only thing that had to be done now was to ensure through negotiations that there be a mechanism established for the release of Mr. Cross and Mr. Laporte. This is the thing that has to be established at the outset. I might add that on the general topic I can only express an opinion. I do sometimes wish that the media—radio, television and press—would exercise a bit more restraint in talking about these problems. It is a mistake, I think, to give them publicity, which is the thing they hope for most. I also think it is a mistake to encourage the use of the term "political prisoners" for men who are bandits.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

WAGE INCREASE GUIDELINE—EFFECT OF SETTLEMENTS WITH POSTAL WORKERS AND CERTAIN SENIOR CIVIL SERVANTS

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. In view of the settlement for the postal workers and now the decision handed down by an arbitrator with regard to certain senior civil servants, which provides for

increases in salaries ranging from 13 per cent to 15 per cent, may I ask the government whether this means the government has now abandoned the 6 per cent wage guideline as being unworkable and ineffective?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the guideline was introduced as just that, a guideline. In answer to my hon. friend's question I should like to say that, in the opinion of the government at least, unless labour and income settlements generally attain a lower level than that at which they have been running in current months and over the past year or so the long-run battle against inflation is a long way from won because these costs are bound to build themselves back into the cost structure of the economy.

CRITICISMS BY CHAIRMAN OF PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION—GOVERNMENT POLICY

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. Do the statements made by Dr. Young, the chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission, having to do with his criticism of the business community's general lack of willingness to face up to strikes and his criticism of Steinberg's for increasing wages despite the assurance of that firm that this meant no increase in prices, represent government policy?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as is well known, the setting up of the commission is government policy. I do not know of any mechanism whereby the commission checks its statements with the government before they are made on matters such as the hon. member just quoted. Therefore they cannot be said to be government policy because they were not devised by the government.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In view of the fact that Dr. Young is the chairman of a commission set up by the government and in view of the fact that his attacks have been almost solely on wage and salary increases, accompanied by a significant silence about increases in the profits of the chartered banks, does the Prime Minister not consider that the effectiveness of the chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission has come to an end?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I will recognize the Leader of the Opposition in a moment, but I suggest to the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands that his question is in the form of an argument and is not acceptable in those terms.

CONTINUATION OF POLICY OF RESTRAINT AND WAGE INCREASE GUIDELINE

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Finance tell the House whether it is going to be the policy of government to continue the policy of restraint and the 6 per cent guideline? Is it going to continue to be the policy of the government to follow this approach in the fight against inflation?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I will be speaking at some length on this matter later this day.

* * *

PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION

METHOD OF PROVIDING FOR PAYMENT OF INCREASED COST

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the President of the Treasury Board. My question relates to the Prices and Incomes Commission. Is the government drawing on the contingency fund to pay the increased cost of the Prices and Incomes Commission or will there be a supplementary estimate which will be submitted to Parliament?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, in so far as additional funds beyond those provided in the main estimates will be needed, there will be a supplementary estimate.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in view of the element of policy involved in this, will that estimate be submitted to the House of Commons at an early date?

Mr. Drury: Mr. Speaker, all supplementary estimates are submitted to the House of Commons.

Mr. Baldwin: Not willingly.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Will this be done at an early date?

* * *

[*Translation*]

POST OFFICE

MONTREAL—DISCUSSIONS WITH FORMER EMPLOYEES OF G. LAPALME INCORPORATED

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister in charge of the Post Office.

Can the minister tell us whether negotiations with the former employees of G. LaPalme Inc. of Montreal have come to an end, or whether he will have other meetings with the representatives of these people who have been the victims of their own union?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, first I want to say that the meetings I have had with the employees of G. LaPalme Inc. took place after their statement that they have had nothing to do with the kidnappings of hostages. My final meeting is scheduled for 3 p.m. today.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*English*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

COMMUTING OF DEATH SENTENCES FOR MURDER OF POLICEMEN

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address this question to the Minister of Justice or the Solicitor General but in their absence may I put it to the Prime Minister. Is it the government's policy, which seems to be established now because of two previous cases, to exercise in all cases the Royal prerogative and commute all death sentences of persons charged and convicted of the murder of policeofficers, having regard to the present legislation?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, all cases are decided on an individual basis by cabinet and it would be a mistake to say that there is a policy which applies in advance to all cases. Of course the law itself is to be reviewed by the House of Commons at the expiration of five years.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, in view of the seriousness of what has occurred recently in western Canada and elsewhere, would the Prime Minister agree that this is the proper and appropriate time for the Minister of Justice or the Solicitor General to make a report, particularly in view of the fact that murder has increased by 55 per cent in Canada?

Mr. Trudeau: I have had a report on this particular case from the Solicitor General, Mr. Speaker. At this time there is nothing to announce except that the search is being continued and that the RCMP are being assisted by the armed forces. I will bring the suggestion of the hon. member to the attention of the minister and if he has anything to add he will do so.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA—CANADIAN SUPPORT FOR ADMISSION TO UNITED NATIONS

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, in view of the announcement just made by the Secretary of State for External Affairs regarding the agreement of the governments of Canada and the People's Republic of China on the establishment of diplomatic relations I have a twofold question. What commitment has the government of Canada given to the government in Peking regarding sponsoring or supporting the admission of that country into the United Nations? Second, has Canada in her negotiations with the Peking government determined whether or not that government will support the charter of the United Nations and particularly the declaration of human rights?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, during the negotiations I said publicly in this House and elsewhere, and the same position was stated to the representatives of the People's Republic of China in Stockholm, that if we establish diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China as the government of China it would, of course, be quite consistent and to be expected that we would support that government in the occupation of the China seat.

Mr. Thompson: Could I have an answer to the second question regarding whether or not the government of Peking will pledge its support of the charter of the United Nations and the declaration of human rights?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I should assume that if the government of the People's Republic of China wishes to occupy the seat of China in the United Nations it would at that time be declaring its support for the charter.

* * *

TAXATION

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION BASED ON WHITE PAPER ON REFORM

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Finance in respect of the timetable for the introduction of income tax changes arising out of the white paper on taxation. In view of the indefinite reference to the timing of legislation in the Speech from the Throne, can the minister assure the House that such legislation will be introduced during the current session and that it is the intention of the government to proceed with legislative enactments at the current session?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

MANPOWER

NEWS RELEASE INDICATING SUMMER EMPLOYMENT FOR CANADIAN STUDENTS IN GERMANY IN 1971

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration concerning a news release, which I believe all hon. members received over the weekend from an organization known as Student Employment Europe, under the heading "5000 Canadian students to work in Germany summer 1971". Was this document prepared with the co-operation of the minister's department and is his department in fact calling upon West Germany to aid Canada's faltering student employment program?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member will have noticed as well a recent press release about the very great effort which was made this past year in connection with the employment of students for the summer; that general effort will, of course, be extended and strengthened. So far as the particular news release is concerned, I should like to take the question as notice.

Mr. Macquarrie: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the minister would look into the situation surrounding the delivery of this document which came without envelope and appeared to many of us to be one of the multitudinous outpourings from the minister's department?

STUDENT SUMMER EMPLOYMENT—ABILITY TO CONTINUE EDUCATION

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Manpower and Immigration whether any systematic canvass is being made by the federal government in co-operation with the provinces regarding the position of students at this time of the year following the summer, for example, as to how many have had to drop out of university or high school because of employment difficulties during the summer? Is any such systematic canvass being made by the minister or his department?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, a survey is under way of the situation in regard to students and the effectiveness of employment programs this past summer.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, would the minister answer the question I asked him, whether a systematic canvass is being made as to the effect on these students? I did not ask him about the success of his program but the state today of students as a result of this summer's difficulties?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had answered the question and if I should say in addition to the Leader of the Official Opposition that the study is systematic I would be glad to do so.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): I wonder if I may ask the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, in line with the questions asked by my leader, whether there is any active and real negotiation between the provinces and the federal government with regard to extending university facilities which are sadly overcrowded in all provinces in Canada today?

Mr. Lang: That question goes beyond the purview of the Department of Manpower and Immigration. The question of education of course falls principally within the scope of the provincial governments, as I am sure the hon. member knows.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INDIAN AFFAIRS

NORTHERN QUEBEC—TRANSFER OF ESKIMOS TO PROVINCIAL JURISDICTION

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Could he tell us whether steps have been taken for a jurisdictional transfer in New Quebec and whether he anticipates a settlement in the near future, particularly in the field of education?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, discussions are still going on with Quebec authorities and I had the opportunity to meet with the Minister of Natural Resources two weeks ago in this regard. It is a very intricate problem as the Eskimos have expressed their opinion very clearly and discussions are still going on with them and with the provincial authorities. We hope to find an area of agreement satisfactory to the three parties concerned.

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the minister.

Could the construction of a million-dollar school at Fort George be interpreted as the desire of the federal government to transfer the jurisdiction in education to the provincial government of Quebec?

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, the Eskimo population should not be deprived of education facilities because some people are quarrelling. We are taking our responsibilities in order to offer those Eskimos and those Indians the best education opportunities.

[*English*]

RESOLUTE BAY—USE OF NATIVE LABOUR ON LOCAL PROJECTS

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): I had intended to ask the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development a supplementary question, but I will forgo that and instead ask the minister directly whether he is aware of a preposterous situation whereby Department of Transport officials at Resolute Bay in the Northwest Territories, upon briefing Canadian and U.S. businessmen intending to bid on a particular five-year contract for catering and the like, have advised private industry at that Arctic community and other posts not to consider native labour for local projects and to regard available Eskimos as occasional help? In light of previous declarations by the government that it had a favourable approach to promoting the employment of Indians and Eskimos, would the minister look into this matter and report to the House at an early date?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I really cannot understand that attitude. This is not official government policy. On various occasions we have said that, like the government, the private sector has to make special efforts in order to provide the Eskimos and the Indians of that region with regular jobs.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL SECURITY

MOVEMENT OF TROOPS INTO OTTAWA—NUMBER AND USE

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): My question is directed to the Minister of National Defence. In light of the highly sensational and widely varying reports with regard to the bringing of additional troops into Ottawa and their use, would the minister advise the House just what is the situation, what use will be made of these troops and how many were brought in?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the troops were brought in at the request of the security forces, principally the RCMP, to supplement the police resources, which have been under very considerable strain, for the purpose of the protection of individuals and property. I think it would be undesirable to indicate either the specific roles or the number of troops in order to preserve the basic security involved.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Is the purpose to supplement the police forces or are these troops to take on additional duties that the police forces would not normally fulfil?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I do not think the hon. member is correct in his final statement. As I said, the forces are to supplement the police authorities.

* * *

UNITED NATIONS

SOUTH AFRICA—CANADIAN ABSTENTION ON ARMS EMBARGO RESOLUTIONS—DECISION ON SPARE PARTS

Mr. Doug Rowland (Selkirk): My question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Was it upon his explicit instructions that the Canadian delegation at the United Nations abstained in the vote on a resolution in the special political committee calling for the adherence of all states to an arms embargo against South Africa?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Obviously the delegation acts on my instructions.

Mr. Rowland: Would the minister indicate to the House when we might expect a cabinet decision upon the question of shipment or spare parts to the Union of South Africa in light of the Security Council and special committee resolutions, and would he indicate whether, once that decision is made, we may expect a statement in the House?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that the hon. member has drawn attention to the reason for our abstention which is that we have not yet reached a decision on the question of spare parts. I hope a decision will be reached soon.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

INTERPROVINCIAL MARKETING—REQUEST FOR REFERENCE TO SUPREME COURT—INTERVENTION IN CASE BEFORE QUEBEC COURT

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. Now that the province of Manitoba has decided to intervene in the proceedings involving the validity of regulations in Quebec prohibiting the importation of agricultural products, will the minister indicate to the House whether or not the government of Canada will be represented by counsel at those proceedings? Alternatively, will he discuss with the Minister of Justice the necessity of proceeding directly to the Supreme Court and securing a speedy decision on this issue as was done in the breathalyzer case?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Without reviving all of the points I have raised in reply to the hon. member's previous questions on the same subject, I would like to say that I have discussed this matter and will do so again with the Minister of Justice in view of the new developments. But I have to say that I do not believe that a satisfactory solution to the whole problem can be reached as expeditiously through that route as through the one I indicated to the House some time ago.

Mr. Baldwin: You and I are not on the same wavelength.

* * *

FISHERIES

ATLANTIC SALMON—DISCUSSIONS WITH DENMARK RESPECTING CONSERVATION

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. Did discussions take place with the government of Denmark at the recent meetings held in Copenhagen, referred to in a press release issued by the minister's office today, regarding the conservation of Atlantic salmon? If no agreement was reached, is the minister now prepared to recommend to his cabinet colleagues economic sanctions against Denmark?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): I will certainly continue to give that matter consideration.

Mr. McGrath: Perhaps the minister might answer my question before he starts considering it. The question was specifically whether the government discussed with the government of Denmark at the meetings held in Copenhagen recently the question of the conservation of Atlantic salmon and the harvesting of that species by Denmark which is threatening its very survival?

Mr. Davis: We had discussions in Ottawa with the Minister of Fisheries from Denmark late in the spring. I am not aware of any recent discussions with Denmark on the subject of fishing for salmon in the Atlantic.

* * *

PESTICIDES

DDD—REASON FOR ONE-YEAR EXTENSION ON USE—NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I have a question on a matter which has been previously discussed. In view of the reported decision by the federal Department of Agriculture to extend for one year the use of the pesticide DDD, which was to be banned as of January 1, 1971, can the minister inform the House

whether the department received any information indicating that this chemical has become less dangerous and less a health hazard which could justify such a decision?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): I do not think that this is the reason in the context in which the question was asked. As was pointed out, there was a 90 per cent curb on the purposes for which DDD could be used, but a condition was attached that satisfactory alternative chemicals would be available for some of the purposes for which that chemical had been banned. However, I will check into the situation and give a more specific reply to the question tomorrow.

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Agriculture. Can the minister say why general notices of changes will be sent out by private letters to chemical manufacturers and not be announced by public notices? How will the public know of any general notices of changes?

Mr. Olson: I think it is done by both routes, although I presume that the private letters that go to industry are of a more technical nature giving details respecting the technology that is involved in the statements. I do not believe there is any attempt to refrain from notifying the public in general terms.

* * *

GRAIN

LOCAL ELEVATOR CONGESTION—AVAILABILITY OF BOXCARS

Mr. Jack McIntosh (Swift Current-Maple Creek): I wish to direct my question to the minister responsible to the House for the Canadian Wheat Board. In view of the fact that farmers are unable to deliver their prescribed quotas at the present time owing to congestion in the local elevators, what assurance can the minister give the House that boxcars will be available to transport the amount of grain that he professes to have sold?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): The program for the very heavy deliveries of grain is going ahead very well. There is congestion in some elevators as a result of some heavy deliveries on the quotas which have been opened fairly wide, and this congestion is being relieved as rapidly as possible. Certainly it is simply a matter of time until cars arrive to provide space in elevators for the delivery of these quotas. Of course in the meantime the farmers have the cash advance program available to tide them over.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

IMPORTATION OF NEW ZEALAND BUTTER

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Can the minister tell the House whether Canada received a certain amount of butter from New Zealand this summer?

[*English*]

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): No, I do not believe so, Mr. Speaker. I will check to see, but as far as I know no import permits have been issued since September, 1968, more than two years ago.

* * *

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

BANKS ISLAND—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF OIL EXPLORATION AGREEMENTS

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development arising out of the matter of oil exploration on Banks Island in the Canadian north. Will he table in the House any memoranda of agreements between the government and the Eskimo people, between the government and the oil companies or between the Eskimo people and the oil companies, so that we may fully understand what decision has been arrived at in connection with this exploration?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I think I could table the text of the agreement between the companies and the government, agreement which has been communicated to the Eskimos' lawyer in Banks Island and whose contents was discussed with the Eskimos a few weeks ago in the presence of representatives from the government and the companies.

[*English*]

Mr. Barnett: As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the minister to answer my original question. Will he table these documents in the House so that members can examine them?

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to table the documents we have but I do not know if they are available right now. I am not aware whether they have been returned to me by those who signed them.

BAFFIN ISLAND—PROPOSED RE-OPENING OF IRON MINES —CONSULTATION WITH NATIVE PEOPLE

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the minister with reference to a question I put to him the other day about the possible re-opening of iron ore mines on Baffin Island and the negotiations going on with a consortium of South African and American companies. Have there been any consultations with the native population in that area in order to protect their aboriginal rights in this matter?

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, this question is still at the preliminary stage. This is the situation: Very large deposits of iron ore have been discovered and we are presently studying the possibility of working these deposits to provide a large number of jobs for the Eskimo population of the area. However, we are not yet in a position to report on this development.

The Eskimos are aware of the possibilities of this area and we certainly will be able to discuss with them, during negotiations, the degree of their participation in this development.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Richmond.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): As a further supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question just asked by the hon. member was not really supplementary to the preceding one, and the Chair has recognized the hon. member for Richmond. I will return to the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands in a moment.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development whether he can give the House the assurance that no final agreement will be entered into with the consortium of South African and American corporations to which I referred until there has been full consultation with the native people with respect to their aboriginal rights?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, we are aware that this will have important implications for the Eskimos, and I can assure the House that we shall in due course discuss with them all the aspects of the problem, more specifically the issue foremost in my mind: to make sure that Eskimos will be hired and will get all the education and the training needed to do an efficient job.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

STUDY OF BILL C-197

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the President of the Privy Council.

As the debate on Bill C-197 was adjourned at the close of the last session a few days ago, would the President of the Privy Council inform the House whether the Standing Committee on Agriculture will continue its study of this bill so that it may be referred back to the House?

[*English*]

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, it is on the list of bills. Just how it will be advanced and when, I will disclose later.

[Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

VETERANS AFFAIRS

CLOSING OF LONDON, ENGLAND, OFFICE—CONTINUATION OF SERVICE

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a question of the Minister of Veterans Affairs. In view of the decision to close the DVA office in London, England, would the minister advise what continuing service will be provided for the many Canadian veterans who receive assistance and are resident in England, and what is being done to reassign the staff employed there?

Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Mr. Speaker, over the years our personnel in the London office has been gradually diminishing, corresponding with the reduced number of our veterans there, but I wish to assure the hon. member that our veterans are still being served with the same zeal and efficiency as before.

* * *

TRADE

PROPOSED ENLARGEMENT OF EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce whether at a very early date, perhaps in the throne speech debate today, he intends to make a statement with regard to the enlargement of the European Common Market that is now under consideration, and further, whether he intends to make a statement as to the views he expressed abroad with regard to some plan he has in mind as to the reference of any agreement between Great Britain and the EEC to some international organization?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I hope to do that soon. I was expecting to be challenged by what the Leader of the Opposition had to say on this subject in his speech on Friday last, but I must admit I was not. I was hoping he would provoke me into entering the debate but there was not much in what he said on the subject. However, I will try to be provoked just the same.

Mr. Stanfield: May I point out to the hon. gentleman in the same spirit, Mr. Speaker, that, whatever importance he may attach to my views, this is a very important question, and I hope he will have something important to say on this subject inasmuch as no spokesman for the government has done so to date.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

KOOTENAY WEST—ALLEGED UNSATISFACTORY SERVICE BY PACIFIC WESTERN AIRLINES

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport or in his absence for his Parliamentary Secretary. In view of the

completely unsatisfactory service now provided by Pacific Western Airlines in Kootenay West after its recent purchase of B.C. Airlines, would the minister personally investigate the existing service with a view to having it improved, as was promised to the citizens of the area at an Air Transport Committee hearing in Castlegar several months ago?

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): In the absence of the minister, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this question as notice.

Mr. Harding: Would the minister also check immediately the reasons for PWA cancelling the former Saturday and Sunday air link between Castlegar and Calgary via Cranbrook?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that his supplementary question should normally be placed on the order paper or discussed at the time of adjournment, but since it is supplementary to a previous question to which the Parliamentary Secretary has undertaken to give a reply it has been accepted along with the main question.

* * *

RESEARCH

POLICY RESPECTING GRANTS TO FOREIGN-OWNED CANADIAN COMPANIES

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Following the tabling last week of the answer to a question of mine, which shows that 70 per cent of all federal government non-repayable financial grants for scientific research and development during the years 1965 to 1969 were awarded to foreign-owned firms, could the minister advise the House whether his department has now begun a reassessment of its scientific grant programs with a view to bringing about a change so that most grants will go to Canadian-owned companies?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, we do not discriminate in the support that my department gives to research and development. We give it wherever it is being done when it is in the Canadian interest, even when it is being done by foreign-owned companies in Canada. The proviso, of course, is that such research will be used in Canada. That is how the program is being administered.

* * *

MANPOWER

PROVISION OF EMPLOYMENT FOR WORKERS DISPLACED BY PLANT SHUTDOWNS

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Has the minister made any approach to his colleague, the Minister of Labour, with respect to a method of providing new jobs for workers affected by

permanent plant shutdowns such as the Garden City Paper Mill at St. Catharines, Ontario, where 150 workers lost their jobs forever?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, my colleague and I have not discussed this specific issue. The departments, of course, frequently discuss the general issue.

* * *

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The House resumed, from Friday, October 9, consideration of the motion of Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Stanfield (p. 29), and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands) (p. 41).

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, today at this time it is difficult to come to grips in this speech of mine with the economic problems that face our people. It is also difficult at a time when it would appear that the security and very foundation of our nation are being somewhat shaken. At the outset may I say to the government that now is the time to support to the fullest our administrative personnel and our officers so that law and order can and will be maintained in this nation in the future as it has been in the past.

I might say as an aside that I am confident, and I am sure all members will agree with me, that the majority, more than 99 per cent, of the citizens of Canada, because of being steeped in the traditions of this nation have confidence that we can return soon, I hope, to normalcy. There is an emotional temper afoot. No one can deny that. We saw this today in the question of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and in the Prime Minister's answer to the Leader of the Opposition. I felt that the question and the statement made fitted the responsibility of Parliament in this regard at this time. When one speaks of the emotional temper afoot one cannot help but think of the words of the late president Franklin D. Roosevelt in a statement he made at a time when violence was afoot throughout the world. It is so well put together that it became almost a prayer. This is what he said:

> Grant us brotherhood, not only for this day but for all our years—a brotherhood not of words but of acts and deeds. We are all of us children of earth—grant us that simple knowledge. If our brothers are oppressed, then we are oppressed, If they hunger, we hunger. If their freedom is taken away, our freedom is not secure.
>
> Grant us the common faith that man shall know bread and peace—that he shall know justice and righteousness, freedom and security, an equal opportunity and an equal chance to do his best, not only in our own lands, but throughout the world. And in that faith let us march toward the clean world our hands can make.

Those words have real meaning at this time when our nation is under so much stress.

In proceeding to the meat of my address I would ask this question: What did the Speech from the Throne and the Prime Minister's message contain relating to the matters before the nation so far as this House is concerned? The two speeches reminded me of a university graduate delivering at the request of the faculty a valediction. You know, a valediction is given when a graduate is bidding farewell to the students. The Prime Minister has placed himself in that position. If I might paraphrase, this is what the Prime Minister said: I as Prime Minister have failed you; my government has failed, the just society I promised you was a fake, a fraud; the just society is a far away ideal, a new heaven. I could not help but think that the Leader of the New Democratic Party touched on something very important at that time. To paraphrase the Prime Minister again he said that it is a far away ideal, a new heaven but that he has lost faith. He said in effect that there is no heaven, injustice is everywhere, he cannot do anything about it and that we are all going to—I cannot mention the place opposite heaven. That is what he said.

The two speeches were made up of mere magical phrases. In a nutshell, the Prime Minister's speech that was read can be classified as gobbledygook. The playboy and world traveller has a sense of his own writing, and indeed reading, and a personal affection for beautiful words because he bewailed the mammoth string of wooden clichés which he has used so often to preach his propaganda and dogma about what his ideal is. The two speeches will long be remembered for their hollowness in respect of any positive suggestions to curb the ever-spiralling cost of living which is affecting Canadians at all levels and in respect of a remedy to work out any reasonable solution to the problem of disputes between labour and management.

If I might digress at this point I would say that the western farmer is in trouble today because the government failed to measure up to its responsibilities in the dispute between labour and management and this has made it difficult for grain to be moved to the ports and markets. I would suggest this involves other things such as the postal strike and so on. Then there is the problem of social need in respect of housing, the crying need to solve air, water and noise pollution as well as the need for programs to guarantee job security and retraining and, above all, the need to re-establish respect for law and order.

It seems to me that the Trudeau government, which Canadians in 1968 fondly hoped would carve out and create a just society for all Canadians, has reduced this nation to a mere second-rate power among the smaller nations of the world, and has stripped us of our domestic prosperity, unity and dignity. It has successfully eroded our international respect abroad, responsibility and, indeed, our image. However, in 1972 when the election rolls around this all-powerful, absolute, cruel and heartless government will be defeated at the polls. Senator Cameron may have put his finger on the situation. He is a Liberal senator in the other place. He said recently that if an election were held in Canada at the present time not one federal Liberal would be elected west of the Great Lakes. I think that if he took a look at the situation he would say the same thing in respect of Liberals even east of the Great Lakes. The people are fed up with this government.

This government has neglected the cities. I could carry on in this vein. The two speeches, however, rang out with hollowness. They lacked any content. They were both rhetorical incantations. The verse of the government contains only words and not deeds.

Let us for a moment review the platitudes and the clichés in the Prime Minister's speech, let alone in the Speech from the Throne, in which he attacked us and our leader. The Prime Minister started off in his usual gracious manner. He said he had a hunch that the leaders of all parties, particularly the Official Opposition, would be critical of the Speech from the Throne. Why? Because he must have known before the speech was delivered that it was a weak effort, strong in language but weak in deeds. This is really the kind of government we have today. No one needs to exercise his political capacity or sagacity to reach that conclusion.

What did the Prime Minister say about foreign ownership of Canadian industries which is an important problem today? He attacked the position taken by our leader and the leader of the New Democratic Party. This is a typical statement by the Prime Minister. Perhaps I might paraphrase what he said: We on this side have said, through the offices of a minister reporting to cabinet, that we are in the process of trying to enunciate government policy in this important area in order to avoid a pragmatic or ad hoc approach, but we knew we did not have the support of the opposition on this.

During the election the Prime Minister preached strong nationalism and the taking over by Canada of foreign investments. The moment an election is over there is one thing we can always rely on a Liberal Prime Minister doing. When the election is over, what do they do? They rush to the United States, cap in hand, to get another big, fat loan, as the government of Quebec did and as this government will do. Not only does that aggravate our problems but it mortgages the future of Canadian generations yet unborn through foreign investments and increases Canada's national debt. That is kind of inconsistent. The Prime Minister talks about inconsistencies, yet he preaches one thing on the hustings and does another.

• (12:20 p.m.)

Of course, one need not go far to find the answer for this. One only needs to read what was printed in *Le Devoir* in February, 1963. There the Prime Minister wrote about liberal philosophy. I have quoted these words before, and it is time to repeat them, because they place many things in their proper perspective. The article is headed, "Pearson, or the Abdication of the Spirit, by Pierre Elliott-Trudeau". At page 14 of the article the following appears, "Thus, the political philosophy of the Liberal party is simplicity itself." That is what he said, and it is easy to understand. He goes on to say, "Say anything, think anything you like. But put us in power, because we are best fitted to govern."

When he stepped into the leadership of the Liberal party he talked of a just society. But that was merely a

vague promise of something to come in the future, if we ever get there. That was merely stalling, because nothing is being done.

Let me go to another subject. What does the Prime Minister say about youth? He said that Canada is a young country. Those are beautiful words. He also said that it is in the youth of our country that we seek our future. Well, any Prime Minister could have said that. We all agree with those words. Then he went on to say:

> To the youth the past is of relatively little consequence: their lives are still to be lived.
>
> A poet once wrote that "a land without ruins is a land without memories." Our lack of ruins is in some ways a tribute to our ability in the past to adapt to change.

There is one truism about this statement: the Prime Minister has left the country in ruins. What has the government done for the youth of this country or for youth in general—that is what I ask—except mimic their ways and dress? That is something any man of 50 can accomplish. But that is not what our youth are looking for.

I have asked questions on this subject. The two ministers, the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), have failed to reform our laws that affect our youth. I have brought before this House several times a bill to amend the Criminal Code, because the code says that any person of seven or over who is competent to know the nature and consequences of a criminal act may be convicted of a crime. The government has managed to build an unenviable record. Not since confederation have such claims been made for a just society and administration of justice. We have incarcerated, during the period this government has been in office, more young men and women in our country that at any time since confederation. Is this a record to be proud of? Is this what the government is doing to youth? Actually, this government is good at bringing about highs—high unemployment, high interest rates, high rates of incarceration and high murder rates. The murder rate in Canada has gone up by 55 per cent. This is the government's record and, while intelligent men and women are placed out of sight and out of mind in penitentiaries, the drug problem continues to grow.

The research centres and the rehabilitation centres recommended by the LeDain Commission have been and are still being ignored. They ought to be set up immediately. In liaison with the provinces, the government ought to run such centres. Their purpose is good, for they would explode the drug fictions and make sure that youth becomes more knowledgeable about the use or misuse of non-medical drugs. Words are not enough. Let us have some deeds.

It is two years since this government took office and since the members of the Privy Council, took up their jobs as the executives of Canada. And what does the government say about all these matters? In its own defence the government blames the courts; and the courts, in their own defence—actually the courts have no method of speaking effectively—say that Parliament made the law. Parliament has tried to get these well spoken script readers to change the law, but we have only had more scripts. Again, we have had words but not deeds. Let me repeat: the government blames the courts and the courts blame Parliament. They say that Parliament passes the laws, and that they must be enforced. What is the government? It is really a sort of classical university unto itself. That is what it is.

This past summer I saw some of the realities of our country. As I drove from Ottawa to Calgary on that great No. 1 trans-Canada highway, I saw young people hitchhiking. This summer more young people in Canada roamed and hitchhiked across the country than ever before. Never before have we seen young men and women hitchhiking across this country as we did this past summer. What were they looking for?

Mr. Crouse: Work.

Mr. Woolliams: Yes. They were looking for work and opportunity, and they found no work and no opportunity. They were made promises, but few were kept. On this side of the House we begged the government for a positive program to help them. We begged the government to help those graduating from high schools or universities to find employment and opportunity. Few got work. The government did little. Moreover, it destroyed the morale of our armed forces and even destroyed the militia. Then it tried to establish a playboy army by paying youth to play at soldiering while at the same time we put in mothballs $285 million worth of CF-5 aircraft. Again, there were words but no action.

Mr. Baldwin: Just look at the Prime Minister's staff.

Mr. Woolliams: Yes. Just look at the staff. There is no policy or plan to assist our youth to get an education or to obtain job retraining. While the Prime Minister permits the dissipation of our best resource, youth, unemployment grows and grows among young people. We hold a record in this regard and then he says, "Canada stands as one of the most happy and enviable facts of the times." I do not think he can take credit for all that has happened in this country since confederation. He went on to say:

> Because of all this, our country can be looked upon as a global environment, as an environment exceptionally favourable to the fullness of human development.

When young people leave high school and university and cannot find jobs and when young people cannot enter university because of lack of money, are we allowing them to develop? Let me ask the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Lang), when they are on the list of the unemployed, are they developing? So I say to the government that this is a time for decision and not a time for rhetorical phrases and procrastination. It is a time for an energizing performance. It is not a time for vacillation. We are living in important times. It is time to restore law and order. It is time to maintain our principles and bring about justice and liberty in the true sense of the word. It is not a time for tergiversation. Above all, it is a time for straight talk and not for political verbicide and waffling. The Prime Minister has said:

> Some are unable to maintain such a standard because of a lack of education or an absence of the skills necessary in today's world; others are unable to stretch their fixed incomes to meet the increased costs of necessities; still others are temporarily without employment through no fault of their own.

Let me ask four questions. What aggravated and accelerated the high cost of living? The government's policies did. Who brought in nineteenth century economic methods to cure inflation? The Prime Minister did. Who aggravated unemployment and dumped people out of work on the unemployment market? The Prime Minister did. Who placed the burden on the underprivileged and on those living below the poverty line in Canada? The Liberal government did.

• (12.30 p.m.)

The Prime Minister says justice will be obtained when the needs of everyone are satisfied. What have you when most things have been ignored, have deteriorated and all are dissatisfied? The Prime Minister stated in his speech in the debate on the Speech from the Throne, as recorded at page 34 of *Hansard*:

> There is justice when everyone's essential needs are satisfied. This implies a reasonable access for all to the goods owned and produced by the country. Now, work is the normal mode of access to the goods on which life depends; it therefore cannot be disassociated from the right to live.

Has the high cost of living brought justice to the old age pensioners or the veterans? Never have they been in such a cost squeeze. Who has been satisfied by throwing people out of work and reducing the low income pensioners and others to destitution? Nobody. Is that the just society?

My charge against this government is that economic justice is rationed. When justice is rationed, how can the ideal of the just society be even a vision let alone a realization? The Prime Minister promised a heaven. He has lost his faith. Now we are left to believe in that other place where all people are suffering.

What about his brave words regarding pollution? The Prime Minister has talked about the ability to set up a number of laws to deal with pollution. For two years I have been raising a question in this House. I use this only as an example. Each year one and a half million visit Banff national park. Raw sewage from the government administrative offices and the government's facilities which they supply during the months of June, July, August and September is being poured into the beautiful, colourful and clean Bow River which crosses Alberta and joins up with the Saskatchewan River and eventually flows into Lake Winnipeg. This is because the government is expropriating practically all free enterprise except the big corporations. Imperial Oil and Canadian Pacific Railway can move in, but the little man is out. While the government talks about doing something concerning pollution, they are not even cleaning up their own household. It is a speech of words and no deeds.

The situation is so bad on the Bow River that 60 miles upstream cattle have died from the pollution caused by this government that talks about fighting the pollution of air, water and noise. The government has now set up a committee. That will mean another delay. I hope my expression will be parliamentary when I say that when I listen to their story about pollution I think, what bloody rot!

What about the cities? The Prime Minister blames the housing crisis on the framework of the Canadian constitution. He says that according to the constitution we cannot rush into the situation like a bull in a china shop. He seems to be out of date. The late Bob Winters started a mammoth housing project after World War II. That was the beginning of a national housing scheme which built houses across this nation and which started suburbia. In a period of 18 months the Diefenbaker government poured $700 million into housing. This was in 1957 and 1958. This would be a lot more today if we compare the present proportion of our budget. While we now have a $13 billion budget, in those days the budget was only $5 billion or $6 billion. If the late Robert Winters was able to do so much when he was the cabinet minister in charge of housing, why cannot the Prime Minister do the same as we move into the seventies?

What we need is a housing program that will rock this nation, one that will work for the average man. Unless a person earns $8,000 to $12,000 he cannot purchase a house in the Montreal, Winnipeg, Calgary or Vancouver areas. This is for the rich. There is nothing for the poor. That is the just society. Is that the far-away ideal we heard about during the election campaign?

An hon. Member: And Toronto.

Mr. Woolliams: I agree with the hon. member. I am glad to see the Liberals are aware of the situation in Toronto. We now have good representation from Toronto. After the next election we will have many more members because the people in that area are fed up.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: The late Premier Johnson of Quebec saw infiltrating revolutionary forces in his province. He saw revolutionary forces and crime syndicates in Montreal, Winnipeg, Calgary, Vancouver and Toronto. He asked the federal government to please set up a royal commission to tabulate how those people were working, the countries from which they were infiltrating and who they were working with. Had this been done we would today have the evidence to lay before the administrative and police officers as well as the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice. We would be able to handle the FLQ problem. While we asked for that action for two long years the government said, "Oh, we don't need it". We wonder how close they are to this situation when they refuse to find out the facts and the evidence.

The Prime Minister will not yield to the request of the opposition to investigate syndicated crime in our urban centres. All words, no action! Appeasement has never promoted lasting peace. Understanding the problem will achieve a solution, if we act.

The greatest injustice done by this government to any class of people outside of the average men in the urban centres is the injustice that has been done to the treaty Indians. Nothing is more important to a treaty Indian than his treaties. This is the cry of his generation. Here lies the cultural gap between the now white generation and the now red generation, and I am talking about the colour in a colloquial sense and not in a philosophical sense.

Before the Indian Act is repealed, before the dictatorial, bureaucratic, unsympathetic white paper is implemented, the treaty rights concerning the Indians' land, culture, way of life and inalienable rights, as guaranteed, must be defined, clarified and judicially defined. Therefore this government, as was promised by the Pearson government and died on the order paper when we were defeated as a government, should immediately set up an Indian commission and administrative board with all the necessary informalities so that evidence judicially admissible or inadmissible should be made admissible before this board in order that this board can ascertain the treaty rights of those Indians and so that the proper facts and documentation which are presently denied by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development can be ascertained. This board must be armed with the proper powers to subpoena witnesses, hear evidence and force the production of documentation which is being denied the Indians. The most skilful lawyers and advisers should be placed at the disposal of the Indians.

When members on this side of the House make the positive suggestion that the government hire and pay these people to ascertain those rights, the government says it is not necessary. For ten years a case has been pending in the Exchequer Court involving the Blackfoot reservation Indians who are asking for the establishment of their treaty rights. They are also asking for compensation for land abuse and expropriation. For ten long years that case has laid idle. This is not because the court will not hear the case but because the Indians do not have a lawyer. One lawyer undertook to act in connection with the petition. Then he wrote to the Department of Indian Affairs asking whether he could receive at least his expenses. But he got no answer, no co-operation. Is this the just society? It is just in words, but not in deeds. Until we have achieved this promise of legal assistance, this nation can never achieve the destiny visualized and expected by our forefathers, nor can we as Canadians point a finger at other nations, whether they be the United States of America or the countries in Africa, as to their rationing of justice.

• (12:40 p.m.)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): I regret to interrupt the hon. member but the time allotted to him has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Does the House give unanimous consent for the hon. member to continue?

Some hon. Members: Continue.

Mr. Woolliams: I have only a few more remarks to make. I shall not abuse the courtesy of the House. But I will say this. The constitution has guaranteed the Indians their rights, if rights they are—I could elaborate on this theme if I had time. Those rights arose because of treaties made in the name of the Crown. The terms of the constitution placed the Indians under federal jurisdiction. An attempt is now being made to assign this responsibility to the provinces as part of an effort by the government to evade its full responsibility. It is being done in the name of justice and, we are told, following consultation. What really happened? They hired a few Indians on the breadline to go out and try to sell this program.

But let me ask these questions. What Indian has asked for land ownership which would result in provincial taxation of Indian reservations? What Indian has asked that the Canadian constitution be changed to remove any reference to Indians or Indian lands? What Indian has asked that treaties be brought to an end? What group of Indians has asked the government to exclude from its special consideration half of the Indian population in Canada? Mr. Speaker, these questions are self-answered. No Indians have asked for these things. Yet this policy is being rammed down their throats.

The just society is a far-away ideal. The Indian had faith, and what he was promised was a heaven. It proved to be a fraud and a fake. The heaven has turned into hell for these people, who are now demanding action.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Jerry Pringle (Fraser Valley East): Mr. Speaker, I am indeed happy to associate myself with those who have extended compliments to the hon. member from Bourassa (Mr. Trudel) who so ably moved the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I also congratulate the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) for selecting a member of this stalwart group on the immediate left of the Speaker who are entrusted with the balance of power in this chamber and who are affectionately referred to by the opposition as the government rump. I would be remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I failed also to extend sincere congratulations to the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault) on the occasion of his elevation to the position of Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour. As unofficial leader of the rump in Canada's twenty-eighth Parliament, he discharged his duties faithfully and well. Our loss, here in the rump, can only be compared in depth to the expressions of sadness and grief exhibited by the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. MacInnis) as a result of the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour being reseated in another section of the chamber.

My compliments also go to the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) who seconded the reply. I congratulate him on the context of his remarks which brought a message to the chamber from Canadian agriculture. His long association with various segments of our agricultural industry, as a practising farmer, is invaluable to Parliament in general and to the Standing Committee on Agriculture in particular.

Notwithstanding the apparent determination of the Official Opposition to obstruct progress or permit change in needed farm legislation, farmer producers have been striving to throw off the yoke of the status quo and accept authority, provided by provincial enabling legislation, for production planning coupled with the responsibility of marketing. This is especially true of commodity groups which are heavily dependent on domestic sales.

Failure to complete the report stage and third reading of Bill C-196, the Canada Grain Act, as amended by the Standing Committee on Agriculture, may serve the inter-

ests of the grain trade but will provide little or no solace to grain farmers now desperately in need of the provisions in the Act to improve and expedite the marketing of grain according to world customer demand. The hope of our grain farmers, and indeed of all producer-oriented Members of Parliament from all parties, is that the Official Opposition will agree to permit the debate on Bill C-196 to proceed in its present status during this new session so that the bill can be passed without further unnecessary delay.

The second farm bill to fall prey to the sabotage tactics of the Official Opposition was Bill C-197, an Act to establish a farm products marketing council and to authorize the establishment of national marketing agencies for farm products.

Mr. Speaker, although I have been associated with Canadian agri-business for many years, no one has satisfactorily explained to me why farmer producers have been denied the right to place a price on their products. The purchaser quoted the price and the farmer took what he was offered. With the exception of the Wheat Board and the Dairy Commission, little or no federal ground rules, known as enabling legislation, have been enacted to allow commodity groups in competition with other commodity groups to discipline themselves and establish a reasonable degree of stability. On the contrary, farmer producers have actually been encouraged to produce in heavy surplus, to build unmanageable inventories, resulting in disastrous market prices which on a regular basis dropped below the cost of efficient production. This system has enabled secondary industry to farm the farmers while the Canadian taxpayers picked up the tab in the form of subsidies just prior to the collapse of a commodity group into bankruptcy.

Consumers have also unwittingly been the innocent victims of this system. Heavy surpluses forced prices to farmers down, although secondary industry usually managed to maintain satisfactory margins. The consumers jumped with joy, only to find that within a period of time farmers were forced into alternative production, creating shortages which shoved prices to a high level, more than wiping out any advantages gained during the low-price period. Farmer producers, with unpaid feed bills in areas of specialized production, either lost their farms or, in attempting to switch to other commodities, went further into debt to provide additional capital.

Therefore, under the old system of surplus and shortage consumers have suffered with producers. The solution has proven to be production and marketing stability. By this I mean ample high quality production with manageable inventories, providing an adequate service to processing and distribution outlets at stable prices and in competition with other food items. This system may curtail the profits of some segments of secondary industry. However, producer confidence, inspired by stability, encourages farmers to take advantage of technological progress by investing in mechanical aids which improve efficiency and lower costs.

A moment ago I suggested that the solution has proven to be production and marketing stability. I use the past tense because existing marketing boards operating within the scope of provincial enabling legislation have already brought during the last nine years a degree of stability to their commodity groups virtually unheard of in the history of Canadian agriculture.

I say this while acknowledging the fact that a threat to interprovincial movement of poultry products now exists in Canada. It has been dubbed the "chicken and egg war". Those of us who are familiar with the sequence of events know that each step taken by provincial governments in order to maintain stability was the direct result of actions taken by commodity groups who have refused to adopt the concept of orderly production coupled with orderly marketing through marketing boards.

It is no secret that Quebec egg producers pleaded with producers in other poultry surplus provinces to adopt a system of supply management and orderly marketing which would assure some price stability in Quebec. This took place over a period of years. They wanted some stability that was comparable to other commodities in other provinces which were operating through producer marketing boards. When the Quebec egg producers' pleas were ignored the Quebec agency, I would say somewhat in desperation, placed interprovincial movement of eggs into Quebec under the jurisdiction of the Quebec board. They did not eliminate interprovincial movement of eggs into Quebec, and I place emphasis on that fact.

During this period certain promoters known in the poultry trade as integrators apparently decided to invest heavily in facilities for broiler production in Quebec. We now come to the chicken part of the "chicken and egg war". It is interesting to note that while broiler marketing boards were operating successfully in other provinces, Quebec producers were either unable or unwilling—I am more inclined to believe the former to be true—to establish a broiler marketing board in Quebec. Quebec producers with little or no capital were persuaded to provide land and labour at prices considered unrealistic in all other parts of Canada. It was not long before huge unwieldy surpluses of broilers began to build up in Quebec and subsequently went into interprovincial movement to all sections of Canada at what must be considered distress prices by all people knowledgeable in the broiler industry.

It is inconceivable to believe that the promoter integrators of Quebec who enjoyed mark-up revenues from feed sales, egg hatching and processing would expect farmer producers in other parts of Canada to go bankrupt and abandon their investment. It is also paradoxical that Quebec egg producers showed the way to the other provinces. It was they who paved the way for resumption of stability, something in which all farmers across the land are interested, which has been lacking in agriculture through the years but which is now finally finding its way to the surface. All other provinces, with the possible exception of Newfoundland, have with the co-operation of provincial enabling legislation issued orders relating to interprovincial movement of broilers similar to the Quebec order regarding the interprovincial movement of eggs.

This unilateral action on the part of provincial marketing boards and governments was taken as a last resort and not without considerable apprehension as to the future of interprovincial trade in Canada. Let it be a

matter of record that the broiler commodity groups in all provinces of Canada endeavoured to persuade the promoters in Quebec to cut back their production and to work out a market sharing system so it would not be necessary to ask them to hold back their shipments. This is something that had to happen. I have been in touch with most broiler marketing boards in the western provinces, and it is my understanding that some stability is already returning to the market. I have been told there is a shortage of broilers in Ontario but on checking I find that a bothersome surplus still exists. Broiler chicken is still the cheapest meat on the counter and will continue to be in the foreseeable future. May I call it one o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. It being one o'clock I do now leave the Chair.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN GALLERY OF DELEGATION FROM GHANA

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I take pleasure in bringing to the attention of hon. members of this House the presence in the Speaker's gallery of a delegation of Parliamentarians from Ghana. I am sure all hon. members of this House will be pleased to pay tribute to their appearance here.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

* * *

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment (Mr. Stanfield (P. 29) and the amendment to the amendment (Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands) (P.41)).

Mr. Pringle: Mr. Speaker, when I was obliged to call it one o'clock, and for the benefit of those who have tuned in late, I may say that I was discussing the sequence relating to what is now known in the vernacular as the "chicken and egg wars", I was referring to the problems relating to interprovincial trade between the various provinces.

Let me make it very clear that I know of no one who holds the Quebec farmer-producer, and I stress that phrase, in his role as a type of hired man, grower accountable for the present dilemma. It is most unfortunate that they undoubtedly are suffering now financially as a result this ruthless overproduction. It must be noted that broiler growers everywhere are deeply concerned, but I believe that farmer-producers will find the solution if we grant them the opportunity to do so.

It was suggested on several occasions earlier today that we should support the government of Manitoba which has elected to seek a ruling from the Supreme Court of Canada. I am at a loss to understand how this will solve the problem of interprovincial trade. This may assist Manitoba in shipping eggs into Quebec, if they are successful, but as I previously stated, the Quebec order does not eliminate the interprovincial movement of eggs into the province of Quebec. Other provinces have made similar orders and I should like, if I may, to quote from the last paragraph of the order published by the province of British Columbia. It reads:

> Nothing in this order shall prevent any person from bringing into, packing and storing in the Province of British Columbia any import product or from exporting any import product to any place outside the Province.

• (2:10 p.m.)

But the Province has the jurisdiction to regulate sales, and is doing this to the best of its ability. In fact, Quebec is granting contracts and orders for the inter-provincial movement of eggs at present. But let us suppose that the steps taken by the Manitoba government are successful. It will mean that the efforts of one province in Canada to regulate interprovincial trade have been ruled ultra vires. However, the other orders made by at least eight other provinces are not exactly the same as the Quebec order. That means we would have to go back to the Supreme Court of Canada—I am not a lawyer but I am advised that this would have to happen—on each different order, and I am not too sure whether my tenure of office would be long enough for me to see the end result. But I know what it would be if we could provide the producer-growers of Canada with a marketing act which would be operated by producers and be satisfactory to them.

I think we all agree that trade restrictions at provincial borders under individual provincial jurisdiction are going to be a stop gap measure at best. A national producer marketing act operated by producers, designed to challenge the various commodity groups to compete with each other for their fair share of the consumers' dollar would provide the best vehicle. I therefore renew my plea to hon. members opposite to permit the enactment of such legislation as soon as possible.

Canadian farmer-producers, through their various commodity group organizations, are ready, willing and able to shoulder the responsibility of stable food production. They possess the expertise and desire to manage their own affairs.

I was more than pleased with the emphasis on pollution control included in the Speech from the Throne. Since my constituency is located in the beautiful Fraser Valley, the acknowledged garden spot of the world, any type of pollution quickly becomes a matter of deep concern. This is evidenced by the formation of a number of groups willingly giving of their time and effort to fight pollution of all kinds wherever it becomes apparent. Perhaps one of the most active groups is known as SPEC,

which stands for the Society for Pollution and Ecological Control. This group is not only dedicated to attacking industrial waste, whether air, land or water, but is also concentrating on the control of pollution at the home owner level. In this particular, area we are concerned with fighting pollution more than with fighting industry. We do not believe that the elimination of industry will cure pollution, but we believe that we have the technological knowledge at present to cure pollution and to permit industry to continue to operate.

These groups have recognized that the use of detergents in automatic washing machines, overuse of pesticides, incinerator burning, and in fact outdoor barbecuing, all add to pollution. It is interesting to note today that a member of the society in my home town of Chilliwac, Mr. John Rogers, has been petitioning for a survival day for all Canada for many months. I am sure he would be gladdened by the knowledge that the nation's capital is attempting the experiment on October 14, and I wish it well even though I am not too good at riding my son's bicycle.

Another problem of deep concern relating to the ecological future in my area is the proposed flooding of the Skagit Valley by the department of lighting of the city of Seattle. Although the existing dam is located in the United States, the flooding will take place in Canada. This would create a ten mile addition to Ross Lake with a gradient of only 100 feet or less so that only a very small draw down would create a large area of mud flats. It is my understanding that the International Rivers Improvement Act, passed Parliament on July 11, 1955, requires federal permits approving the altering of any waterway crossing an international border. We are, therefore, hopeful that the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) will take whatever measures are necessary to persuade the Seattle department of lighting to seek additional power elsewhere.

In closing may I say to all hon. members within the sound of my voice that the 100th birthday of British Columbia's entrance into confederation takes place in 1971. Plans are now being developed throughout the province for a year of meaningful celebration, and worthwhile projects are being projected commemorating the past 100 years whilst steadfastly looking to the future.

May I at this time properly thank the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), his cabinet and the government for the very generous gift of $10 million to the people of B.C. from the people of all Canada to assist in paying the cost. Many fine and worthwhile buildings will be made available to the people of B.C. which would have undoubtedly been denied to them without the generous gift of this government. I therefore, extend a warm and sincere invitation to everyone: come to British Columbia and join with us in 1971. You will receive a welcome unsurpassed anywhere in the world.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to take part in the Throne Speech debate. I wish to offer my congratulations to the mover (Mr. Trudel) and seconder (Mr. Douglas (*Assiniboia*)) of the motion which brought the Throne Speech before us in the House of Commons. It is an honour to be so selected.

[Mr. Pringle.]

I find the Throne Speech to be a very interesting document. It contains many platitudinous statements with which practically anybody of any loyalty to our country cannot but agree, yet many of these are hollow in that the meanings of the words are neither interpreted for us, nor are the statements which follow the embodiment of what is meant. In fact, many of them are contradictory.

Today I want to draw the attention of the House to one aspect of the remarks made in the Speech from the Throne. The Speech from the Throne states that the passing of the 60's and the beginning of the 70's reminds us that Canada faces a new age, an age which will be subject to forces not all of which are yet comprehended or understood, forces which will proceed from external as well as internal origin. I agree with that statement. I only wish that some of the happenings and events that are taking place today might indicate that the government as well agreed with it.

• (2:20 p.m.)

It is a new age not so much because of changed circumstances, but new because of changed values and attitudes.

I think that is a fair statement too, Mr. Speaker, but what disturbs me is that there is no attempt in this Speech from the Throne to define or explain what these changed values or attitudes are. Like a lot of other Canadians today, I am concerned about what they might be. The next paragraph of the speech is as follows:

Because of the clash between these new values and the old, because of the quest by the young and the disillusioned for some resolution of attitudes, we live in a period of tenseness and unease. It is an age frequented by violence as desperate men seek ill-defined goals; an age of frustration as gentle men question impatiently old assumptions.

I question many of the old assumptions that are before us, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to hear the government state more clearly what some of these new attitudes and changed values are, because therein does my concern lie. Thus, Mr. Speaker, my remarks are going to be based upon these statements which I have quoted from the Speech from the Throne.

I believe that this is an historic but sad day for Canada. The government of our great land, while being intimidated on the one hand by the FLQ, which it knows as well as we do is a revolutionary movement in sympathy with and in full support of the communist movements of Cuba, Algeria and elsewhere, has chosen today to announce its recognition of the communist government of China. Political leaders in Algiers, Peking and Moscow must be very smug and happy today. Likewise it must be a dark, discouraging and frustrating experience for our friends who directly confront communist China, such as Korea, Viet Nam, Thailand and many other countries which by their own experience know the ruthless strategy of communism, and whose citizens have struggled and died for the hope of freedom. I think of the Phillipines and of Hungary. I think of Indonesia, of Czechoslovakia, and of at least another score of nations across the world. Is this where the changing values and new attitudes are?

The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) said earlier today that Canada has no statement to make one way or another in regard to the claim of the Peking

communist government that Taiwan is an inalienable, territorial part of China. Who does the minister think he is kidding? Do we throw 14 million people into the hands of the communists without even a quiver of conscience? How could any government of a free nation, or any conscientious liberty-loving person be neutral between freedom and slavery?

A few days ago the death was announced of M. Daladier, once leader of pre-war France. I cannot help but wonder if we are in the midst of another Munich betrayal.

In 1936 in the Council Chamber of the old League of Nations in Geneva, the Emperor of Ethiopia, under whom it was my privilege to serve directly for some eight years, when the pressure of events had caused him to realize that passiveness of the League had neutralized any action for justice in face of the invading fascist armies in his country, said, "God and history will not forget." Perhaps God and history will not forget today either.

But, Mr. Speaker, referring again to the changing values and new attitudes which the Speech from the Throne spoke about, I must say that as a Member of Parliament and as a citizen of Canada I am disturbed and saddened by the events of the past nine days. A tragedy of numbing severity and of frightening ramifications at two distinct levels has stunned the country. On one level we have witnessed the spectacle of warped and desperate men playing at the same time magistrate and executioner in mad pursuit of their goals. For the safety of two innocent lives we have but two responses—hope and prayer. For two equally innocent families, one cannot verbalize or articulate sympathy equal to what all Canadians feel.

At a collective level as a nation we have witnessed a tragedy no less inestimable. For the past nine days we have seen the subjugation of democratic values to terrorism, the subjugation of human life to political expediency, the subjugation of justice by law to oppression by anarchy. We allow this situation to continue only at our individual and collective peril. Frightened Canadians in Quebec and in every other province, I believe, look bewilderingly for leadership.

I am reminded, Mr. Speaker, that just about three years ago—in fact it was on October 17, 1967—I raised a question in this House regarding reports that appeared in the press, which had appeared throughout the summer and during the following months, concerning guerilla terrorist training activity taking place in the Laurentians. I talked about the huge staff at the Cuban pavilion at Expo actually participating in such terrorist training. I talked about the distribution of communist newspapers, and in particular of GRANMA, the official Cuban communist party newspaper which was being distributed freely from the Cuban Expo pavilion.

I was laughed at then, Mr. Speaker, and I found it necessary to write an open letter to the minister of external affairs, the Hon. Paul Martin. I tried to talk to him about the matter, but I could not get anywhere with him with regard to it. So, my open letter was an attempt to bring these things to his attention.

In this connection, I quote from an editorial which appeared in the Toronto *Telegram* on July 31, 1961, as follows:

> Recently there have been overtones of association between small extremist French Canadian separatist groups and alleged guerilla veterans among the bloated staff of the Cuban Expo pavilion. In 1965, half a dozen French Canadian separatists attended "summer courses" at the University of Havana...

The editorial continues:

> Cuba, unlike almost all her communist fellow states, is openly playing the oldest communist game of all, violent international revolution.

At that time we did not realize really what was taking place, and we are only now coming to the reality of it.

The federal government is naïve to assume that it is dealing with political separatists or with those whose commitment is to change by political means. In that regard I must say that the statement made the other night by Rene Levesque was a commendable one. I am very pleased he made it because he disassociated himself and his organization, which is seeking to bring about change in Canada through legitimate political means, from those who would bring change about through revolution and terrorism.

The abductors of Mr. Cross and Mr. Laporte are members of the FLQ who are committed first and foremost to the destruction of a political system by revolution. These are not the new ideas and attitudes that we want in Canada. These people seize any issue to advance their cause, through violence if necessary. The FLQ is not a political action group working to reform the country. They are revolutionaries. Ascribing middle class values of fair play to these men is not to face up to reality. There can be no middle ground with these desperadoes.

I call upon the government, supported by Parliament, to re-assert that the rule of law, the sanctity of the judicial process shall prevail in this emergency. To bargain with those who would equate reason and reform with abduction and murder is to bargain with no less than the stability of society itself. Any concession to those to whom violence is a political expedient, no matter how small, can only be construed as a sign of insipient weakness and a lack of resolve and commitment to those principles upon which civilized society inevitably rests. To suppose that criminals, who would countenance the taking of innocent lives for their own twisted purposes, will be amicable to reasoned compromise is to ignore historical experience and present realities. I must commend the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) for his statement during the question period today when he resented the fact that certain members and elements of the press continue to call these men political prisoners—those whose release is being sought. They are what he said—criminals and brigands, and I think we should deal with them.

• (2:30 p.m.)

It disturbs me to hear men on television and radio, who would pretend to lead public opinion, say they cannot make a moral judgment on these issues until they know more of the facts. The country is responsible. Just as we members of this chamber extend the responsibility to

others, we carry public responsibility as well. The agony of decision must not obscure the issues involved. The choice is between a society of order and justice, where the majority determines the destiny of a nation, or a predatory state of anarchism where a nasty, brutish and short life is expendable to the dictates of a minority. Concession in this context can lead only to further concession, as we have already witnessed. The rule of law in a free society is non-negotiable.

Realizing as I do the gravity of the situation, and conscious as I am of the responsibility of all members of the House of Commons to assure the Canadian people that we shall never succumb to lawless terrorism, I call upon the government to implement without delay the following five-point program. I call upon the Prime Minister to make a nation-wide address to the Canadian people to reassert the primary rule of law in this country and to assure them of the government's resolve to take measures of appropriate severity to the gravity of the situation. Acting upon the authority conferred upon it by Section 91 subsection (1) of the British North America Act, I call upon the government to declare that the political kidnappings in the city of Montreal are matters affecting the peace, order and good government of Canada and henceforth will be treated as a federal responsibility, working in close co-operation with the provincial and municipal authorities. We have already seen a partial step in this regard, although even that was bungled this morning. When we see troops in battle dress in the House of Commons or even on the Hill, we admit our own weakness or ability to judge the situation. It is good that this situation has been corrected.

Third, I call upon the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) to announce a substantial award, plus executive clemency, to anyone who can provide authoritative information leading to the apprehension of the criminals responsible for these two abductions. Many times in the past this has proven to be a very useful strategy. Fourth, I call upon the Prime Minister and members of the cabinet to commit such officers of the RCMP and of the Canadian armed forces as are necessary to ensure the speedy apprehension of those responsible for these heinous crimes. I invite the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice, and the provincial and municipal authorities, to explore in detail the feasibility of commencing an immediate house to house search of any area where reasonable suspicion exists that FLQ cells are operative. It is a travesty of justice that persons are able to hold the men whom they have abducted without the forces of the law being able to apprehend them or even know where they are.

As a member of the House of Commons, I hereby serve notice that at the earliest opportunity I shall attempt to secure an amendment to subsection (1) of section 233 of the Criminal Code of Canada concerning the crime of kidnapping to make kidnapping for political ends a capital offence subject to the death penalty.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Thompson: As the law stands now our hands are tied.

[Mr. Pringle.]

This is a concrete program born not of panic but of resolve, put forward not in turbid confusion but in the unshakable conviction that whatever be the problems of our society they are not solvable by vigilante lawlessness. It is a program which would not only unite the Canadian people in their determination to continue a society which effects change by non-violent democratic processes but would also serve notice upon those who would use terrorist tactics to erode the confidence of the people and to eradicate a nation's values that such methods will not and cannot succeed. To forfeit this opportunity to clearly express our values and the depth of our commitment to those values would be an individual and collective abdication of our responsibilities.

In closing, I should like to refer to another statement contained a little further along in the Speech from the Throne. I would challenge the Prime Minister to act upon these words which basically are his. These are the words:

> ...there is more need than ever before to preserve as constant values truth, honesty, excellence and relevance; that a society which is not inspired by love and compassion is not worthy of the name.

I would add to that statement "that is not inspired by love, compassion and justice is not worthy of that name". Certainly, the people of Canada are expecting more than they are getting from the government of Canada today in this crisis.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I should like to congratulate the mover (Mr. Trudel) and the seconder (Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia)) of the Speech from the Throne for the tremendous job they did in this respect. I should like to participate in this debate today to discuss the developments in our economy and in our economic policy that have taken place since I presented my budget to this House in March.

Our perspectives on the economy and on economic policy are changing with changing events. It may be helpful if I begin by recalling to hon. members how we viewed the situation last March, based on the facts then available. The data on the year 1969 was nearly complete. It revealed that the inflation gripping the country had carried prices up at a rate of about $4\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. Our fiscal and monetary policies had finally, after some delay, succeeded in reducing the rate of growth of demand after mid-year. This lower growth of demand had induced lower profit rates, but had brought no reduction in the rate of wage rate increases. As for prices, we were able to say at that time that we could see some hopeful signs of a lower rate of price increase, but nothing more. It looked as though the stage was set for some dampening of the inflationary forces, but one could not be sure. The Prices and Incomes Commission had just concluded its agreement with the business community and we were conscious that any success they might achieve on their front would permit more rapid relaxation of the restrictive policies.

In these circumstances, we struck a stance for a moderate expansion in fiscal policy. We planned for a reduced budgetary surplus and for increased non-budgetary expenditures, which taken together implied an increase in our cash outlays from the previous fiscal year of about

three-quarters of a billion dollars. In planning our increased expenditures we concentrated on high priority programs such as those of regional economic expansion, housing and manpower training. We also took particular care to ensure that much of the new stimulus would be directed to regions of traditionally higher unemployment.

At the same time, because of the continuing inflationary threat, we took out some insurance by planning for a system of controls over buying by consumers on credit and by extending our measure for deferred depreciation on non-residential construction where we felt the thrust of construction costs was particularly strong and infectious.

In outlining this policy position, I stated clearly that the government would respond quickly to changes in the economic outlook with changes in its policy measures.

On the basis of this policy position, I anticipated that output and employment would move upward in 1970 though at a lower rate than in 1969. I indicated that there would be some increase in unemployment accompanied by difficult labour negotiations and strikes. I also held out the hope that price advances would be somewhat less vigorous. These expectations have so far been borne out by developments, though in somewhat fuller measure.

• (2:40 p.m.)

I should like now, Mr. Speaker, to review the economic developments to date this year in some detail. The economy has been growing less rapidly this year than last. In the first half of the year the national output, apart from price changes, grew at an annual rate of just under 2½ per cent. This compares with a rate of a little below 4½ per cent in the last half of 1969.

Some sectors of the economy have been stronger than others. Growth of the demand for consumer goods and services and for new capital goods have been outpaced by demands of governments and even more by demands for our exports. In the personal sector, a slower growth of income has led to lower growth in the demand for goods and services, especially in the first quarter of this year.

Investment in residential construction, following the lower starts of late 1969 and early 1970, experienced a sharp fall, especially in the second quarter. We are now, however, on the way up. Housing starts, reflecting the March budget's injection of an additional $150 million in CMHC loans, have been rising for several months. In September they were running at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of about 185,000, up from about 175,000 in July and August and an average 137,000 in the second quarter.

Business spending on new capital has been sluggish so far this year. On non-residential construction spending was no higher in the first half than the average level of last year. This is in spite of an increase of about 15 per cent indicated for this year in the surveys of investment intentions. The intentions surveys also suggested much higher levels of spending by business on machinery and equipment this year, but in the first half this spending was some 6 per cent below 1969. These shortfalls of spending below intentions reflect in part the deliberate choices of business in the face of their expectations of profits and sales. But they also reflect, especially in regard to construction expenditures, the strikes and lockouts in the construction industry. These disputes have produced an 82-per cent increase in the number of man days lost in the construction industry in the first eight months of this year compared with the same period in 1969. Labour peace in this sector would, I am confident, give rise to a marked renewal of activity.

Let me turn now to two expansive areas of demand this year. I refer first to demands by governments for goods, services and new capital assets. Taking all levels of government together their expenditures have risen by about 8 per cent in the first half of this year as compared with some 5 per cent in the second half of last year. The increase this year has been particularly heavy in the second quarter.

Secondly, exports have been a most dynamic force in the economy this year. After having grown at about 7 per cent over the last half of 1969, they grew by some 9 per cent in the first half of this year, most of this increase being concentrated in the first quarter. The latest figures, for August, show some decline from the very high plateau achieved earlier in the year, but exports continue to run well above the figures for the last quarter of 1969. Our sales to countries other than the United States have been the most buoyant. On a seasonally adjusted basis export sales to the United States were lower in August than in December by 7 per cent, but sales to other countries were higher by 14 per cent.

Merchandise imports have been on a declining trend this year and as a consequence the balance of trade has been very strong indeed. Even when this favorable balance is offset by a first half deficit on non-merchandise transactions of about a billion dollars, the current account of the balance of payments is left in surplus by nearly $300 million.

This strong trade surplus, reflecting in part our better price performance, combined with strong inflows of capital to produce considerable upward pressure on the Canadian dollar. We decided at the end of May that we should not resist this pressure any longer. The alternatives were to revalue or allow the dollar to float. In the event, we decided to cease for the time being to purchase sufficient U.S. dollars to keep the exchange rate of the Canadian dollar in the market from exceeding its par-value of 92½ U.S. cents by more than 1 per cent. Since then the exchange rate has been allowed to respond to market forces. I shall refer later to the effects of the subsequent rise in the exchange value of our currency.

I would like now to discuss the labour situation in some detail. The population of the country that is of working age grows at a fairly predictable rate. The rate was about 2.6 per cent last year and we expect it to be about the same this year. What is very much less predictable is the proportion of those in the population of working age who will offer themselves for employment. This proportion, technically referred to as the labour force participation rate, has been showing some wild gyrations lately. These gyrations very seriously affect our unemployment figures. For example at a given level of employment a difference of 1 percentage point in the participation rate—which is the order of magnitude we

have been lately—can make a difference of 1¾ percentage points in the unemployment rate. This is a very serious matter. We believe the factors involved in these swings include the movement of students in and out of the labour force, the impact of the manpower training program and the reactions of potential income earners in a family unit to the fortunes of the principal breadwinner. These factors interact in a complicated way. Predictions and assessments of the unemployment situation are greatly complicated by this situation.

Another factor of considerable importance in assessing the unemployment situation in the country has not received much public attention to date. This is the dramatic acceleration in recent years in the time lost in work stoppages owing to industrial disputes. The figure of man-days lost per quarter from this cause has been rising at an average rate of 25 per cent per year since 1962 and has now become very large. Disputes in some industries cause unemployment in others. In fact, the second quarter seasonally adjusted unemployment rate was probably a half to three quarters of a percentage point higher for this reason. In referring to this matter I do not wish in any way to minimize the distress that unemployment causes. We must, however, recognize that it would be futile to use fiscal and monetary policy to try to eliminate unemployment arising from this cause.

In following the developing situation in respect of unemployment, it is important to keep a close watch on the number of those who have been unemployed more than three months. For these persons the lack of employment is obviously even more serious than for those who are out of work for shorter periods. This proportion is small. In August, people in this category comprised 1.7 per cent of the labour force, and the figure has remained remarkably stable, indicating a high order of resiliency in our economy.

I have spent some time, Mr. Speaker, in commenting on these special features of the labour supply situation because all members of this House share the government's deep concern with the fact that unemployment is as high as it is.

Mr. Stanfield: Shall we send the minister a towel?

Mr. Benson: The hon. member could use, himself, all he can get. In spite of the levels to which unemployment has risen, I cannot report any convincing evidence that the rise in wage rates has begun to slow down. I believe that the pressures in the economoy emanating from this fact are the most important single obstacle to the resumption of the faster rates of growth with high employment and steady prices which we all want.

Mr. Lewis: Bilge.

Mr. Benson: The average annual increase in base rates provided by major wage settlements during the first two quarters was 8.9 per cent. For 1969 as a whole it was 9 per cent.

An hon. Member: What about government manpower?

Mr. Benson: To the extent that these settlements are indicative of cost developments in other parts of the economy or to the extent that they may guide new wage and salary settlements on a broad scale in other parts of the economy, then we are faced with the possibility that such increases may be rolled through the system. This could seriiously affect our price performance if a sufficient easing of fiscal and monetary restraint were in progress to accommodate it.

The rise in wage costs in the face of a mediocre productivity performance has meant a substantial surge in labour costs per unit of output in manufacturing. In that sector and in the economy at large, profits per unit of output have taken another sharp plunge in the second quarter of this year similar to that recorded in the second half of last year.

Mr. Lewis: We ought to send some people handkerchiefs.

Mr. Benson: This has no doubt been an important factor impeding the growth of investment and employment this year.

I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that we have been rewarded in our struggle against inflation. I am sure all members of the House welcome the better recent news concerning prices, and that they will want us to consolidate these gains. Raw materials prices have been falling since early in the year, relieving the impact of higher wage costs in varying degrees from industry to industry. Wholesale prices generally have been on a downward trend this year. The all-items consumer price index, on a seasonally adjusted basis, increased at a 1.5 per cent annual rate over the February-August period this year. Food prices played a very imporant role in the slowdown. The consumer price index excluding food increased at a 3.2 per cent annual rate, which is sharply down from increases at close to a 5 per cent annual rate in most of 1969. Generally, our price performance in recent months has been considerably better than that in most other industrial countries.

• (2:50 p.m.)

I spoke earlier, Mr. Speaker, about the policy measures adopted in my March budget to deal with the economic situation at that time. I have traced the economic developments since then. I would like now to describe in some detail the policy responses of the government and the specific measures we have taken to deal with this changing situation. The government's economic policy objective is to give to the economy the maximum stimulus that can be provided without unleashing another and inevitably more damaging round of inflation.

In pursuing this objective, we are continuously reassessing the degree of stimulus that can be provided within the terms of the objective. In this reassessing we have been greatly encouraged by the more moderate price increases. As the new price information brightened into sharper focus, the government felt that it could take a more relaxed fiscal stance. We are still very worried by the continued increase of wage costs. We continue to hope, however, that moderating prices hold some promise that wage demands might soon be scaled down. Given the lags in the impact of policy changes, which we consider carefully in our planning, we felt a progressive

adjustment of the stance was warranted. This view developed before we were pressed by events into allowing an appreciation of the dollar to occur. We recognized that this appreciation would put pressure on our exporters and on our import competing industries.

One of our first moves was to drop the insurance policy we had taken out in the form of a projected control over consumer credit.

The Governor of the Bank of Canada has explained in his statement of August 31 that monetary policy since early in the year has sought to relax the very tight credit conditions which prevailed at the beginning of the year. The bank rate has been progressively lowered from 8 per cent to 6½ per cent. Market rates of interest, especially for shorter term securities, have fallen this year. The rate on long term government of Canada bonds is down roughly half a percentage point and treasury bill yields are down about 2½ percentage points. Since March of this year the average monthly increase in the seasonally adjusted private money supply at annual rates has been 12.1 per cent.

I should like also to refer to the measures I announced at the meeting of Ministers of Finance and Provincial Treasurers at Winnipeg in June. On that occasion I announced that the government of Canada would undertake to accelerate payment to the provinces of tax collections we make on their behalf. This has the effect of increasing our non-budgetary requirements this year—in effect the funds we put into the economy in this way—by $150 million. In addition, I announced that equalization payments to provinces would be increased by $60 million over the $867 million originally planned, on the basis of new data that had become available since the estimates.

Finally, I announced that $150 million remaining to be spent under the technical and vocational training schools program would be disbursed to the provinces in this fiscal year and the next. This, coupled with a further extra $15 million of disbursements to the provinces under other programs, added $90 million more to our budgetary expenditures for this year. Thus the effect of these measures was to add $150 million to our budgetary requirements and $150 million to our non-budgetary requirements or $300 million in all—a very considerable figure.

We have taken further important steps since the June announcements. Let us consider budgetary expenditures first. Equalization payments to the provinces for the current year have been raised by another $50 million to approximately $975 million owing to the impact of yet further new data. Payments under social insurance programs such as the Canada Assistance Plan have risen and will add further to the purchasing power in the private sector. Hon. members will be aware of the important effort and expenditure we made this past summer in connection with student summer employment programs.

In addition to these extra steps, I wish now to announce that the government has recently decided to ask the approval of Parliament for the expenditure of an additional $60 million to be directed very specifically to the alleviation of unemployment where the unemployment conditions are especially severe. Just under a third of this sum will be used by the Department of Manpower and Immigration in an extension of its manpower training programs.

Mr. Stanfield: Will the minister permit a question which I think is appropriate at the present time? Does the minister mean to indicate that the payments to the provinces during the current fiscal year will be higher than those that were forecast?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, I indicated two situations where they will be substantially higher; first, with respect to the increase in equalization arising out of the data which is received, as my hon. friend knows, two years late; second, because of the agreement of the federal government to speed up payments to the provinces of taxes collected which will be an expenditure for us in the current year. Then, there is the speeding up of the program with respect to vocational schools where we agreed to pay off the $150 million, half this year and half next year.

Mr. Stanfield: My question relates to the forecast made for the current year as to the payments to be made to the provinces under the tax-sharing arrangements. Is the minister suggesting that these payments will, in effect, be substantially higher in total than were forecast?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, I was not speaking of the tax-sharing agreements under which we collect taxes for the provinces and transfer them. As a matter of fact, if my hon. friend will wait a few minutes, I will file a table which will show exactly what payments will be made to the provinces. We have decided at this point to ask Parliament to allocate an additional $60 million of which one-third will be used to increase the manpower retraining programs. About one-quarter of the amount will be employed for the use of special employment programs and will be directed to capital projects in regions where unemployment is higher. The remainder of the program, about $25 million, will be used to employ men for a variety of operations and maintenance tasks which need doing but which departments had been asked earlier to postpone.

Mr. Lewis: May I ask the minister a question? Are these additional funds to deal with unemployment going to the Department of Regional Economic Expansion or will some other department do this?

Mr. Benson: They will be going to several departments. Manpower retraining will be getting about one-third. There will be $25 million which will go to various departments.

Mr. Lundrigan: That is for Newfoundland. What about the rest of Canada?

Mr. Benson: Again, these special efforts will be made in regions of particularly high unemployment. These extra measures undertaken since June will add over $200 million to our budgetary expenditures.

I have been speaking of measures we have taken that involve budgetary expenditures. Several measures also adopted since June involve non-budgetary expenditures. The largest single item relates to the program announced

on August 5 by my colleague, the minister responsible for the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Under this program, the government has added $100 million to the capital budget of the corporation for the current calendar year to enable it to expand its lending for construction of homes for home-ownership and rental accommodation for families of modest income in areas where housing and employment needs are greatest. These new funds will add 15,000 housing starts this year.

May I now be permitted to outline the budgetary and non-budgetary changes since the budget and the effect of these upon the cash position of the government. Budgetary revenues are down $50 million and budgetary expenditures are up $350 million, producing a prospective budgetary deficit of $150 million instead of the surplus in prospect last March of $250 million. In addition, there has been an increase of non-budgetary requirements of $325 million, except for funds required to finance foreign exchange transactions. With this exception, I am now anticipating a cash requirement on budgetary and non-budgetary account of about $1.3 billion. To October 1 of this fiscal year the Canadian cash required to finance exchange transactions has been just over $1.2 billion. These post-budget government outlays represent a very considerable fresh fiscal stimulus to the economy.

• (3:00 p.m.)

If I may have the permission of the House, Mr. Speaker, I should now like, for the information of hon. members, to include as an appendix to *Hansard* tables in the form normally provided with budget speeches. These include a summary statement of our cash requirements for 1969-70 and our current forecast for 1970-71, the yields for the same two years of our main categories of budgetary and old age security revenues and again for the same two years tables and explanatory notes giving the budget figures in terms of the national economic accounts in the form published by the Bureau of Statistics together with a reconciliation with the budgetary accounts.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have to ask the hon. minister's pardon. I was not listening. I was conferring with the Clerk.

Mr. Benson: I requested the permission of the House to attach certain tables as an appendix to *Hansard* today.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the minister have the permission of the House to append these tables?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

(Editor's note: For text of above documents see Appendix A)

Mr. Benson: Let me now summarize the progressive expansion which has taken place in the government's fiscal and monetary policies in step with the steady easing of inflationary pressures over the past several months.

In the budget last March, there was a significant easing of fiscal restraint, with the government's cash requirement undergoing a swing of around three-quarters of a billion dollars from the previous year. At the meeting of Finance Ministers and Provincial Treasurers in Winnipeg last June I indicated that outlays to the provinces would increase by some $300 million to cover accelerated transfers of tax revenue, accelerated payment of technical and vocational training school grants and higher equalization payments. Since that time it has been estimated that equalization payments to the provinces will be further increased this year by $50 million. The student summer employment program launched by the government, together with increased payments under various social insurance programs, will add another $73 million to current expenditures.

An additional $100 million has been allocated in the present calendar year to finance the construction of 15,000 housing units for families with moderate incomes. And today I have announced plans for new expenditure of $60 million of programs aimed directly at relieving unemployment where conditions are most severe.

On the monetary side, there has also been a significant easing of restraint. Since March of this year, the money supply in private hands has increased at a seasonally adjusted annual rate averaging 12.1 per cent. Rates of interest are significantly lower, particularly for shorter-term securities.

Mr. Speaker, this review should assure all members of the House that the government is maintaining an alert, continuous watch for opportunities to move the economy forward. Just as soon as we have felt reasonable confidence that our anti-inflation policies were bringing favourable results we have moved to stimulate the economy. We are anxious and determined to achieve a faster rate of growth and higher employment. But we know we cannot achieve and retain this prize through inflation.

I would like to make a few observations on the outlook as it now appears to us. In the government's view the pace of our advance and the support we can give to it will be determined very largely by developments in the private sector of the economy. A key is the performance of costs. The recovery of capital investment depends very directly upon the outlook for profits. This is turn depends upon productivity and wage costs. The potential demand exists, for there is today no generalized over-capacity in capital equipment and structures such as we have known in certain earlier periods. On the recovery of capital investment depends the recovery of employment and personal incomes and hence consumer spending. We can expect strength from government expenditures and exports, the forces which have sustained the economy this year.

As our economy moves forward our governments and industries will have growing needs for funds. Having in mind the pressure that appreciation puts upon our industries in direct competition with foreign producers, I would urge those who are contemplating borrowing to consider very carefully whether they have fully availed themselves of the competitive services of the Canadian capital market before they decide to float issues outside of Canada.

We anticipate a steady improvement in our employment situation, though the winter ahead will be a difficult one. We shall need a substantial annual rate of real growth before any marked improvement in the unem-

ployment rate will be forthcoming. These are the hard facts.

We believe that the economy is capable of returning to the rates of growth which will reduce the unemployment rate significantly over the next four or five quarters. We believe that our policy stance will guide the economy on this course. The government will do the people of Canada no service if it rekindles the inflation by seeking to force an advance more rapid than productivity improvement and cost moderation will permit. The government will continue to be alert, as it has been alert, to reassess the developments in costs, in productivity and in prices, which must in the end determine the maximum degree of stimulus that the economy can safely absorb. When we can take further action to spur the economy closer to the goal of full employment and growth with stable prices we shall do so. We believe the stage is now set for the recovery of employment—perhaps slowly at first but at an accelerating pace. A strong growth of employment and the reduction of unemployment consistent with good price performance and moderating costs is the priority goal of our economic policy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lundrigan: I should like to ask the minister a question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member rising to a point of order?

Mr. Lundrigan: I was hoping to ask the minister a question before his time ran out.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. minister's time has just expired by about one minute. I gave him a minute's grace because it seemed to me he was coming to the end of his remarks. However, if the House gives unanimous consent, the hon. member may ask a question. Is there such unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Lundrigan: My question relates to the $60 million nest egg which the minister said would be available. Would the hon. gentleman tell us the basis of its distribution and whether he has arrived at a conclusion concerning the manner in which the money will be distributed, and to what parts of Canada?

Mr. Benson: First of all, in my speech I did not talk about $60 million, but about several hundred million dollars—changes in expenditure in the last several months and additional expenditures. With respect to the new item of $60 million, I indicated that 30 per cent would go to manpower, about 25 per cent to capital expenditure and the remainder on various maintenance expenditures. If the hon. member wants details of the total amount and precise information as to where these sums are to be spent, I will be pleased to provide it if he will drop me a note.

Mr. Lundrigan: Perhaps I should rephrase my question; I seem to find difficulty in communicating with the hon. gentleman. Has he decided where these monies will be distributed, when they will be distributed and the basis of the distribution? I am referring only to the nest egg he offered to offset the unemployment situation in places where 20 per cent or more of the work force is unemployed.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Mr. Benson: No, Mr. Speaker. I did say that we had already decided on making this expenditure, and I have indicated to my hon. friend that I will give him a breakdown by areas if he drops me a note. I cannot, off the top of my head, say that we are spending x dollars in Newfoundland, that we are erecting a building somewhere else, and so on, but I will supply the information if my friend drops me a note requesting same. In addition to that, we will be introducing a supplementary estimate to cover this expenditure.

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne and in the remarks of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in this debate, this House has witnessed an almost unparalleled barrage of high-flown phrases and wordy platitudes. No doubt the speech writers in the Prime Minister's office and the other draftsmen responsible for these documents, are congratulating themselves on their command of language and esoteric concepts. But what the Canadian people are more interested in is whether the government commands a grasp of the problems facing the Canadian people, and whether the government has an effective program to deal with those problems.

Thus, I welcomed the amendment moved by my leader, because it brought the debate back to reality, back to the threat to Canadian independence created by growing foreign ownership of our economy. It brought us back to the reality of high levels of unemployment, to the reality of poverty and hardship that is being faced by many Canadian families.

If we heard something of the sublime in the Speech from the Throne and in the remarks of the Prime Minister, then I think we heard something of the ridiculous this afternoon from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson). The Speech of the Minister of Finance this afternoon was a recitation of the failure of government policy. I noted that the minister placed a great deal of emphasis in his speech on laying the blame on the labour situation in Canada. It seemed to me that he was acting something like Dr. Young, Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission in this regard. I am not sure whether the Minister of Finance is parroting the chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission or whether the chairman is parroting the minister; but in either case they are both talking in the same way.

For one thing, the minister commented on the wild gyrations taking place in the labour force participation rate. I suggest that this is just one more piece of evidence that points out that the government has a complete lack of control over the economic situation in Canada.

The minister took great pains to point out that there has been an increase in work stoppages in Canada. I think the key question is: Why are they taking place? The answer to the question is that the government

has allowed a jungle-type society to continue to exist in this country. The government has failed to introduce a comprehensive incomes policy such as that proposed by New Democratic Party members. This is the reason for the increasingly difficult situation with respect to management-labour relations. Where is the incomes policy that we have heard suggested over the past several months?

The minister also said that a slowdown in wage demands is not coming. He suggested that this was the most important factor in the economy. On the other hand, he also pointed to a plunge in profits. I have never heard the minister express concern about a plunge in wages. Neither have I heard him express concern, or at least any great concern, for those Canadians who altogether lose their incomes as a result of unemployment. When did either the government or the Minister of Finance have any concern to express about the sharp increases in profits that have occurred during the past number of years? When did they have anything to say about the increase in interest rates? They have said nothing about that.

These factors are supposed to be indications of a healthy economy. Yet once wages start to go up this is cause for great concern amongst the government policy makers. This is why I suggest there is a basic contradiction involved here. I further suggest that the government has revealed its true colours in that it is not concerned with the ordinary working man in this country. Rather, it has concern for the corporate sector of the economy, for those people who already have a larger than proportionate share of the wealth of the country.

Certainly, the announcement of the minister this afternoon that more money would be voted to alleviate unemployment is belated but welcome. The minister then went on to say that a difficult winter is ahead. I suppose he expects people to take some consolation from that statement. He said that possibly there would be a return to normal growth conditions within the next four or five quarters.

What does that mean, Mr. Speaker? It means that there will be a return to normal growth conditions at the end of 1971. The minister is suggesting that at that point it is possible the government will take steps to stimulate the economy. And what will happen near the end of 1971? This is very near the time when the government is going to think of calling the next federal election.

Both the Speech from the Throne and the Prime Minister's address dealt with economic conditions. There were curious contradictions and conflicts, some straying from the facts, and throughout a failure to face up to necessities and to the bankruptcy of government policy. On the one hand, it was noted that something had to be done about unemployment and other problems. On the other hand, the attitude of "I'm all right, Jack" was taken. At one point some satisfaction was gained from the contention that unemployment rates had levelled off. If it is suggested that the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate remained at 6.7 per cent in both July and August of this year, this will be small consolation to many thousands of Canadians.

The situation was perfectly predictable. The government was warned from many sides that its economic policies would result in a serious slowdown in the Canadian economy. It was warned that the voluntary guidelines policy to be implemented by the Prices and Incomes Commission could not succeed. The New Democratic Party advocated a comprehensive incomes policy. Other proposals were advanced. But the government blindly persisted in its policies. Now, many thousands of Canadians are reaping the whirlwind of the government's policies.

The government is now faced with a serious problem. Expectations are for high unemployment this winter,—admitted by the minister—a serious slowdown in business investment and the prospect of no growth in the second half of 1970. It seems clear that there will be no real economic pick-up until well into 1971. The reason is obvious: there is a time lag between policy changes and their effect on the economy.

A year ago the New Democratic Party urged the government to change its policies. The government failed to listen. On Friday the leader of the New Democratic Party again put forward a five-point economic program involving public investment programs, investment controls, redistribution of income by tax reforms, prices and income controls if necessary, and action to reduce our dependence on and vulnerability to the United States economy.

The Speech from the Throne must be analysed in terms of its adequacy. No one will dispute that there are some welcome announcements in the Speech from the Throne and in subsequent statements by ministers. Some proposals may even be regarded as a faltering and inadequate step in the right direction. The establishment of ministries concerned with environmental affairs and urban affairs will be meaningful only if accompanied by sound, far reaching and courageous programs.

In the final analysis, the government's program must be judged on the basis of its adequacy. Does it take the necessary steps to ensure the well-being of Canadian society? Does it ensure the welfare of individual Canadians? Is it prepared to go beyond "equality of opportunity", as mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, to "equality of condition"? Does it show courage?

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that on too many counts the government has fallen short in a speech liberally sprinkled with conflict and contradictions. Let me cite a few examples. According to the speech, the just society has now become the "distant ideal". Concern is expressed for the "life-support systems of the biosphere", and a new department of environmental affairs is to be created. But there is no assurance that the government is prepared to take the profound steps necessary to cope with these matters.

Reference is made to the need to anticipate and plan rather than reacting to events. But the government persists in taking smug satisfaction from its performance. Reference is also made to equality of opportunity, but not to equality of condition. Too often the phrase "equality of opportunity" is used in order to avoid the decisions necessary to bring about meaningful change. In reference to the government's urban activities, the Speech from the

Throne states that "the government seeks, by making rational its efforts in these fields", and so on. That is surely an admission of past irrationality and hardly an assurance of future common sense. Reference is made to the "competitive marketing system faced by consumers" and then we are told the government is going to do something about "combines, mergers and unfair trade practices".

• (3:20 p.m.)

There is only one short paragraph concerning problems of foreign ownership and no assurance of any program arising out of the current government study of this matter. The Speech from the Throne states:

> It would be irresponsible to suggest that the economy is now in a satisfactory condition".

And then later:

> Unemployment remains distressingly high in some parts of Canada—

It then concludes:

> In sum, the vitality of the economy, coupled with present governmental policies, is countering slowly but effectively the pressures of inflation and unemployment.

Much lip service is paid to the United Nations. But words cannot make up for the failure of the Prime Minister to fulfil the expectation that he would address the 25th anniversary session of the UN on behalf of the people of Canada.

In the light of the two kidnappings in Montreal in the past ten days, special note must be taken of the statement in the Speech from the Throne:

> Notwithstanding its difficulties, Canada continues to enjoy social stability to an exceptional degree.

Surely, this is the type of statement that can only contribute to an attitude of smug complacency which in turn allows situations to grow which eventually can result in the type of problems now faced by the governments of Canada and Quebec. It is not my intention to comment upon the immediate problems in view of the delicacy of the matter, but I did want to comment on some broader implications.

First, any tendency to donwngrade the problems facing Canadian nationhood is wrong. This crisis, which was somewhat submerged during the past year, now is a matter of concern for each and every Canadian. If we want a Canada we are going to have to work for it. For one, I want a Canada.

Second, the Prime Minister received a mandate from the Canadian people at the last election largely on the confidence and expectation that he could solve the problems of Canadian nationhood. Many people from all parts of Canada looked to him to save Canada. To create such a hope and expectation was false. To rely on such an approach was false. The evidence is now clear that, for whatever the reasons may be, the state of our nation has not improved and the Prime Minister has not reached the impossible objective associated with his political personality.

However, it would be folly to counsel despair. Rather, all Canadians must reassess the situation and develop new approaches. Constitutional reform must be tackled on the basis of dealing with real issues and problems. Regional development programs must be related to people, not to the strengthening of private corporate power. Concepts of law and order must not be used as a weapon to prevent or hinder changes in outmoded or inadequate systems.

I was especially interested in the comments on tax reform in both the Speech from the Throne and the Prime Minister's speech, since I served as a member of the House committee studying the white paper. Members will know that the majority of the committee bowed to the pressure of business and corporate representations and recommended substantial concessions to the corporate sector. Maybe they did not go quite as far as the Senate committee but we really do not expect any better from the other place.

It is also noteworthy that the committee meekly acquiesced to the modifications of the Minister of Finance to the White Paper proposals as they affected the oil and mining industries. It might be useful to recall some events. On August 5, the minister informed the committee he did not intend to announce any further modification of the white paper but added a rider "you can never tell". On August 26, the minister announced his concessions. By early September, when the committee met to consider its report, government members were prepared to accept the new proposal without having asked a single question.

I note the Prime Minister attempted to rationalize the concession to the mining industry in terms of growth. I challenge him to reconcile these concessions with the statement in his speech last Friday, which reads, at page 34 of *Hansard*:

> The only true prosperity is that which is equitably shared.

I challenge both the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance to reconcile these concessions with the following two sentences in the Speech from the Throne:

> Thereafter, legislation will be introduced incorporating policies designed to make more equitable the economic burden shared by our fellow dwellers in this complex and varied land. These taxation measures are part of the government's pledge to utilize the wealth of Canada for the good of all Canadians and not just for those fortunate enough to be shielded by the protective apparatus of giant corporations, alert professional organizations or powerful labour unions.

This is one more example of the hollow words in the Speech from the Throne. It is one more piece of evidence that real tax reform is a long way off. While it now appears that the government intends to proceed with the enactment of whatever changes are finally decided upon, I hope adequate time will be reserved for consideration of the legislation.

Members will be aware that the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Saltsman) and myself introduced a minority report on behalf of the New Democratic Party. I commend its recommendations to the Minister of Finance. Tax credits instead of tax exemptions, a full capital gains tax, an end to the special privileges associated with corporate and investment income, an end to special concessions to large oil and mining industries, integration of estate and income taxation, and an ade-

quately structured progressive tax rate schedule—all of these things are needed for real tax reform.

The government must change its approach and not back down to the pressure of special interests. The Speech from the Throne correctly noted tensions existing in Canadian society. Inequality of wealth and economic power is one of the causes of these tensions. Failure on the part of the government to correct these inequalities can only intensify these tensions in society.

One final word on taxation concerning the provinces. There was some legitimate concern on the part of the provinces concerning the long run revenue implications for the provinces related to their fiscal needs. Beyond that the role played by the provinces in the White Paper debate was very disappointing. Most of the provinces joined the anguished cries of corporate business and were prepared to concede just about anything wanted. I think Canadians expected a more responsible approach by provincial governments. At least one provincial government has the unenviable position of being linked with the other place. A *Leader-Post* article dated October 1, 1970 is headed, "Province, Senate agree". The first paragraph reads:

> The Saskatchewan government and the Senate Banking Committee see eye to eye in their disagreements with the federal government's white paper on tax reform.

I have already made some comments in respect of the national economic situation. I should now like to turn to a number of matters concerning the province of Saskatchewan which has been particularly hard hit by a combination of national economic events and special factors operating particularly in that province. The crisis faced by Saskatchewan during the past year poses many questions involving Saskatchewan's future and I would like to take a few minutes to discuss the implications of some government programs and policies on that future.

One indicator of the course of events in Saskatchewan is population. On July 1, 1970, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics estimated there were 940,000 people in Saskatchewan, an absolute drop of 22,000 from the figure of 962,000 in October, 1968. Net migration out of Saskatchewan would have of course been much higher. Unemployment figures have not reflected the true picture due to the high degree of mobility in Saskatchewan's labour force, the relatively high percentage of people engaged in agriculture and the fact that some groups, such as Indian people on reserves, are not included in labour force surveys.

Several industries have faced serious problems. Potash faced special problems due to unplanned, too rapid expansion; oil and uranium slowed down but most important, agriculture faced a real crisis due to a slow down in markets, price drops and continual cost increases. Agriculture is still the most important industry in Canada and grain production is still foremost within the industry. For this reason I think it is tragic that the Canada Grains Act was not passed at the last session. The government waited too long to introduce it with the result that we did not finish the committee stage until the last day before the summer adjournment. It was an improved bill that came out of the committee, and we in this party wanted the bill passed quickly. That was not to be. When the House reconvened on October 5, the Conservative members tabled 44 amendments. I submit that such a move was made for one reason only, that was to kill the bill, and they did. Most of their amendments would have reduced the Grain Commission's powers to control the grain trade. Now, the bill has to be introduced again in this session before it will be possible to introduce protein grading which is so badly needed.

• (3:30 p.m.)

The Speech from the Throne tried to paint a good picture of the infamous Operation Lift and tried to suggest that it was responsible for unclogging wheat markets. I suggest that the unclogging of wheat markets was due more to crop conditions in a large number of foreign countries. It was also suggested that, the Lift program encouraged a healthy diversification of agricultural activities." Possibly the government has not heard that the price of weanling pigs in Saskatchewan dropped from $22 to $3 to $4 in recent months. Such are the consequences of crash programs like Operation Lift.

In addition, hon. members will recall that last spring the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board warned farmers not to increase their barley acreage. Some increase took place anyway. Now, we have the prospect of a barley shortage and the minister is busily covering his tracks by urging farmers to grow more barley.

In the long-run Operation Lift will prove a real setback to western Canadian agriculture. Had this expenditure been used to stabilize farm income, production adjustments would have been made without the damage that has been done.

Finally, it should be noted that when the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) spoke last Thursday in the debate in seconding the motion now before us he did not once refer to Operation Lift, although he referred to many other items. From a farmer from a farm constituency in Saskatchewan, surely this silence is eloquent.

There are other aspects of agricultural problems in Saskatchewan that I would like to discuss, including price supports, marketing, grain movement, etc., but time does not permit. There is one particular matter though that is causing many farmers concern, that is the government's dairy policy.

I raise this matter because of the previously quoted reference claiming that Operation Lift encouraged agricultural diversification. Many farmers in Saskatchewan are concerned at the rigid application of the policies of the Dairy Commission which now effectively prohibit them from obtaining cream subsidies in particular. This operates badly for many prairie farmers because the Commission's policies were introduced at a time when grain markets were buoyant and many farmers had gone out of milk production. I hope the commission and the government will review the rules to bring about a more fair operation for any prairie farmers.

In answer to questions and representations the government has pointed out from time to time that Saskatchewan will benefit under regional development programs. Complaints have already been made about the low allocation of expenditures to Saskatchewan.

In addition, early last spring Regina and Saskatoon were declared special areas by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion for purposes of industrial grants. To date, there has not been one announcement of a grant under this program. There have been rumours, but that is all.

I am concerned about what is happening to Saskatchewan communities, large, small and rural. Unco-ordinated programs, economic pressures and technological developments are bringing about changes which often do not consider people and their needs. I believe that planning, co-ordination and foresight are required if we are to avoid even more serious problems. I would like to deal with some cases.

The Post Office Department has been engaged on a program for the past three years of closing hundreds of small post offices across Canada, many of them in Saskatchewan. In response to the need for changes, it developed its own criteria and applied them ruthlessly. I am glad to see that the minister in charge of the Post Office has called off further closures until further review. I hope the minister will develop new criteria which avoid both the old political patronage approach which bedevilled the Post Office for so long and the new inhuman profit and loss approach. Decisions need to be taken within the framework of community plans and needs.

I would like to advance one proposal for consideration in developing an alternative policy. I would like to suggest that the sub post office structure be developed for some rural areas. Such a system is now used in most cities. In the city of Regina there are 37 sub post offices. One of these offices operates a general delivery service for customers in a nearby rural area. To adapt such a system to rural areas, attention would have to be given to delivery of mail, adequacy of service and the situation of the postmaster.

It is essential, however, that the government not return to the old patronage system in the post office. I express concern about this matter because of one incident involving the closure of the post office at Serath, Saskatchewan, located on the boundary between my constituency and the constituency of Regina Lake Centre. Serath is a small country community located approximately 20 miles from centres to the south, north and west. As a result of closures, it was the only post office, together with another small nearby post office in a large rural area, between the CNR main line and the CPR Bulyea subdivision line. These post offices are now closed. I have obtained a copy of the correspondence concerning this closure. The entire situation stinks of Liberal patronage politics.

The first major development was a letter from the Liberal member for Assiniboia dated November 12, 1968 to the Hon. Eric Kierans, then postmaster general. Concerning Serath, that letter states:

> When I was in Regina on November 9 to attend a provincial Liberal executive meeting, I was approached by some leading Liberals in the area north of Regina, which is not in my constituency and which is represented by an NDP member. They made what I consider an unusual request, that a post office be closed. They said the post office at Serath is serving very few patrons recently and could be closed with little hardship to anyone, and a considerable saving to your department. If it is not already slated for closing perhaps you could have it investigated with that end in view.

This was followed by a letter dated December 16, 1968 from the other Liberal member from Saskatchewan who was then minister without portfolio. It was addressed to the former postmaster general and it reads:

> I spoke to you the other day about two post offices about which I had received a closing suggestion.
>
> The post offices in question are located at Serath and Arbury, both in Saskatchewan. The information I have is that they are very little used, and that no rural route is indeed needed, because the people who live in the area travel easily to Southey and to Raymore.
>
> I received representations from a responsible source, and I pass them along for your consideration.
>
> Yours sincerely,
> Otto E. Lang

Arbury, located in my constituency, is now closed. I wonder who the "responsible source" was?

There were also some letters from well known Liberal supporters in the district urging that the post office be closed. One such letter stated: "The only ones that are getting their mail there are strong NDP. The postmaster himself is an NDP organizer". It might be noted that the majority of the people in this district have generally supported the NDP.

Then, on January 19, 1970, there was a letter from Peter Simmie, research assistant in the office of the present Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Lang) to Mr. Andre Houle, special assistant to the Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans) who dealt with post office closure matters. That letter reads:

> On December 4, 1969, Mr. Lang wrote to your minister concerning the possible closing of the Esk, Saskatchewan post office. As you may remember, a petition was circulated amongst the town's citizens, and received the endorsation of 38 of the 41 families. Mr. Kierans replied to my minister on December 29, 1969: "The Minister has since received representations at Serath, Saskatchewan which has, we understand, only 28 subscribers at present. It seems as if many people in the immediate area do not patronize the post office in Serath and have indicated no real opposition to the closing of the post office. However, there is a proviso and that is that the same people who would prefer the Serath post office to close would firmly support the maintenance of the Esk post office.
>
> We would appreciate your looking into the possibility of ensuring the continuance of the Esk post office and, if necessary, closing the Serath post office to effect the necessary economies."

I wonder who "the same people" are who wanted Esk kept open and Serath closed. I suggest it was the local Liberal executive.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Then on June 4, 1970, there was a letter from Andre Houle to Peter Simmie as follows:

> Please refer to previous correspondence concerning the possible closing of the Esk and Serath, Sask. Post Offices.
>
> After a careful review of all the relative factors, it has been decided to retain the Esk post office as it is serving a useful purpose in the community.
>
> With respect to Serath, however, our survey has revealed that the village is far from being self-sustained and the customers must of necessity go to the larger neighbouring centres for banking, medical and shopping facilities. Therefore, action is being taken to close Serath post office in conjunction with the establishment of a new rural route at Southey which will serve the customers concerned. As a result of this and other related changes in the area, we expect to realize a saving in excess of $2,800 per year.

The above information is being provided in view of the interest you have expressed in this regard.

Why is Esk so much more stable than Serath? I have nothing against keeping Esk open, but let us compare the two communities.

Esk is about five miles from Lanigan, a rapidly growing town. Serath is about 20 miles from the nearest town. Serath has 50 householders according to the latest postal guide while Esk has 38. True, Serath does not have banking and medical facilities. What does Esk have? The 38 householders comprise 23 farmers, one teacher, three retired, one postmaster, four labourers, two grain agents, one carpenter, one housewife, one garage or service station operator, and one general—whatever that is.

The then Postmaster General (Mr. Kierans) refused to listen to many representations and reasoning. Local Liberal politics held sway. Some local Liberal supporters wanted to get the rural route contract. This is the type of patronage politics that has hurt the post office more than all other factors. The two Liberal members from Saskatchewan played a disgraceful role in this episode.

Another matter of concern to many communities is the reduction in railway service. The CPR has closed most of its agencies in Saskatchewan, and branch line service in many areas is restricted to grain movement. Now, the CPR is trying to unload its last remaining passenger service in Saskatchewan, the main line service.

The CNR also tried to close most of its agencies and establish a master agency plan. Public reaction was so strong that it looks as if the CNR has called off its plans. Instead, it is resorting to the old railway game of squeezing out service when the railways do not get their way. Passenger tickets have been taken away from many station agents. Communities on some lines no longer have cartage services; draying contracts have been terminated; distribution of express is becoming more centralized. Such an approach by the railways is the height of irresponsibility.

These examples and many others I could cite, Mr. Speaker, illustrate how the structure of Saskatchewan communities is breaking down because of the lack of co-ordinated planning sensitive to the needs of people. What is needed in Saskatchewan is concern and attention to the needs of communities, large, small and rural, to ensure that viable communities exist which are desirable places for people to live, from aesthetic, cultural and economic standpoints.

Many program changes are needed. I give one small example. For years forest nursery stations have provided trees free of charge to farmers. A very useful service has been performed. I suggest the time has come when this service should also be provided to urban communities. I recognize that in doing so consideration would have to be given to the situation of commercial nurseries.

In view of the serious problems facing rural Canada and smaller communities, and in view of the urgent need for co-ordination, planning and programs I urge that a minister of state for rural affairs be appointed. A useful step will be taken by appointing a minister of state for urban affairs and housing. I hope this step will be followed by meaningful programs. I suggest there is a similar need for a minister of state for rural affairs. Because of the failure of the government to act on this and many other problems, I will support the amendment to the amendment moved by the leader of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Philip G. Givens (York West): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I wish to congratulate the mover of the motion for the address in reply, the hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel), and the seconder, the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas). I do this not only as a formality but because of my high personal esteem for both of these gentlemen.

Many years ago when I was a law student, I began to learn about the constitution of this great country. I learned pretty quickly that municipal institutions came under section 92 of the British North America Act, which meant they came under the jurisdiction of the provinces. Indeed, I had a very good teacher. My teacher in constitutional law was so eminent that he now sits as a justice on the Supreme Court of Canada.

Then, almost 20 years ago I went into municipal politics. I worked my way all the way up from nothing to a state of absolute poverty, through the stages of alderman and controller, and went on to become the mayor of my beloved city of Toronto. I saw the city of my birth grow from a population of 650,000 to a metropolitan area of over 2 million population. I saw it grow by an estimated 50,000 to 60,000 people a year each year for the past 20 years, and as well I saw grow its problems of congestion, poverty, housing, welfare, education, traffic jams and pollution. I saw these problems engulf my city and its environs.

Quite often I sat wringing my hands in frustration because of a lack of power and money to do the things which had to be done for my great city. I would go to the province with my hat in hand, like a mendicant or beggar, looking for financial assistance and legal assistance. I was told by the boys in the provincial government that it was the federal government which had the money and that I should go to see my friends in the federal government. So, I would come up to Ottawa. They would take me out to lunch and they would tell me, "Phil, you know very well that jurisdiction over the cities belongs to the provinces."

I rapidly became a track star on the run-around track of passing the buck, and when I came here as a federal member of Parliament two years ago I knew about the constitution. I knew what it said in the constitution but, Mr. Speaker, that did not make it right, because it did not accord with the reality of the situation.

I have argued loud and long, time and again, that the municipalities we now have in this great country are not the municipalities which were envisaged by the Fathers of Confederation and the BNA Act, that their responsibilities today are not just to fix curbs and fill potholes, to look after police protection and fire protection, that today the cities are conglomerates, and that Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver could never have been envisaged in 1867 in the extent to which they have grown today.

Indeed, notwithstanding the fact of the constitution, the federal government today is financially right up to its neck in municipal matters, to the extent of hundreds of

millions of dollars spent on housing, airports, harbours, post-secondary school education, post offices, public works and so on. Today the budgets of Montreal and Toronto are bigger than the budgets of at least seven of the provinces, and the populations of Montreal and Toronto are each bigger than the populations of seven of the provinces. Indeed, today the populations of each of the cities of Toronto and Montreal is bigger than the population of all the four Atlantic provinces put together.

If the provinces have a right to sit in at constitutional conferences, as I have seen them with premiers representing provinces which have populations of anywhere from 150,000 to 200,000 or 300,000 people, then surely the populations of our great cities have a right to be represented at these conferences which will determine the constitution of this country for the next 100 years.

I have pointed out that by the year 1980—this has been stated time and again by eminent statisticians and research authorities—which is only a short ten years off, 80 per cent of the population of Canada will be living in the cities of the nation. Sixty per cent of our population will be living in cities of over 100,000 population, and one third of the entire population of the nation will be living in Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver. I have argued that there was a need for the federal government to manifest its concern for the cities in order to prod the provinces, even though the cities are their responsibility under the constitution, something which I have never denied. I have argued that urban areas have affected national policies, financial and monetary policies, more than many of the provinces. In any event, Mr. Speaker, we are not dealing with municipalities as such but with people, the people we represent in this House of Commons.

But, Mr. Speaker, all these arguments seemed to fall on deaf ears. I was told that the constitution stood in the way, that I was beating my head against a brick wall, and so it seemed to me.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Mr. Woolliams: They were bluffing you.

Mr. Givens: Anyway, I will leave to others the chronicling of the sequence of events which took place from the beginning, two years ago, until now. But, lo and behold, in the Throne Speech last week my impossible dream seems to have come true. By the appointment of a secretary of state for urban affairs and housing, the government has acknowledged that it has a place in the urban affairs of the nation. This is a specific acknowledgement in the Throne Speech. This is a *de jure* as well as a *de facto* recognition that the federal government owes responsibility, and is manifesting its concern, for the cities. It could not be clearer than it is in the Throne Speech. This means to me that there will now be a recognition of the place of municipal governments in the day to day public business of this country and in the planning for the future. In addition, in the search for a new Canadian constitution, the municipalities will be recognized and accepted as participating partners and be given a role consistent with their influence on the lives of the Canadian people.

So far as I am concerned I consider this to be a total vindication of my position and I have only one word of caution I wish to express at this time. If a federal initiative in urban affairs is to bear fruit, it must necessarily be accepted in good faith and must take into account the indispensable participation of the other levels of government, particularly in the area of formulation of national urban policies. It must be a tri-partite arrangement. This means that the federal government must recognize and pursue actively its responsibility to foster effective and continuous consultation between all levels of government in the formulation of national urban policies. It also means that the municipal governments must recognize the responsibility they have to consult together in the formulation of the municipal point of view. They must, themselves, come to terms with the problems that are situate within their boundaries and they must work together to assure a better understanding by each municipality and its officials of national urban problems. Without the full participation of municipalities as provincial and national groupings any federal initiative is doomed to failure. Without the full and active participation of individual provinces and the provinces as a group, once more federal initiative is doomed to failure.

The Canadian municipalities, through the Canadian federation of mayors and municipalities, have obviously contributed to the alerting of the federal government to its need to take an initiative in urban affairs. Let us hope that the municipalities do not consider the federal initiative to be a sufficient measure. Let us hope that they are urged to move even further and faster along the road to three party consultation rather than make the fatal mistake—and this is what it would be—of relaxing their efforts at the first sign of success in this venture.

Much has been said about the matter of pollution. We have been inundated with a miasma of pollution jargon. In an age of transcience in which fashions and fads change over night, as people leap from one sensation to another, there is a strong danger that the public will lose interest and that the destruction of our environment will continue apace as man goes the way of the dinosaur into oblivion. But I do not think this will happen.

I think that pollution is, and will continue to be, the vital issue for the rest of this century. If we fail in this period of time and over the next generation to control its disastrous devastation and to repair the basic defects of rampant population growth and uncontrolled technology, and if we do not somehow adjust our concern about the environment and adapt it to our traditional institutional framework of society, then we will have had it; we simply will not survive. Many cracks have been made by sophisticated, "hep", people, the swingers, who have wondered out loud through the facilities of the media whether the furore about pollution is full of sound and fury signifying nothing and whether indeed it is a passing fad like the mini or the midi or the Nehru jacket. There are the neanderthal types in all walks of life who have indicated that it is only a tempest in a teapot, a gimmick for professors and radical students to attract attention and publicity for themselves.

In the past decade we have seen many emotional and volatile issues grab people and shake them only to be

forgotten the day after tomorrow. Our attention span is terribly short and our concentration as fickle as a femme. This unfortunately is true. I feel, however, that never before have we been faced with an issue of such vital significance to ourselves and the future of our children and our grandchildren. This is an issue which we live with every day and which is before our very eyes day in and day out, week in and week out, year after year. We are reminded of it constantly as we breathe the air, listen to the constant cacaphony of deafening noises around us, struggle through crowds and traffic, twitch our noses and turn away from looking at the streams, rivers and lakes in and out of our cities in order to keep from throwing up.

If in the face of these frightening reminders which we see every day we turn away or lose interest and turn to something else for kicks, then we will truly deserve the catastrophe which will descend on our heads. Therefore, I consider the call in the Throne Speech for a co-ordination and consolidation of all our efforts in an effective fashion and the establishment of a department with a mandate for the protection of the biosphere to be a declaration of major importance which would not have been possible two years ago.

On the subject of abortion, I welcome the proposal for a special debate. Naturally, I would prefer to see the government take specific action on this matter but two years in these hallowed halls and corridors have taught me that there are many deep and serious divisions of opinion on this subject and of course I have mine. I do not think I will ever forget the debates in this House when we were discussing the therapeutic abortion amendment to the Criminal Code omnibus bill last year.

The state of New York, which has a population greater than the whole of Canada and which has an ethnic, racial and religious mix which is a microcosm of the whole of the United States and comparable to ours, has freed abortion from criminal strictures. Although this great state is just across the border, it may as well be at the other end of the world so far as this progressive move is concerned. At least the xenophobes in our midst can take comfort in the fact that we have not been brainwashed and acculturated to this degree by our United States neighbour.

When we passed the therapeutic abortion amendment I really believed we had done a good thing and that we would be protecting about 100,000 Canadian women a year who seek illegal abortions from the back alley butchers who prey on them. Alas, this has not been the case. I believe it is time this Parliament took heed of the growing number of Canadians who maintain that an intimate decision concerning abortion should be made by the woman or couple concerned, without being dominated by those who would impose their ideas concerning morality and religion on others who hold entirely different views and beliefs.

I feel the same way about another controversial matter mentioned in the Throne Speech. I refer to the question of the non-medical use of drugs. I have been appalled by what I have seen in the courts in Toronto and by what is going on in the courtrooms throughout this nation with regard to this problem. Every day hundreds of youths across this country are being arrested, mugged, finger printed and given a criminal record at the start of their lives for the mere possession of a "reefer" or two of Cannabis marijuana. Many of these kids have come from our finest homes. The result of such conviction, regardless of the penalty imposed by enlightened courts, has a devastating effect on the families as well as the accused. It is granted that this whole problem in respect of drugs is vexing and perplexing, but this method of handling these cases under the Criminal Code is really archaic and Draconian in an enlightened society. I shall anxiously await the commission's final report so that it can be studied, discussed and acted upon without further delay.

So, for the reasons I have indicated, I am delighted with the Throne Speech and for the first time in the two years I have been here I can honestly say I now feel at home in this House.

• (4:00 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I take the opportunity of congratulating the movers of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne (Mr. Trudel and Mr. Douglas).

We are all invited to discuss the Speech from the Throne. In all such speeches, we find valuable items and some that are less so, as well as omissions. This speech teems with good intentions. In fact, it says, and I quote:

> As Canada moves into the seventies, we are all invited to join in this bold enterprise—to share the excitement, to face the challenge, to pursue the distant ideal of a just society.

Further, it says:

> The Canada of the seventies must continue to be a land for people; a country in which freedom and individualism are cherished and nurtured; a society in which the Government lends its strength to withstand, rather than support the pressures for conformity.

That surely set me wondering! Here is more:

> Fortunately, our population, the number of Canadians engaged in productive employment, the total volume of goods and services which they produce, and Canadian exports all continue to grow.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to spend the few minutes I have left commenting only the Throne speech. As many others, I would like to make some objective remarks.

After two years in the House, we might well ask ourselves certain questions. In fact, there were 300,000 unemployed two years ago; today there are 500,000 people out of work.

The government has adopted an anti-inflationary policy. The attempt to limit salary increases to 6 per cent is an example. However, they forgot to ask industries and businesses to restrict their profits to 6 per cent. To me, it was gross injustice. I was very surprised to see that the government wanted to limit salary increases to 6 per cent without any consideration for low wage earners. This type of unfairness was designed to widen the gap between the rich and the poor.

As regards housing, there are still very serious problems in this field.

On many occasions—and I shall take the liberty of repeating this—we had asked the Minister to repeal the

11 per cent sales tax on building materials. For a year and a half now, we have been asking the government to make low-interest loans to workers with low incomes. In my view, such action would soon bring about the expansion of the construction industry.

A policy aimed at making the repayment of loans easier may well be introduced, still, low-income workers cannot be required to pay over the years three times the actual value of their homes.

It is indeed a pleasure and a duty to request once again—and I hope the minister will listen to us this year—low-interest loans, or, in other words, loans bearing interest at 5 or 6 per cent for wage-earners with an annual income of $10,000 or less.

With respect to agriculture, the two years that have just elapsed have not yet brought the expected profits of results. This could be discussed at length. However, where the milk producers are concerned and taking into account their good faith in relation with quotas, I urge the minister in charge to rectify as quickly as possible the iniquities they have been suffering since last April. Because of that iniquitous situation—and many of you know it—several dairy farmers have disappeared. The minister had undertaken to put an end to that anomaly as soon as the good faith of the dairy farmers could be established. Having said this I hope that the minister will act without any delay so that these producers can get the grants they need desperately. We have perhaps forgotten during the last two years to readjust the pensions of the blind and the disabled. Those pensions set at $75 monthly are insufficient, and this has been the case for a long time. I hope that this year we will be able, after discussion, to increase the pension of the people who, in addition to living alone, need someone to help them. This $75 pension, in view of the need for a companion, is ridiculous surely, considering the cost of living today. Since April 1964, a blind person cannot earn more than $1,600 a year or his pension will be reduced. I hope the government will reconsider this measure and will allow a blind man to become less dependent and thanks to his skill, to increase his income without losing his pension.

Mr. Speaker, if we make a quick survey, it is hard to believe that we will gain the confidence of the people in this manner.

Last year, I spoke at some length about objectivity. I thought that, which the good will of all hon. members, we could achieve a greater degree of objectivity, act more as administrators than as politicians. Such objectivity, I feel, has not been exercised in the manner that I and the whole population of Canada would have wished to see in the House. This year, I hope that there will be more objectivity here than heretofore. We can never gain the confidence of the people so long as suggestions brought forward and likely to help our fellow-citizens are being rejected.

I dare hope that we may still prove our Parliament to be truly democratic.

To my way of thinking party discipline is much too rigid in certain cases.

• (4:10 p.m.)

I know that the party in power is often embarrassed. I also know that, according to an old tradition, any legislation introduced in the House, if rejected, necessarily brings about the fall of the government.

In my view, this tradition could disappear. I feel that the government should be defeated through a vote of non-confidence. If this measure were more clearly defined we could ask the political parties to be less rigid when party discipline is involved.

I do not accept very well that party discipline should involve the conscience of the members, because this practice leads us to deny certain commitments we have made and forces us to vote against our own convictions. Obviously, the party in power is often placed before this dilemma. By changing that attitude or those old traditions, we could give more freedom to the members and thereby prove to the Canadian people that a democratic parliament can really be achieved.

As long as party discipline is that rigid, it will continue to bind the conscience of the members. There are striking examples.

Indeed, last spring, the matter of dairy policy came up. I remember full well that the majority of the members, who represent rural areas, were not in favour of the government policy. But the party discipline was strong enough to silence the members of the party in power and the government cut back the subsidies by $10 million, which did excessive harm to milk producers.

Today, we are still trying to get the situation back to normal. But the fact remains that party discipline forced a number of members to vote, I am convinced, against their convictions. They would have liked to have fought for the interests of the riding they promised to represent well, but they were unable to do so.

Now, I dare hope changes will be made to that effect, to enable Parliament to allow all its members to be more honest and honour their commitments towards their electors.

Mr. Speaker, a while ago mention was made of a bill allowing greater freedom in the matter of abortions. I am sorry that the Speech from the Throne did not refer to a bill that would have given us the opportunity of discussing abortion this year. I feel that the impressive statistics published in the last three years and a half justify a new debate on that law.

I would have liked better during this session to see a debate on capital punishment rather than on further liberalization of the legislation on abortion. I would have preferred that we should try to get rid of our criminals rather than consider doing away with innocent people.

Mr. Speaker, I shall take this opportunity to mention a problem of some significance in my riding which does not have only advantages but also its own problems.

For the past few months I have made representations to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) in order to get, on behalf of my riding, information concerning the current unemployment rate. I consider myself justified in asking the minister for a better understanding of the difficulties we experience at this time.

There are various reasons for the 15 per cent unemployment rate in my riding. We should also be able to find work for some 1,500 students who enter the labour market each year.

The training programmes that have been made necessary by the work done at the international airport and that normally should help reduce unemployment will certainly not be felt before 1980. As there were reductions in some areas of the textile industries in my constituency, unemployment has gained momentum.

I am convinced that the minister understands the situation and that he will attempt to give it special attention. I will have the opportunity in the near future to present him with a petition from my constituency, namely from all the municipalities, the Chambers of Commerce, the Regional Economic Council and from cities such as Joliette and l'Assomption. I think that, in the light of claims which will show the difficulties we are experiencing, the minister will seriously consider the possibility of including my constituency as a designated region or at least setting up special areas which would be a great help for us.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words about severe unemployment throughout Canada and particularly in the province of Quebec.

I made on occasions some suggestions aimed at curtailing unemployment. There are works to be done in each municipality. I wonder whether we could not ask the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his government to give special attention to the organization of winter works this year. This is something that was going on previously, but that has been called off by the government. I wonder whether we would not have reasons re-establish them, at least with respect to public services in each municipality.

I wonder also whether it would not be desirable to have students work during the summer at cleaning up our waterways; this would give employment to students and help fight pullution at the same time.

These works would confer a tourstic attraction to our cities.

I would like to ask the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin), and the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion as well, to consider very particularly the possibility of granting assistance to industries.

The Minister of Regional Economic Expansion has greatly improved the situation by allowing certain expenses in different areas of Canada, especially in the province of Quebec. We have, therefore, profited by a reasonable part of those works.

But I wonder if it is adequately considered to protect the industries. It is very interesting to see a certain number of new industries come into being, but I believe that we unfortunately forget to give them adequate attention. In my opinion, it would be much less burdensome to allow these industries to have a certain expansion or, at least, to continue their operations.

Before concluding my remarks, I would like to say a few words on a question which has not been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, namely the measure to amend the constitution. Some hon. members talked about the matter and discussed it, but I regret that that question has not received the priority which it deserves.

I think that in the opinion of Quebecers and of all other Canadians, such a change is becoming increasingly essential and should have been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. People are worried right now because we are living anguishing hours. Still, I believe we should ask what is behind this phenomenon.

I think that over the past 10 years Quebec has made quite normal claims at federal-provincial conferences. Perhaps the federal government has refused for too long to recognize the particular situation of Quebec in Canada. In fact, 80 per cent of Quebec's population is nevertheless represented by French speaking people.

The history of the French Canadian nation leads us to recognize differences. It is also the responsibility of Quebec to see to the preservation of our traditions, of our turn of mind and of our views which are not necessarily identical to those of other Canadians. I think that these are quite rightful aspirations. We share much in common with all other Canadians: we want well-being and affluence but, at the same time, we want to keep our language and our habits, desires which are quite legitimate.

I regret, however, that the federal government should be reluctant to revise the Constitution, which discourage, to a certain extent a number of Quebec people. It may be that the federal members from the Province of Quebec should have given their colleagues from the other provinces more precise information on the difficulties and the aspirations of Quebecers. It may have been to often said that only a few people, a gang of bums, were involved, and that the matter did not have any great importance.

If that is so, then it was not the truth. A wish for emancipation was coming alive in Quebec. I believe that, to a certain extent, it was due to some hesitation in granting this wish that the movement for independence came into being, and, through all this, it happens that some groups go further than those who wish to remain peaceful.

Some will say that at the last election, the Province of Quebec, being well satisfied with the present system, elected a majority government which favoured federalism. But perhaps no attention was drawn to the fact that 66 per cent of the French-speaking population of Quebec voted for opposition parties, and this proves the dissatisfaction of a large number of citizens.

I say that because we already have a committee whose very first task will be to tackle the problem of improving the constitution.

I also believe that the briefs submitted by the Quebec governments since 1960 were aiming at the same goal and emphasizing the needs of the whole Canadian population.

The brief tabled at the last conference was almost the same as those from the precedent governments although its tune was a little different.

If on occasion we have perhaps changed our tune, it might be because we used the appropriate tune at the time, which made it possible for the Quebec premier to change his tune and perhaps his words while still taking into consideration Quebec's objectives and needs and also the conditions by which this province could remain in our great country, Canada, so that the Quebec people could be happier and more content.

I do not think that by passing one single piece of legislation we could settle the problem of national unity. I believe in differences. Some are found in our province

but also elsewhere. We are prepared to recognize them and we have proved it.

Should we also ask to the majority of hon. members to understand these differences in order that each citizen can get his share of happiness and satisfaction in Canada?

We are willing to accept—and we have proved it—the differences that exist in other provinces. I must say that so that there can be a better understanding in our country, since I am convinced that, if we were better informed and more open-minded, we would be able not only to accept the province of Quebec, but to keep it within Canada and to make it easier for it to obtain the particuler rights which would enable its inhabitants to be happy. Under these conditions, we will build our country—and this is surely the desire of the vast majority of Quebecers—while respecting the differences existing not only in Quebec but elsewhere as well.

After all, I still think that in the future, thanks to a better understanding from those sitting here, the province of Quebec will develop further in this beautiful country which is called Canada.

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, during the next few minutes I should like to express my opinion on the Speech from the Throne delivered on October 8. I commend the government for it because I am convinced that its devoted civil servants must have taken a lot of time to prepare as perfect, as eloquent a piece of oratorial art as this with such high-sounding but absolutely meaningless words.

In my estimation, this speech could easily be compared to a stuffed animal. One admires the art of the craftsman who has given it an appearance so near to reality; one admires the finish, even the elegance of this so-called work of art, but everyone knows very well there is no consistency inside this beautiful body, that this lovely decor hides only a few pounds of straw and that the whole thing rests on the ability of the craftsman to give it its striking appearance.

Once again, as usual, we are given pompous statements devoid of meaning.

Mr. Speaker, one reads in the Speech, and I quote:

> Canada continues to enjoy social stability to an exceptional degree.

Incidentally, I should like to say that when the Speech from the Throne was written our situation was not what it is today. Still, we knew something was wrong. Today, the situation is far more serious than we thought.

They dare say that Canada enjoys exceptionoal social stability. I wonder where the staff of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) get their information.

Perhaps the people working for some of the hon. opposites still believe in Santa Claus. If the members of the government believe in Santa Claus, I beg of them to dispense with trying to make us believe in him. Obviously, we no longer do.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, someone should ask the employees of G. Lapalme Inc. if they believe in Santa Claus! We should ask the farmers of Eastern Canada if they are still expecting Bill C-197 from Santa Claus! Western farmers who are at grips with the famous Lift program should be asked if they think Santa Claus exists! We should also ask Canadian shoe manufacturers, Indians of the North, as well as foreign investors whether they believe in Santa Claus!

In one word, Mr. Speaker, government members should leave their offices and look around.

If the Prime Minister's statement is true, what are we doing here? If everything is fine, why keep trying to improve the situation? We are now at the beginning of the third test year of the present government which is repeating its usual story, the establishment of its just society.

I sincerely wonder if it is a just society for fun or a just society for a few. According to the Winnipeg *Free Press* of April 21 last, Governor Louis Rasminsky of the Bank of Canada stated that average salary increases of 7 to 8 per cent a year too high to allow the federal government to successfully combat inflation.

Well, in the course of last year, no doubt as an active participation in the anti-inflation fight, this same Mr. Rasminsky raised his own salary from $50,000 to $75,000 a year, or 50 per cent, which is only six or seven times more than what he had considered too high. A just society for whom, Mr. Speaker?

I am not against the principle of "just" salary increases. I use the word according to the meaning it has for us Créditistes, that is, equal justice for all.

Justice demands, I claim, that the wage increases to be granted to Canadian workers be proportionally equal to that given to Mr. Rasminsky.

But you will say that this would be absolutely impossible, and you are right. Then why not keep wages at a stationary level and cut down commodity prices? Impossible again, you will reply. And again I agree; such action is impossible in this unhealthy system. The solution to the problem lies in the implementation of Social Credit policies.

I know for sure that nobody will ever accept this truth without being compelled to do so. And in spite of it all, it is considered that Canada enjoys exceptional social stability. Words! Words! Words! Preposterous I say!

Where is that so-called just society? Are we talking about true distributive justice, or about the hollow concept of "justice"? Speaking of "justice", I think that at the present moment, we know nothing about it in Canada.

I would like, at this stage, to relate a conversation I had with somebody whose logic was perplexing.

In view of all that is happening in Canada, this person asked me simply: "Why should the federal government not decide to be honest once and for all and enact legislation which would confiscate to the benefit of the government all private property in Canada?»

This person told me that he considered the present governments as true usurpers taxing indispensable commodities in order to take over, by indirect means, what belongs to the people.

Why not, then, frankly be usurpers and do it directly, without hiding behind taxes? What do you answer to such advanced logic? In my opinion, such a statement leads us to doubt the exceptional social stability we enjoy in Canada, according to the Speech from the Throne.

Every day there are edifying news about attempts made to bring about a just society. Thus, in looking through the annual report of the Canadian Film Development Corporation for 1969-70 I was quite surprised to find out that such films as L'Initiation and Les deux femmes en or had received financial assistance from the said corporation.

Mr. Speaker, here is what it says on page 9, and I quote:

"Under Section 10(2) of the Act establishing the Corporation, a completed film, in order to be eligible for a grant, must have a significant Canadian content.

Mr. Speaker, it is conceivable that a producer could decide to include in a film obscenities, insults to justice, words that vilely sully the beliefs of the majority of Canadians, and all sorts of things we all, I am sure, condemn, since he alone assumes moral and financial responsibility for them.

But that taxes paid by Canadians should contribute to the financing of such films, that, I repeat, is revolting to me. I strive to bring my children up in the natural respect of genuine love and of the most elementary human values, hereas the government, using funds raised from the fruit of my labours and those of all Canadians, allows producers to show such films in all our movie houses, accompagnied by spectacular and well-orchestrated publicity. That, Mr. Speaker, is beyond my understanding and I am squarely against it.

Is this the "just society" which means to shake the foundations of a self-respecting society? We should not wonder at the trouble our young people have been giving us lately. And to think that in the report it is said that such movies have a significant Canadian content. Supported, I suppose, by some kind of foundation garment. Is this what should be used to identify our society, as basic principle? Perhaps it is one of the objectives sought in the creation of the "just society"!

Moreover, we are spending thousands of dollars to find the reasons why so many young people take drugs. In fact, we are degrading them with all kinds of things and they have no hope left in the future.

There is no logic in the government's attitude, Mr. Speaker. Thousands of dollars are spent on research into the harmful effects of cigarettes, drugs, etc., and at the same time, tobacco farmers are granted subsidies to increase their production. As for me, I do not really see the logic in such a reasoning on the part of a government deemed reasonable.

We can also see in the Speech from the Throne that the government has just found a miracle solution to the problem of housing and pollution by establishing federal departments. We really feel that the matter is being dealt with, that we need no longer worry about housing and pollution. The creation of these departments is so ridiculous that it is virtually impossible to say a word about it to our constituents without making them laugh, and I do understand them!

This reminds me of the fine books and documents that I keep preciously on the shelves in my office, here, in the parliament buildings. They all deal with bilingualism and biculturalism in Canada. So many words which mean nothing.

In my opinion, bilingualism in Ottawa is, in fact, a French Canadian who speaks English.

Most of the messengers of the House of Commons, whose mother tongue is French, speak English, while those whose mother tongue is English are very seldom able to speak French. The same applies to elevator operators, members of the protective staff, etc. And yet large amounts of money are used to publish rubbish submitted by young people who are not much more intelligent than their proposals.

What is the use of special commissions, task forces and even departments, when we know very well that this will in no way change the views of our devoted Prime Minister? Where is the democracy of which we have been hearing for 20 years? We should call this a dictatorship, because here in Ottawa, there is only one man who governs. We see this every day. I am thinking of the worthwhile efforts of hon. members who sit on committees and of the reports of which no account is ever taken.

• (4:40 p.m.)

We are informed of a possible series of debates on consumer protection, reorganization of the textile industry and the study of the report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women, etc. Even people outside politics could easily see, upon reading the speech, that the present government is beating around the bush to save time. The Prime Minister is the only one who knows what the immediate future of the country will be.

The uneasiness we are plagued with is an economic one. All efforts to protect the consumer, to reorganize the textile industry and to raise unemployment benefits, will have to be made all over again soon if we do not change the foundation of our economic system.

And the foundation I am talking about here is that of the monetary concept.

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to note how easily certain people get lost in the clouds. In conclusion to his brilliant speech, our clear-sighted Prime Minister stated, and I quote:

We stand on the threshold of greatness.

I am convinced that this sentence will remain famous in our records for posterity. It is about the 30th time that at the opening of a session of Parliament, our poetically-minded prime ministers have really felt they stood on the threshold of greatness. This is where we have been standing for the last 100 years. What a joke!

Extreme poverty exists in the St. James district, in my riding. People there no longer believe in beautiful and bombastic tirades.

We must put an end to this once and for all.

Some government members may tell me that this time, it is for good that our poetically-minded Prime Minister is truly on the threshold of greatness.

This has been said so often that I feel people like us should not let ourselves be forever taken in by the same thing.

For the last few days, we have been living in the climate which prevails on the other side of that threshold. For my part, I do not believe that it is the threshold of greatness. The people who are active in the FLQ are surely to be condemned, and I condemn them very strongly. Actions such as those taken recently should, in my opinion, be most severely punished. However, I do understand them! For quite a long time, especially in Quebec, certain demands have been made, and, as long as the authorities do not get their arm twisted, nobody will do anything. We are floundering about in a completely obsolete system. The poor are telling us that. It is most difficult for a student, a small wage earner to work and survive.

The government is resorting to handsomely paid publicity to fool the people. It is using funds coming out of the tax-payers' pockets to finance pornographic films. It sets up inquiry commissions by the dozen without achieving any results. Their reports are only so many beautiful books. Furthermore, it is claimed that our country enjoys "social stability to an exceptional degree" and that we are "on the threshold of greatness."

Let us put the question to some 1,500 businessmen or others who went bankrupt this year in the province of Quebec. It will be seen if we have reached the threshold of greatness, especially the threshold of prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks, I want to assure the hon. members that as long as I have the privilege to make my views known in this House, I shall do so with vigour and determination in an attempt, against all hope, to bring them to open their eyes and see the "greatness" on the threshold of which we are standing, a greatness that wallows in violence, in a total lack of respect for the fundamental rights of society, in the tolerance of all known vices, in the recognition of the greatest agitators in the world, among other things.

I want future generations to know that it will not be people like me or my colleagues who will have brought this so-called just society, this so-called greatness but the present so-called government.

Mr. Guy LeBlanc (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) told us a few minutes ago that the Speech from the Throne was a mere list of good intentions. Knowing him and having spoken with him at noon, I feel he is attaching a derogatory meaning to the words "good intentions".

I also believe that a Speech from the Throne should represent a program being implemented by people, as a team, with good intentions.

First, I want to congratulate the movers of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne (Mr. Trudel and Mr. Douglas) who carried out their task with sincerity and conviction.

In the hon. member for Bourassa, I have recognized the realistic businessman who is used to aim straight at the target and speaks his mind.

In the other mover, the member from Assiniboia, I have recognized a most serious man, with a sense of humour which is a quality we should keep if we really want to be objective and positive in our daily tasks.

The member form Assiniboia spoke with great competence on the agricultural problem, all the more so since all hon. members and many Canadians are aware that he is in a position to speak as an expert on agriculure as he is himself a master in this field.

During the few minutes at my disposal, I propose to express my own modest opinion on the opposition's motions, which I would call negative, and to state why I fully support the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

I am opposed to the opposition's motions. The subamendment of the New Democratic Party, for instance, states in the first place that the government failed to deal effectively with the threat to Canadian independence which is dear to all of us.

However, I believe that the government did take effective measures to protect the economic independence of our country.

I believe we could give a lot of examples to substantiate this statement, but I intend to mention just one: the industrial incentives legislation which has been improved over the past few years and which has been most beneficial in our areas, especially in mine where employment was provided.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Besides, the government intends to take further steps in this connection. For instance, the bill on the uranium industry with regard to foreign control is a concrete example of what is contained in the Speech from the Throne as to the government's program.

When I speak of negative attitudes, I have in mind certain positions taken by the New Democratic Party and, as a case in point, I will mention a topic which is of particular interest to us from the lower St. Lawrence and Gaspé region.

I have in mind a debate on a private bill concerning the population of low-wage earners of my region, the Quebec Telephone bill regarding the Compagnie de téléphone Bonaventure et Gaspé Limitée.

Members of the New Democratic Party did not allow representatives of the latter company to appear before Parliament and expound the situation. And those people talk about freedom and democracy. When people wish to come and explain what they want to do for the citizens

of my area, they are not allowed to speak. Our friends of the New Democratic Party did that!

The New Democrat subamendment deals with the high rate of unemployment. According to that party, the government has not done anything. But we all know that the government has set a policy to reduce unemployment. I mean the professional training and retraining as well as the Canada Manpower Mobility program.

Every day many unemployed Canadians benefit from this program and from retraining courses. I know that education, curriculum preparation and complete jurisdiction in education comes under the provinces.

However there is nothing to prevent us, economically speaking, from encouraging our young people and our unemployed citizens to complete their education, their training.

As mentioned in the Speech from the Throne and as all Canadians can see for themselves, inflation which has been a very serious problem, not only in Canada but in many other countries, is on the wane.

The fight against inflation has not helped the government to deal with the problems of unemployment but, with inflation decreasing, we can hope it will be easier for the government and for all citizens to work on bringing down the high rate of unemployment.

The government intends to continue its action to this end. We will just mention the various regional development agreements the government plans to revise or renew. And we could mention many other steps the government intends to take.

The sub-amendment also deals with the guaranteed minimum income, in order to abolish the poverty from which at least five million Canadians are said to be suffering. We are all for it, because all of us want to carry on the fight against poverty.

However, it would be a mistake to say that this government has done nothing or is doing nothing to ensure a minimum income to Canadian citizens, because that is what it has been trying to do since 1968.

Take the social programmes that have been improved and will be further improved. Let us also consider the efforts made by the Economic Council of Canada in order to advise Parliament, the government and the Canadian people. And the government wishes to continue to guarantee such an income since a measure to that effect stands in the name of the government.

At this stage, I should like to add a personal remark. When it comes to providing an income, we must also think of providing jobs, and since the people are willing to work, it may be more practical, and we would thus perhaps show more consideration for the pride of our fellow-citizens, to take steps to find them jobs.

And I come now to the amendment in the name of the official opposition. It states in part, and I quote:

—of the indecision and the failure of Your Excellency's advisers—

In my humble opinion, there has been no indecision nor have there been failures.

[Mr. LeBlanc.]

If we consider realistically the 1968 program, without thinking of any Christmas gifts for Santa Claus, as the previous speaker mentioned, it may be said that it has been completed.

The idea of a balanced budget was put forward. Certain steps have been undertaken in order to balance the budget, and I believe that all Canadians will agree on that point.

At that time, the government made it known to us that it wanted first to pass the bills under consideration by this House, which we have done.

The new program shows the good-will of the government. The negative approach of the opposition can also bring about failures. I think of the famous Bill C-197 which the previous speaker mentioned. That legislation, which was designed to aid farmers and to make trade easier between the provinces has now been studied for months. Even during the period of adjournment, the members of the committee came back to consider that bill. Why? In order to be able to pass it during the session which ended a few days ago. And I think that the provincial authorities were hoping that we would adopt that measure before the end of the last session. It turned out to be a failure.

• (5:00 p.m.)

The destructive opposition makes of the just society which is proposed a remote ideal. When one speaks of an "ideal" one always thinks of something that must be relatively far-off. Far-off, yes, but where and in what place? It is, in fact, the same ideal that individuals and societies have always wished to attain, a purpose that is relatively far-off. A program such as the one contained in the Speech from the Throne represents, it seems to me, the research for a far-off ideal.

In 1968, the government has spelled out his "philosophy" of the just society. I use this word even if some members have used it in a disparaging sense. Someone said it was time to live through justice and not off charity, and to do everything possible to achieve a just society. I fail to see why the opponents of the government, the members of the other parties, should chide the government or the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) for speaking to us of a just society. Its achievement is not the promise of Santa Claus, or the promise of a miracle for tomorrow, because no one can tell us today that, tomorrow, we will have a just society. However, someone who is sincere can promise to use all the means at his disposal to achieve a just society. We can, for instance, even today, make an ideal of our concept of a just society and the Speech from the Throne, according to me, is a proof of that.

As a whole, I think the attitude of the opposition is negative. I am proud to express my views on behalf of my electors of the riding of Rimouski. That negative attitude of the opposition is surely harmful. That it should harm our party, in the face of the problems now facing us, has no importance.

Some time ago I read that a statesman must work for the generations to come but that a politician, in the narrow sense of the word, works solely towards the next

elections. To my mind, some members of the opposition could meditate upon that statement. Such an attitude is harmful to the good features of our system, and it is certainly harmful to parliament which is the expression of our freedom, and a tool that has proved itself and will continue to do so provided we can continue to improve it. I feel that attitude has lessened the confidence Canadians have in the system, in parliament. That is why I think it might be wise for the opposition, instead of acting as it has done in the last few days, instead of refusing to see what is good in the program of the Liberal party, and saying that it is all wrong, that the government achieves nothing, to at least admit that there are good things in the Speech from the Throne which, as I said a while ago, illustrates a philosophy and a program.

Everyone will agree, I hope, that it is quite normal to bring to mind certain principles, to say why we want to work towards this or that end, before preparing a program like that one.

Philosophy and program, both are necessary since it is impossible that everything can be bad and, in line with this, I will refrain from adopting the extreme standpoint of our friends in the opposition. When I tell them that they find everything bad, I do not suggest that all is fine in Canada, which would be naive from me. In fact, some problems do require a solution in this country, and this is a truism. This is why we should always have governments and other structures designed to solve our problems, such as that of the Constitution for instance. It is said that the government is ignoring it, but a special joint committee has been created by this House to make a survey of all the constitutional issues which have been discussed for years.

The question of tax reform is dealt with in the famous white paper which has been talked about so much lately. We all have fears, in spite of the committee report published recently. We think it right that the small wage-earner will no longer have to pay taxes in future, if legislation is passed accordingly. But we believe that the load of the middle class should be lightened, because middle class people work very hard to maintain the economic stability of this country. It seems to us that there should be a better balance between the tax paid by the middle class—business men, professionals and others—and the wealthier classes, corporations, etc.

There is also another problem, the partiality for the C.B.C. which has been criticiezd by many members on all sides of the House for many years. We are proud to be able to say that in Canada we enjoy freedom of the press, but a good many people seem to think that in the name of freedom anything goes. It has been said that our freedom begins where that of the other ends. It has also been asserted that freedom consisted in abiding by the law.

In my opinion, our bill of rights should state once and for all and for the benefit of the public at large, what is freedom. Are we deprived of our freedom when those who want to read or to make some research in libraries are required to abide by the rule?

Let us deal now with the problem of unemployment. What about some of our fellow-citizens over forty who lose their job because of unfortunate and uncontrolable circumstances and who cannot find employment? At that age, most workers are still quite productive.

As regards unemployment, I think a useful method would be to make every effort to offer a wide variety of suggestions to our youth.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Young graduates are looking only for interesting and remunerating employment. But it would not be exaggerated, I think, to remind them that, on leaving school at 18 or 19, they can be ready, in a relatively short lap of time, to create jobs in small undertakings or businesses.

Regional development is a problem of particular interest to my friends in the Gaspé region and the Lower St. Lawrence, where is located the Rimouski constituency which I represent. For many years now, governments have spent millions of dollars to set up a program and my electors are becoming more and more concerned in that regard. They want to know if they have not been misled and when they will be able to see concrete achievements.

I am referring here to a measure taken in my riding, about which my fellow-citizens and myself feel proud: the creation of an inter-municipal committee for the Rimouski-Mont-Joli-Price zone. This initiative was taken by our own people, by citizens who think the government can help them, but who also believe that they must begin by helping themselves.

With regard to the projects of this inter-municipal committee, I hope that, in the fields coming under its jurisdiction, the federal government will give serious consideration to the requests of the members of this committee with regard to the improvement of the airport of this urban centre, and of the port of Rimouski, a very important port, to the creation of an industrial park and to improving both ocean and river shipping.

I would like to draw the attention of hon. members to the policy of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation in connection with the building of low-cost housing. Back home low-cost housing units are being built as everywhere else in Canada but, although our directors, the officers of the Corporation, mean well, they have lost sight of the fact that what is a low price in Toronto, or Montreal is not so in our area, as when we speak of low-cost housing, the price must bear some relation to the salary scale prevailing in this particular area.

So, either the cost of housing remains at the same level with the possibility of increasing wages, or what would be even better from certain points of view, the price of those supposedly low-cost dwellings is reduced, so long as my fellow citizens obtain what they require.

I also have in mind a certain policy of the Canadian National Railways in regard to our region. I am thinking about the fate of some employees of this company, while everybody is talking about the protection of workers. I am one of them, as are most of the members of the House. I know that a man who has been employed by the company for one or two months perhaps must sleep in

his car because the company does not provide him with a place to live or does not pay his expenses.

I have in mind some investigation methods it uses to discuss...

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

Mr. LeBlanc (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, would the House allow me to continue for a few more minutes?

Mr. Deputy Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Has the hon. member for Rimouski the unanimous consent of the House to complete his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Agreed.

Mr. LeBlanc (Rimouski): I thank my hon. colleagues for giving me this permission. I will not exceed my time and I shall finish my speech as quickly as possible.

There are many other points which I would have liked to deal with. I might be able to come back to them. I would have liked to refer to in particular, the problem of the farmers and the producers of industrial milk which are of prime concern to us.

Before closing I should like to say again that, like several of my colleagues, I sincerely and earnestly support the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne because this speech gives us an image of the just society. I cannot understand why anyone could object to our desire that justice prevail among our people.

In addition, if we consider as a whole the three Speeches from the Throne since 1968, we notice that the last one is a consistent follow-up of the other two, with regard to the establishment of the just society. The second Speech from the Throne set up a program for drafting white papers for the purpose of establishing the structure or the framework of that society which the government wants to create in order to prepare, for our young people, and for all our fellow citizens, the Canada of the 80s or of the year 2000.

[*English*]

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): First of all, Mr. Speaker, I too should like to offer my congratulations to the hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel) and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) who had the honour to move and second the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I wish them well in achieving progress in their respective constituencies. While I may not speak of them in the same vein in 1972 or whenever the next federal election is called, I do wish them well until then.

I should also like to take this opportunity to offer the government my sincere feelings concerning the difficulties they are facing in dealing with those minority extremist groups which have inflicted a blemish upon the reputation of Canada as a nation, a reputation that all other nations viewed with envy in respect of the status of our law and order and freedom of life. The incidents of the past several days have far-reaching implications which go beyond the two kidnappings. I hope that with co-operation at all levels of government and among all parties, law and order can be restored for all Canadians. The cornerstone of this Canadian nation, this democracy, is respect for and obedience of the law. When we permit the law to be defied or evaded, whether by the rich or the poor, we are to that extent weakening the bonds of our civilization and increasing the chances of its destruction and the chances of substituting a system in which there will be violence, tyranny and anarchy. Mr. Speaker, this is a time for statesmanship, not politics, and I hope that with cool minds, with understanding and wisdom we will overcome this nightmare with which we unfortunately are faced.

My leader and other colleagues who have spoken before me have dealt forcibly and adequately with the shortcomings of the Throne Speech. I am sure other colleagues who speak after me will do likewise. I would, however, like to dwell for a moment on the last paragraph of the *Hansard* recording of the speech made by the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on Friday, because it confuses me. I should like to quote what he said, as follows:

> —we here in this House have both the opportunity and the responsibility to demonstrate to all Canadians that in our common commitment to Canada and to the democratic process we are capable of producing enlightened debate and wise decisions. I look forward, Mr. Speaker, as I know do all hon. members, to a session which will bring distinction to this Parliament and to those who have the honour to sit within it, and which will contribute to a better Canada in a better world.

To use one of the quick reports which the Prime Minister has used in this House, I say "Ditto". These words confuse me, because last year hon. members of this House were a bunch of nobodies. Suddenly we have become members of distinction and honour. Therefore, I hope these words were meaningful and sincere and were not just so many more empty words such as I have heard from the opposite side of the House on many previous occasions. Two years ago when I first entered this House, Mr. Speaker, I heard supposedly sincere words which have turned out to be meaningless, words such as these, that every Canadian regardless of where he lives in Canada must have equality of opportunity. That was over two years ago, Mr. Speaker, and I am still waiting for the meaning, just as some 4 million other Canadians are waiting—the one quarter of our population who live below the poverty line.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Quite a number of these poverty stricken Canadians are in my province. I had occasion to visit those who reside in my district, and they are waiting as they have been for too many years. All I can reason is that equality of opportunity means to this government that there will be studies done and white papers produced; then they will study again and they will consult and they will dialogue, and then committees will tour Canada and supposedly allow the people to participate and to become involved. And still the people are poor. I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, when the action is to start. When are the studies and dialoguing to be finished?

The answers have been in front of the government's noses for years. The Economic Council of Canada had the answer over four years ago. They proved after countless reviews and studies, conferences and reports, that poverty was real. The Canadian Welfare Council and other Canadian organizations have produced answers on poverty. We are all aware that the Senate Committee on Poverty has travelled across Canada and produced answers. Now we are to have a nutritional study across Canada. And do you know what this committee is going to find out, Mr. Speaker? It will find out that poor people need more food which contains the correct vitamins. The government will study this report and print it in two official languages for the committee: the bodies of some 4 million Canadians will continue to deteriorate while this government continues to procrastinate.

Let me give you some examples of poverty, Mr. Speaker, as I have found it while touring the remote areas of my constituency. Picture if you will, Mr. Speaker, a Canadian citizen, bedridden for years in a room just large enough for himself and his wife who sits in a chair for hours and days on end without sleep because she does not have a bed to sleep in, and the room is only granted by the good graces of the family that has taken them in. Picture an elderly citizen with a mechanical heart, miles from a hospital and existing only by the grace of God, or imagine my dismay when I visited a family of six living on a meagre allowance and saw two invalid children suffering from chalk-bone, and our regulations restrict the special care required; how about the old age pensioner who wrote to me recently wondering why he has to pay back some of the $240 he earned last year selling newspapers to supplement his income.

Mr. McGrath: Shame!

Mr. Marshall: I could mention many cases of people going blind because they cannot afford the necessary periodical corrective care or the cost of transportation to visit the proper care centre. This is not to mention the hundreds of families in remote areas who cannot afford decent accommodation and are living in shelters that you wouldn't believe. And yet this government and its experts hide their heads in the sand and brag about what they are doing about overcoming the housing problems in the cities. Does anyone ever hear of what they are doing to meet the housing requirements of those in the rural communities, or to provide the necessary water and sewage facilities? No, Mr. Speaker. They are going to wait until 1980, when they believe, in what can only be termed gross ignorance, that all the people in Canada will be moving to the larger centres. What hypocrisy!

I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, that we substituted a little human consideration and feeling for scientific studies. Here we are, in our concern for pollution, prepared to spend billions of dollars to control and prevent the pollution of the environment and we hesitate to spend money which is long past due to prevent the pollution of the bodies of millions of incapacitated Canadians both young and old. We continue to spend millions on medical research to prevent sickness and to learn the reasons for death by disease, yet we will not provide the moneys needed to prevent undernourishment of the bodies of the poor when we are so well aware of the cure. No, Mr. Speaker, the answer is not in more studies; the answer is in concern for our fellow man—and the sooner the better.

What about our youth in the remote areas of Canada? If we want a better Canada in the future and a better Canadian, we should be concentrating on providing a program of development for all the youth of Canada, and not just for the chosen few who happen to be living in the larger cities. We need a nationwide youth development program with proper guidance and leadership interwoven with our school systems in every nook and cranny in this country. I ask myself this question: Why is so little attention given to youth development and recreation in our list of priorities, when this is the basis of producing a better citizen and of finding in the future the better Canada for which we are looking? Again, we have reports, Mr. Speaker, the P. S. Ross report and the Harry Jerome projects; and the government expects to produce results with a $5 million Canada-wide physical fitness program. What we need, along with the new ministers of state, is a minister of youth development. Let us allocate money out of our budget in this direction. The return in champions and better citizens in the not-too-distant future would be amazing.

In my district of Humber-St. Georges-St. Barbe, Mr. Speaker, I have become well aware of those problems which can only be solved by properly thought-out and programmed development. The process can only evolve around the development of our natural resources. We have found, to our sorrow, that the basis of our economy for many years—the cod fishery—is being fast depleted. The minister is well aware of the problems in this area. While I realize that the problem is a delicate one from the point of view of enforcing restrictions to protect our fishing zones, I am convinced that the present minister is doing all he can to overcome the weaknesses of past governments in coping with these difficulties. I hope he will make progress in continuing liaison with foreign countries to respect the exclusiveness of our waters and at the same time provide that protection which is required to keep foreign draggers away from our Newfoundland shores, so that our people can survive against the deliberate raping of their livelihood.

I commend the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) for his efforts in that portfolio, but I hope he can do more to convince some of those in other closely associated departments that more assistance is required in the way of fisheries improvement loans and in the provision of better facilities to enable the fishermen to cope with new methods which are being introduced and to take advantage of the other species of fish which have been found, with success, through the development branch of his department. I hope, too, that he will look with favour upon my private member's motion which would make available subsidies to fishermen so they could provide themselves facilities which are vital to their success in this fast-changing industry. I was glad to hear the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) announce that

more funds will be directed in order to assist in this area. I hope too, Mr. Speaker, that we will see during this session the promised catch insurance plan for fishermen and that it will be ready with the bill to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act.

I should like to say a few words, Mr. Speaker, on regional economic expansion. In my opinion, as I have stated many times in this House and in my province, this department could be the answer to the problems of the regionally despaired if, indeed, the plan were carefully studied, thought-out and programmed to achieve its aims and objectives. While I am more familiar with the plan from the viewpoint of Newfoundland, and especially my district, I am very disappointed due to the fact that the plan is going the way of the FRED program, which was studied for some years and scrapped here in Ottawa as being unacceptable in the form in which it was presented. I have to say that while the new development plan that is now being studied shows signs of better organization, the first phase of the plan as announced some months ago, and the projects approved, again show a lack of carefully thought-out, projected aims and a lack of intergovernmental co-operation.

To give a glaring example of one project I quote the case of the potential industrial development of Stephenville where, through the good graces of the American government, the province was handed over a modern complex of real estate, worth millions of dollars, which lends itself to a ready-made industrial park. The establishment of a liner board mill was supported by grants and loans under the federal department to support the industry with water and sewage systems, new roads, bridges and a high school. But there was the glaring, fundamental omission of common sense, fundamental planning. The mill, which already employs over 200 people in the construction stage, was responsible for bringing in people from surrounding areas under relocation and has already created for the town of Stephenville a housing problem with which it cannot cope.

Eventually, when the mill goes into production it will employ some 700 people. By simple mathematics, Mr. Speaker, if you multiply 700 by a conservative figure of three per family, you will have some 2,000 human beings who will require housing. There will be the associated need for water and sewage, schools for the children, recreational facilities and other services which should have been foreseen from the outset. But instead, the town of Stephenville and the school authorities already cannot cope with the problem and there is a need for emergency measures to be taken, which can only result in extreme difficulty and eventual chaos. This is not only unfair to the local authorities but it is downright stupid fundamental planning by the supposed experts who are falling all over themselves in offices instead of listening and paying attention to the briefs which have been submitted by interested citizen organizations. It makes me wonder how sincere are the minister's words when he keeps repeating the now empty phrase that no development plan will be successful unless grass roots organizations become involved in the creation of a development plan.

[Mr. Marshall.]

• (5:30 p.m.)

I point out these facts to the minister, not for the sake of criticism but to emphasize that he has the co-operation of every organization in my district. They have listened, and want to participate for the good of their own community or area. I hope that every brief submitted by organizations from my district will be given the courtesy of consideration. I am prepared to give the benefit of the doubt and assume that the new senior appointments to the staff of the Department of Community and Social Development in the province will give that consideration.

The Regional Development Incentives Act as it applies to Newfoundland is almost a lost cause, Mr. Speaker, because it completely misses its objectives in so far as that province is concerned. The reason for this was given by the minister when he stated that it excludes some areas from types of activity such as the development of natural resources, which in some regions is the main, if not the only, source of development. Another bad feature is that it fails to provide assistance to those who want to expand small industry, through lack of capital. One example is a fish plant operator who was denied a grant because of some technicality of commitment. The applicant, who was expanding his fish operation, had to order new equipment from Germany six months in advance in order to get it in time for the fall herring season. He was turned down because he had made the commitment beforehand. Another example is that of an electrical plant operator who almost daily must refuse contracts because of lack of capital for expansion. The act should be flexible in order to give special consideration to those in regionally despaired areas who require more help than the industrial giants who will not come to Newfoundland when they can locate more centrally in Canada.

I cannot blame the federal government for not being willing to provide the funds for the development of a national park in my district. I sincerely hope that the government member from my province, a member of the cabinet, will do his utmost to convince the provincial government to turn over the necessary land to create the Bonne Bay Park, which will give an effective impetus to the economy of the province.

The need for public services induces me to make a plea to the new minister responsible for the Post Office. I was pleased to hear that the closing of post offices will halt and that the situation will be reviewed. The post offices in isolated communities of Newfoundland are still an important communications link, even in this day of satellites. I welcome the announcement. Another important item which should be reviewed is the salaries of postmasters in many communities. These salaries are, to say the least, shameful. I hope these salary scales will be reviewed as quickly as possible.

Still on the subject of communications, Mr. Speaker, there is a breakdown between the responsible federal department and the provincial government of Newfoundland. While I commend the CNT for the expansion program to extend telephones to the northwestern peninsula in my district, there are two failings. One is that the provincial government have failed to provide

the related power facilities, thus denying many communities this much needed telephone service. The other matter which has been forgotten is the cost to the consumer. Already one community has had all its telephones disconnected because the residents cannot afford to pay the charge. Is this good planning, Mr. Speaker? Is this equality?

I have reviewed the 68 measures mentioned in the Speech from the Throne. I hope they will not be taken in the order in which they appear in the list. I sincerely hope that legislation relating to income security, veterans' pension legislation and the bill to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act will receive immediate consideration in this House. There is a fundamental military lesson which can be applied and of which the government should take note. An advancing army can progress only as fast as its slowest elements, and after success in reaching an objective it should consolidate its position before advancing further. I say to this government that our aims in science and technology are running away with us. We cannot cope with the situation. We have already discovered that all the wealth we have gathered will be of no avail because we will have to spend it to control and prevent pollution.

We must consolidate our position. Our wealth in resources has been in the ground and in the sea for hundreds of years. It will still be there in a few years hence. We should look over our shoulders and raise the standard of living of those who lag behind and are unable to catch up without our help. This is our duty and responsibility as a state. Each day we delay, we must remember in our conscience that we are responsible for bringing closer to death those who are incapacitated, maimed and whose bodies are deteriorating because we are not living up to our responsibility. We must concentrate immediately on helping the aged, sick, maimed, incapacitated, blind, deaf and retarded. This is our duty as a state. We owe this to these citizens because they are unable to care for themselves. This is their equality of opportunity. I hope the government will direct their immediate attention to this part of our society, to give some meaning to their concern for the disadvantaged people and areas of our nation.

Mr. Allen B. Sulatycky (Rocky Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to add my congratulations to the mover and to the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. Both these members have displayed their ableness in moving and seconding the Address in Reply.

I want to concentrate on the aspect of urban affairs in the few minutes available to me this afternoon. The riding which I represent is not considered an urban riding although a very small portion of the city of Calgary is located within it. I want to emphasize the importance of urban development to the small, growing communities of Canada rather than dwelling upon the importance of an urban affairs department for the burgeoning, large cities of this country.

All who have a concern for the direction of social and economic development in this country will welcome the announced intention of the government to designate a minister solely responsible for urban affairs and housing. The problems of the cities are well recognized by citizens of this country, whether they live in the cities or elsewhere. It is also recognized that the federal government is greatly inhibited by the Constitution from taking any firm and unilateral initiatives with regard to cities. Hopefully, all provinces will co-operate in any attempt by the national government to act in this area in which the provinces have the greater, and virtually exclusive, jurisdiction. While we await a redistribution of powers among the various governments in the country we will have to do the best with the system which exists at the present time. We do not do our best if we exclude the national government from an active role in urban policies. The new ministry will give it such an active role.

Fortunately, though we may have problems in our cities, they lack the severity of those faced by cities in the neighbouring country to our south or in other highly-industrialized and urbanized areas of the world. No less an observer than Buckminster Fuller has said, for example, that Toronto is a city without problems. All of our larger cities display in general a very attractive face, making them appealing to the visitor or to the residents. But behind this face are problems which will soon become insoluble if we do not quickly come to grips with them.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Solutions to the problems of our cities have been suggested by many who rank as experts in the field. It is a field which is perhaps best left to experts and I, for one, will not presume to offer my own solutions. My concern runs in another direction. Basically, it is that in attempting to develop cures for the ills of the city we do not lead to its further degeneration. We shall avoid this pitfall only by setting a clear course of action based on the conscious choice of the type of settlement pattern we wish to see. Do we wish to have only a dozen or so extremely large cities in which almost all of our population is concentrated or do we wish to have many cities of differing sizes offering our citizens the greatest choice? Do we wish our cities to be located only where large concentrations of people are found, or are there more desirable locations elsewhere?

The answers to these questions are already determined. If we do not make a conscious choice to the contrary, within a very short time most of our population will be living in the two dozen larger cities already established. The rapid influx of people may well prevent the solution of the ills which the cities now face, because we shall constantly be a step behind the growth of the population.

If we are to design a sensible system of settlement in Canada we must first discard two common Canadian characteristics. The first is the sense of inevitability associated with the growth of our larger urban centres. This is evident in our constant prognostications of population patterns in Canada ten or twenty years from now. It is displayed by those who announce that at a stated point in time a certain percentage of our people will be concentrated in only a few areas. It is shown, for exam-

ple, in the statement by a Canadian trade magazine that such an influx—and I quote—"cannot be stopped any more than the ocean surf can be turned back". It is reinforced by civic politicians who make statements such as "this city has a certain momentum which it must maintain." Any more of such momentum is likely to lead to destruction.

The second characteristic of which we must cleanse ourselves is our "mining camp" psychology. In the development of human communities we have tended to concentrate our efforts on barely a handful of communities, establishing other settlements only temporarily to serve the interests of the dominant communities. This is a pattern which began with the earliest of Canadian industries, the fur trade and which still continues today. In the era of the fur trade many trading posts dotted the landscape, built only to serve immediate needs and having no other purpose than to satisfy the commercial interests of embryonic cities hundreds of thousands of miles distant. The pattern has repeated itself a number of times since then. Today, as we survey the landscape of Canada, we find that outside southern Ontario and the St. Lawrence Valley area there are fewer than ten major cities. Scattered about the country are hundreds of smaller communities. We find them wherever there is a mine, an oilfield, a pulp mill or another resource based industry. Some of these communities are as old as, or older than, the Canadian nation, and others are new having sprung to life only within the last few months or years.

Most often those that are old are struggling for survival, while those that are new are too blinded by hope and confidence in the future to envision themselves as tomorrow's Barkervilles and Belle Islands. Canadians are slow to recognize this very evident demographic characteristic. Even the government's task force on housing and urban development did not note it. Its only reference to the communities between those considered rural and those considered urban, said:

> As a sort of half-way house between rural Canada and the burgeoning urban areas lie the small communities which dot the landscape, particularly across the prairies. They are a mixed bag. In regions where agriculture is strong, one finds prosperous and growing service communities meeting the needs of the surrounding population, generating a growth factor of their own and seemingly on the verge, in a few cases at least, of that "great leap forward" into full urban status. In areas where the rural economy is weak, so are the towns, many of them struggling with local industries of varying relevance to ensure that a baby born or a new resident acquired is a net population gain and not merely an offsetting factor against the drain to the city.

This is not an accurate picture of the pattern of settlement in Canada. Our settlements are not concentrated only in the large cities and in farming areas. There are many communities which do not rely solely on agriculture, settlements which do have an industrial base, narrow though it may be, and which are capable of sustained growth if they are given a chance and not forced to compete unfairly with the large urban centres of this country.

Our mining camp psychology is at the core of regional economic disparity in this country. Many of the areas which suffer from a weak economy do so because of their reliance on a single industry which is no longer viable. What I recommend is that in dealing with urban affairs we should devote all our efforts to developing as many urban communities as possible, the greatest attention being given to the sound economic development of the smaller towns and cities which show a potential for urbanization. Some very eminent people are making similar proposals. Earlier this year the United States Secretary of Agriculture, Clifford M. Harding, called for national policies specifically designed to bring about unprecedented growth in rural areas. He advocated the creation in and around the smaller cities and towns of "sufficiently good employment opportunities and living environments that larger and larger numbers of families may choose to rear their children there."

Throughout Canada there are many small towns and cities which are well suited to sustain a larger population. Some of them are growing, others are not. The one certain thing is that in the absence of a changed attitude on the part of governments in Canada, and Canadians, these communities will all gradually decline because of the present overwhelming trend to concentrate all our economic activity in the largest centres.

The difficulties which these communities face in maintaining their growth are similar to those faced by others in their situation wherever they might be in Canada. I am sure this applies to such communities in my own riding of Rocky Mountain, communities which, as a matter of fact, are among the fastest growing in the country. Grand Cache, for example, in the northern end of the constituency is Canada's newest community, having been built only in the last two years to serve the huge coal mining developments associated with the McIntyre-Porcupine Mines near the Smokey River. A number of other communities in the riding have doubled or even tripled their population in the last ten years. Among the growing communities of western Alberta are Fox Creek, Whitecourt, Drayton Valley, Edson, Hinton, Canmore, Black Diamond and the communities which comprise the Crowsnest Pass region. As I say, the problems which face these communities are similar to those confronting any small growing community wherever it is situated in Canada. The basic difficulty is that they must compete with the large cities for capital, labour and industry. This is the unfairest competition imaginable. The small community always comes out second best.

While there is a drastic need for housing in the large cities, there is also a similar need in the small centre which is growing. But the sources from which a person may obtain capital for constructing housing are very much more limited in the small community. Indeed, often it is impossible to get financing for housing in many towns. In large cities there are many branches of chartered banks, various trust companies and usually a wide selection of mortgage companies with which a developer or an individual may arrange financing for housing projects. In the average town, there may be one or two, perhaps three, branches of chartered banks, and often they are reluctant to make housing loans except for single family dwellings.

• (5:50 p.m.)

As in the cities, there is demand for various types of accommodation in smaller centres also, but the financing of such accommodation is very, very difficult to obtain. In many communities only the banks and Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation will finance housing of any sort. It is also evident there are more CMHC programs available for cities than for smaller centres.

If one should try to borrow money for a housing development from a trust company or life insurance company, for example, one is given the cold shoulder. A number of months ago I had an opportunity to see just how much the cards are stacked against the growth of smaller centres. A person who was interested in developing a number of housing units in a town in my riding invited me to attend with him at the office of a major Canadian mortgage corporation in Edmonton. We were invited into the mortgage manager's office and he proceeded to tell us that his firm had vast amounts of money available for investment and housing purposes. He displayed a very lively interest in the project as it was described to him by my constituent, who saved to the end the fact that this particular project happened to be in a town of some 3,000 people situated some miles outside the city. When this fact was made known to the manager, his attitude changed remarkably and he simply stated that no funds were available for mortgages outside the city.

This is not an isolated instance. I have experienced similar examples during my law practice in rural areas of Alberta. It is a very common occurrence for financing for very worth-while projects to be refused simply because the projects are situated in a community that is not one of the major urban areas of Canada.

The problem of providing housing to growing small communities appears to prevail throughout Canada. A Calgary firm, Atco Industries, has had a great deal of experience in providing prefabricated housing for resource communities, not only in Canada but throughout the world. In an article written in January of last year the president of that firm, Mr. R. D. Southern, said the following:

> While the problems of providing low cost acceptable housing to isolated and urban areas are largely similar, one major difference precludes any sensible plan for providing housing to the population presently moving into and required for industrialization and expansion of Canada's isolated northern regions. That problem is an almost complete lack of ability to provide mortgaging for normal residential purchases. This inability is not hard to understand, when the sparseness of population and vastness of the isolated regions are considered, but it also extends to the small towns that are the nucleus of northern and isolated area growth.
>
> It is incongruous, in a country like Canada, which has been and should be committed to the industrialization and expansion of its northern territories—

and, I might add, other areas capable of sustaining economic growth—

> —for the future economic benefit of all Canadians, that rather than providing incentives to locate in these areas, there is a complete and devastating road block to the provision of a dignified class of housing.

I should like to emphasize the last statement, that there is a complete and devastating roadblock to the provision of a dignified class of housing in these small communities. This extends not only to housing; these communities run into difficulty in arranging financing for such things as services, the ordinary requirements of any community. As well, businesses have difficulty in arranging financing for commercial expansion. I believe this applies equally to growing small communities in other parts of Canada as well as to communities in northern Canada.

As I said, the problem does not stop at housing; in the area of commercial development availability of financing is just as critical. I have had many businessmen in a number of small communities tell me that they have run into obstacle after obstacle in attempting to obtain capital for expansion purposes. Other businessmen in large cities have the necessary capital made readily available to them, but it seems that when a small town entrepreneur comes to draw from the well, it suddenly runs dry.

These are problems that we must solve soon. In solving them we may very well help to solve some of the problems in the large cities. But we will not solve them by letting current economic and technological advances take their own course. It is certain that the end result of that course will be a greater and greater concentration of population in fewer and fewer locations. I do not think this is necessary or desirable. It is certainly not inevitable.

I find comfort in the words of the distinguished American public servant, John W. Gardner, who served as secretary of health, education and welfare in President Johnson's administration in 1965. Before I refer to his comments, Mr. Speaker, perhaps this would be a good opportunity to call it six o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Does the House agree to call it six o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): It being six o'clock, I do now leave the Chair. The sitting will resume at eight o'clock p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Sulatycky: Mr. Speaker, before we rose for dinner I was saying that it is neither inevitable nor desirable that all, or even an extremely large portion, of our population be crowded into only the very largest cities. I was about to quote the words of John W. Gardner, former United States secretary of health, education and welfare, who said:

> Within the past 20 years the urge on the part of large numbers of people to pile into cities has become anachronistic. For ten thousand years people had excellent reason to crowd them-

selves into cities. Only there could they find the richness and variety of stimulation that make for creativity, the massed resources and economies of scale that make possible the greatest enterprises. But today, thanks to advances in communication, transportation and the arts of organization, we can provide these conditions at any point on the map that strikes our fancy. So the questions become: How can we best use land space? What patterns of settlement and open space best serve our purposes? How can we revitalize rural areas, create new cities, and overhaul existing cities in ways that serve human needs, the requirements of economic vitality and the claims of beauty?

The answer to these questions is certainly not by crowding more and more people into the largest cities. One further observation which one can make from viewing the developments of urbanization in the United States is that although more and more people crowd into and around the cities, fewer and fewer people wish to live there. In a Gallup poll taken last year it was found that most Americans would live in a small town or on a farm if they had their choice. Only 18 per cent really desired to live in cities.

In Canada we have the opportunity to create for our people the greatest variety of living environments. That should be the prime objective of the new ministry of urban affairs. To reach it we will have to devise acceptable means for influencing the location of economic activity. We should not hesitate, if necessary, to conscript capital for this purpose. There is no doubt that government alone cannot provide all the funds necessary for this purpose. If our existing financial institutions fail to meet the needs and the demands of growth in smaller centres, mechanisms must be developed to compel these institutions to apportion some of their available resources to such communities. I would say that if the same institutions fail to meet the needs of the larger cities, we should not hesitate to compel them to apply their resources in ways which are of the greatest benefit in the opinion of the people of the country rather than in the opinion of the directors of the corporations alone. These funds should not be limited to housing and to industrial activity but should provide capital for industrial expansion and commercial expansion as well as for the services usually required in municipalities.

Any program that will improve our large cities will succeed only if it is tied to a program to increase the over-all number of cities in this country. We must ensure that we have not only a number of very large cities but that we have many small cities—small, but lively and thriving—spread throughout the country. I suggest this is the direction which must be followed if we are to succeed in any urban policy in this country.

In summation, I should like to refer again to the points I have attempted to make. I believe one of the tasks of the ministry of urban affairs should be to take an inventory of existing communities in Canada to determine which are capable of sustaining public growth and to ensure that these communities do not suffer because of increased emphasis being placed on the larger cities. I believe we should ensure that capital for housing, commercial and industrial development is made available to the smaller as well as to the larger centres. Only then, I believe, will we develop a sound system of geographic development in this country and a sound settlement pattern providing for the people of Canada the opportunities which this land should make available to them.

• (8:10 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to extend my sincere congratulations to the movers of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne (Messrs. A. B. Douglas and Trudel). They performed their tasks extremely well.

This debate is giving me and other hon. members a chance to criticize the present government for its lack of decision and imagination when it comes to meeting its obligations. This debate enables me also to let the proper authorities know of the conditions prevailing in my constituency and of the needs of my constituents.

Taking into account the promises made to them during the 1968 election campaign, Canadians were justified in believing that a Liberal government would offer them favourable conditions in all fields, and would solve problems quickly and completely.

However, even a brief examination or hasty review, of present conditions will show that the problems are still numerous. While they pile up one on top of the other, the government fails sadly in its obligations and does nothing to solve them.

Thus, I am not telling anybody anything when I say that inflation is still solidly established, that taxes have never been so high, that the present rate of unemployment is very high, that thousands of householders cannot earn a living for their families and that our industries, especially the textile and shoe industries, operate at a slow-down rate, when they are not completely closed, while imports increase at a frightening rhythm.

According to data from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, the gross national product increased only by 1 per cent during the second half of the current year. For the first six months of the year, the number of dwelling units started was 40 per cent lower than last year.

From January to June new car sales were 15 per cent lower than for the same period last year and there were 75 per cent more bankruptcies.

This is in short where the Liberal government has led the country in return for the confidence the people put in it at the 1968 elections.

Mr. Speaker, since the present debate began, some Liberal members have accused the official opposition of obstructing the legislation proposed in the field of agriculture to help that deserving group of our society. They mentioned Bill C-196 and Bill C-197, blaming the opposition and particularly the official opposition for systematic obstruction.

We are conscious of having done our duty in this field as well as in others, and of having acted in the best interest of the farmers.

If we had accepted Bills C-196 and C-197 as they were introduced, the Canadian farmers would have been embarrassed by these two measures since, in both cases,

many amendments have been proposed then rejected by this government. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) has never agreed to take into account the views of the opposition. All he wanted was to have the House approve these bills as introduced and they were so flawed that we thought it our duty to delay their passage as long as possible, mainly that of Bill C-197, to help the population and particularly the farmers.

Our attitude in this field has been identical to that we had regarding the White Paper presented, some time ago, by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson). Had we heeded him, we would have passed the legislation sponsored by him as it was, whereas today a joint committee of the Commons and the Senate has adopted a great many of our views on fiscal reform.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, far from seeking to create obstruction, we have had as our sole purpose to see that the people of Canada get the legislation they deserve.

Returning to Bill C-197, Mr. Speaker, when speaking to farmers we realize that those the legislation would most affect know very little about it. Few of them are aware that the council responsible for applying the legislation would be fully government-appointed. The farmers expect that they will have their say in an area which concerns them so closely. In fact, I think that those on the front benches opposite have missed the chance to tell the farmers, for instance, that the Council, entirely appointed by the government, and not elected as we want it to be, would control quotas, marketing, storage, labeling and distribution and would have the right to collect charges from the farmers.

• (8:20 p.m.)

They are completely unaware of that. Ministers should therefore go to the province of Quebec and clearly explain this provision of the law. They would realize that farmers have a lot of objections.

Mr. Speaker, within the few minutes left to me I would like to particularly call the hon. members' attention on the conditions prevailing more especially in my constituency. Needless to say that the city of St. Hyacinthe is considered as a natural centre of culture and regional attractions. Over there, farmers and factory workers are familiar with each other and there is complete agreement between these two groups of our society.

Of course, my riding is affected as much as any other by the general conditions prevailing in Canada at the present time. However, the city of Saint-Hyacinthe being a textile centre, the problems of that particular industry affect especially the workers of my riding.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time that I have had occasion to speak about this matter here in the House. Since the present government has been in power, I have taken every opportunity to point out to the responsible minister, and the government as a whole, that some action was urgently required in order to maintain this industry in our area.

Unfortunately, all my requests fell into deaf ears with the result that today our textile workers wonder how long they will be able to keep their jobs.

The textile industry deserves the attention of this government. It provides work for at least 83,000 people, 47,000 of whom live in the province of Quebec. Its yearly output in my province is estimated at $850 million. Every year several millions of dollars are invested in equipment and in the construction or renovation of buildings.

In spite of the importance of this industry, this government has waited until it is almost too late to take the necessary action.

We have warned the government, particularly about the field of shirt making, that imports were much too heavy for the Canadian industry to feel at ease. Nothing was done, except after the damage was irreparable. The Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce did take some action, but it was too late. The harm was done.

In St. Hyacinthe, for instance, the Yamaska Shirt which once had 350 employees cut its staff by 75 per cent. In factories such as Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company and Penman's Limited which employed hundreds of workers a few years ago, there are much less now.

As far as the footwear industry is concerned, official statistics show that since 1963, 45 manufacturers have gone out of business. Some industries are getting ready to reduce the number of employees or to close down.

In 1960, there were 249 Canadian plants in the footwear industry, while in 1970, there are only 189 shoe manufacturers in the country. In 1966, there were 25,360 employees while, in 1970, there were only 22,000.

On the other hand, shoe imports in 1956 amounted to 6,898,315 pairs as compared with 46,100,000 pairs in 1969.

Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the government trading with underdeveloped countries, but I believe our first responsibility is to ensure employment for Canadians before throwing our doors wide open to imports.

Last week I had the opportunity to go into a shoe shop in Saint-Hyacinthe, and in talking with the owner I found to my amazement that 80 per cent of his inventory was imported.

It means that the Canadian market—and the other stores are identical to that one—supplies only 20 per cent of the domestic consumption. That is an anomaly when one knows that workers, in the Canadian shoe industry are amply equipped and able to make a product that will meet the needs of Canadians.

Canadian footwear can favourably compare with any other. However, in certain government quarters, it is suggested that if we favour imports on so large a scale, it is because we want the protection of the Canadian consumer.

Mr. Speaker, in the light of my personal experience, even with the wave of shoe imports from foreign countries, far from paying less for my shoes in 1970, I have to pay more than when the Canadian market was supplied mostly by Canadian plants.

This argument does not hold and before making people believe that we want to protect them, it would be better to take the necessary steps to protect Canadian workers.

Mr. Speaker, I would have liked to discuss many other subjects, but since time goes by and that I have only a

few minutes left, I would like to discuss the measure concerning designated areas.

The area of Saint-Hyacinthe has all the essential criteria in order to be declared a designated area. On many occasions, I have made to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) personal representations which have been followed by those of the city council and trade unions of the city of Saint-Hyacinthe. Unfortunately, they have not been taken into consideration.

That attitude, I am sorry to say, induces the people back home to think that the riding is not being treated fairly.

I say it again: the Saint-Hyacinthe area has all the criteria required to be recognized as a designated area. At least 20 per cent of the work force is unemployed. All these things have been pointed out to the responsible minister, delegations have come here to meet him; but justice has been denied the area of Saint-Hyacinthe. I do not hesitate to say so, this is injustice, even gross injustice towards the people of Saint-Hyacinthe. It is injustices of that kind that breed the events we have witnessed in the province of Quebec in the last few days. Such injustices give certain elements of the population springboards from which to demonstrate and attack the government.

Once again. I urge the government to eradicate those injustices because they are detrimental to mutual understanding and national unity.

Mr. Speaker, those were the remarks I wanted to make. I trust they will be taken into serious consideration, this in the best interest of the electors of my riding.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean): Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I should like to offer you special greetings and to tell you how reassuring it is for the members to see you preside over the proceedings of the House. Your competence gives you the authority required to ensure the freedom of the members while protecting our parliamentary institutions. I think that I speak now for the majority when I offer you our best wishes for good health at the beginning of this session and I hope that we shall have you with us for a long time during other sessions and perhaps on a permanent basis.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean): Mr. Speaker, when moving and seconding the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, the hon. members for Bourrassa ((Mr. Trudel) and for Assiniboia (Mr. A. B. Douglas), proved to those who might have doubted it, that they were worthy of the confidence the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) had placed in them. I join with those who spoke before me to offer them all my congratulations.

In the past, on the occasion of the Speech from the Throne debate the members revealed the interests of the citizens they represented. Since I had the opportunity, on several occasions, to avail myself of this advantage I am certain that the people of the Lac-Saint-Jean riding whom I have the honour to represent, will not take offence if during my speech I do not bring up the specific problems which concern them, in view of the new responsibilities which the Prime Minister has seen fit to entrust me with. It is my duty to make known in this House and to those who will be good enough to read my remarks in the official report of the debates of the House my opinions on Canadian agriculture and what it might become if only we would all agree to show some understanding.

Canadians have never, generally speaking, felt the pangs of hunger since they have been accustomed to taking for granted that Canadian farmers would provide them indefinitely, and very cheaply, with a wide variety of products, thus accepting only in many cases a ridiculous return as a reward for their efforts. We have forgotten that our farmers did not share, to the same extent, this increase in the standard of living which has been brought to us by the development of our country, with the result that they are today among the Canadians with the lowest incomes in spite of their long hours of work and the very high risk investments they have to put up.

It is quite obvious that this situation could not go on and on. It is the reason why we have witnessed these past years the birth of a counter-movement whereby farmers question the somewhat old-fashioned notion prevailing in this area of economic activity.

The farmer has always been exploited, and he wishes today to take or is taking the situation into his own hands, so as to set up a production or distribution system which will protect him against the cyclic trade recessions from which he has always come out the loser, and which will guarantee him a better return on his investments and labour.

Recently I flew over the north shore of the St. Lawrence, east of Montreal, on a clear and sunny day; looking at those wonderful farms with their multicoloured fields unfolding under my eyes I thought I was in dreamland. And I could not, Mr. Speaker, but rejoice as a Canadian about all that partly-developed potential which is our common heritage, and I was telling myself that the day is not so far off where the man owning that land, the farmer, at least I hope so, will get all the consideration he deserves, as well as a fair remuneration for his labour.

• (8:40 p.m.)

We must all agree with these objectives, even if this were to entail in some cases an increase in consumer prices. However, we should not press on or the end result might be disastrous.

One only needs to cast a glance around to realize what is the situation at present. One of our main difficulties stems from the vastness of our land and the diversity of its potentialities. Our federal system which involves the sharing of responsibilities and jurisdictions is both complex and profitable since it provides for the evolving of a national policy which may be effective inasmuch as understanding and co-operation prevail between the various levels of government.

The present policies adopted by the marketing boards bent on raising tariff barriers between provinces are clearly to be condemned. No one will object to some kind of order in the production and marketing of farm products that will ensure security to the producers as well as a reasonable return for their efforts. However, we cannot let certain groups be able to destroy our country by preventing some products from being sold in other provinces.

I do say "destroy our country", because never before has the Canadian common market, which is the very essence of Canada's existence, been threatened as it is now.

At the last session, during the study in committee of Bill C-197, which provided for setting up of national marketing agencies, it was rather obvious that some provinces, taking advantage of what I would call a mistake made by a marketing agency in Quebec, had made excessive and extremely dangerous reprisals.

I do not intend to exonerate the Quebec group which, while meaning well, probably wanted to go a little too fast and apparently committed a tactical error because it is one thing to prevent products from another province—in this instance eggs—, from entering Quebec, and another to want a specific group of producers in another province to be allowed to supply the Quebec market.

In my opinion, and the comparison may seem somewhat stretched, René Lévesque and his group would have been unable to devise any better way of ruining the country than this embargo which several provinces have placed on certain products coming from Quebec and, since they can be mentioned, on broilers.

Ontario, particularly, should lift this embargo, that province being, in my opinion, little affected, if at all, by the decision made in Quebec by the egg marketing agency. At least 55 per cent of the Quebec egg market is still being supplied by Ontario, only 45 per cent of Quebec's egg consumption being produced locally.

There is some control applied, but Ontario eggs are not prevented from entering Quebec. A limit has been set as to the number of Ontario producers shipping to Quebec, and I am against that. Just the same, there is a difference between limiting the number of producers of a province allowed to ship their products to another province and preventing any producers of one province from shipping their products to another province. And that is the problem we are again facing today.

In short, what is the purpose of all this? Is it the intention to ruin a Quebec industry which made the mistake of being efficient, of being in the forefront, of being forward-looking, of being competitive, that is the broiler business.

It is claimed that the Quebec broiler producers do not pay their workers adequately. That is quite possible. I tried to check that and in some places I was told that it was not true. I agree that it is probably true in some cases, but I will not generalize by saying that the Quebec egg producers are not paid as they should be. It is likely that this new competition by the province of Quebec on other markets may have come as a surprise because it was so unexpected and in the past there was so little competition from Quebec producers. This is understandable because I am myself greatly surprised to see that we have been able, in the province of Quebec, to produce so much and to reach such a degree of efficiency that we can sell our products to our friends in British Columbia.

If the aim is to destroy this industry in Quebec, to bring it to heel, as we are told by some people, I have figures which prove that this war of the markets may take us very far, and that we all run the risk, as consumers, to have to foot the bill which will probably be quite high.

I have with me a table extracted from the report of the Federal Bureau of Statistics, Agricultural Section, issued every four months.

It can be noted that for 1968 the total value of the Canadian agricultural production amounted to $4,390,767,000.

Who was producing it? The province of Quebec? No, at least certainly not alone. Ontario, the most industrialized province, was producing the most part of it with a total of $1,328,163,000, followed by Saskatchewan with $900,491,000. Coming third was Alberta with $808,770,000 and, fourth, Quebec with $634,637,000. Then there was Manitoba with $368,315,000, British Columbia with $211,914,000, and then Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island.

The total figures do not necessarily tell the whole story. I tried to assess what could be the per capita production and I looked into the figures of the Canadian population as of June 1, 1968. So, I discovered, that, with regard to agriculture, Saskatchewan headed the list with a per capita production of $938, followed by Alberta with $530, Manitoba with $380, Prince Edward Island with $312, Ontario with $182, Quebec with $107, British Columbia with $98, New Brunswick with $80 and Nova Scotia with $72.

There is no doubt that Quebec overproduces in some lines. Let us take the dairy industry, for example. There is no one who has not heard of over-production in the Quebec dairy industry. However, again looking at statistics, I find that for 1968, dairy production in Ontario was valued at $248,214,598, while in Quebec it had totalled only $232,781,566, that is 38.6 and 36.2 per cent respectively of the total value of Canadian production.

In short, even in the dairy industry, Quebec was accused of being responsible for the dairy surpluses while the volume of our production was even lower than that of Ontario.

Therefore, I ask you who is overproducing in Canada? Have we ever heard any recriminations against Ontario producers? Not that I know of, Mr. Speaker. Here again people have raised their voices against the Quebec producers. Too many Quebecers were producing too much milk. It is the only thing they overproduced.

Now it appears that we overproduce broilers. Hold on, that it has no sense whatever! In short, I ask the question once again: What do they really want? More unemploy-

ment in Quebec or that Quebecers remain idle and live on social welfare? Should that be the aim I have but one thing to say: people will have to accept to pay more taxes in order that Quebec may have higher equalization payments, to enable her to buy certain products. It will be one of these two things. Either we will produce or else the other provinces will do it and give us the money to buy their products. This is a decision that will have to be made.

As for me, I will not accept that. We have too much self-respect, I believe, to do so. The total manufacturing value and the total value of farm production in Quebec are clearly inadequate and there is no question of reducing them. On the contrary. With more than 40 per cent of the unemployment in Canada, Quebec must increase its production and ensure the necessary jobs through a growing manpower.

Raising barriers between provinces will surely not enable us to solve the many problems that are facing us.

The Speech from the Throne says that a federal legislation will be necessary to institute a national marketing agency. We all know that at the end of the last session, similar legislation had been proposed in Bill C-197. Unfortunately, it was not passed in time and the situation has so rapidly deteriorated that it has to become now an urgency.

It is likely that a similar legislation will soon be proposed to this House, and I hope that hon. members will want to give it priority and consider it with all the possible dispatch which requires this decisive situation in the marketing of Canadian farm products.

• (8:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker and hon. members of this House, I strongly urge you to consider the present situation in the field of marketing agricultural products as highly serious and dangerous. The balkanization of our country has started. There is a real danger of escalation if we do not act rapidly, firmly and in full collaboration with all provinces. I urge all members to use all their influence in their home province to stop this dangerous trend, bearing in mind that we are all bound to lose in such a game, some more than others.

[*Translation*]

It will be easily understood that I cannot resume my seat without saying a few words on the dairy industry.

It is indeed too early to claim a victory because there are still many problems to solve. But, one thing seems sure now and, barring any unforeseen circumstances, the end of the current milk year will restore a reasonable balance between consumption and production of these goods in Canada.

That result has not been easy to realize, and Quebec producers in particular know it well. But, after all, the difficult decisions which the government has been forced to take last year have borne fruit and today, we can look at the immediate future at least with more optimism.

Our supplies of powder milk are now normal and prices have levelled off. The production of cheese will all be sold at a good price and we might perhaps even be slightly short. As to butter, the very high supplies of last year will have been reduced by more than half and, for all practical purposes, will become normal.

Mr. Speaker, if we have at all the co-operation of interested groups, it should be possible to maintain the balance, which would subsequently permit better prices and therefore greater net income for our producers.

We have asked that milk production be reduced and we have had our wish. It is therefore normal for the producers having left that line of production to go into other fields, and more particularly in the province of Quebec where the number of those having done so is quite high. Farm production in Quebec will therefore have to diversify and needless to say competition will be stronger. Hence the importance of having a good network of marketing boards administered under a national legislation which would enable farmers to share in the Canadian market on a sound competitive basis.

Something will have to be done to prevent the provinces, through provincial marketing boards, from trying to go their own way by sacrificing the efficiency of costs and quality at the expense of consumers.

As a rule, I think that we can feel moderate optimism for the years to come. The great situation has greatly improved and it is obvious that the enswing good results will be felt in other related areas.

Before concluding my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank all my colleagues for the good words they had for me and they may rest assured in advance that I will continue, as in the past, to work in co-operation with them in the best interests of all Canadians and, in particular, of farmers.

Mr. C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval): Mr. Speaker, when I was first elected to Parliament in 1962, the day of the opening of the session and especially the Speech from the Throne were for me quite an event. I had hoped to discover a wonderful program for the new session and I was somewhat disappointed.

In 1963, I felt less enthusiasm and in 1964, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968 and 1969 I had a totally different opinion so that in 1970, with this Speech from the Throne, I am confirmed in my opinion. In fact, this speech is but a wonderful piece of fireworks.

Through this torrent of words and all those high-sounding sentences, the awful reality still remains. I shall attempt now to present it to this House.

Before going any further, I cannot avoid an old tradition whereby congratulations are offered to the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne (Mr. Trudel and Mr. Douglas). They have shown some talent in speaking in such great length.

After the first sitting, I retired to my office in order to read over the text of the speech which had just been given to us. I had received several invitations to attend official functions but I was unable to go because I had to

analyze the current events in my province in order to visualize Canada in the future.

And since history is still the best teacher, I studied all day long in the light of my readings about the past. We can compare the life of a people, a dynasty, a kingdom, a dictatorship or a system to the human life: birth, adolescence, maturity and death.

• (9:00 p.m.)

I hope we are witnessing the peak of financial dictatorship in Canada.

When one reads history, one realizes that when the great become so powerful as to forget the sufferings of those who have allowed them to reach such heights, the people tired of sacrifices will smash the very shadow of its oppressor.

The financial dictatorship which reigns in Canada today and remains insensitive to human sufferings, refusing to loosen its grasp in order to alleviate the rising tensions in all parts of the country, will shatter Canada unless an energetic government rises to overcome this monster.

The Speech from the Throne read by His Excellency the Governor General of Canada shows clearly that this third session of the 28th Parliament must be different from the previous ones. The speech says this:

—Canada faces a new age; an age which will be subject to forces not all of which are yet comprehended or understood, forces which will proceed from external as well as internal origins. It is a new age not so much because of changed circumstances, but new because of changed values and attitudes.

Because of the clash between these new values and the old, because of the quest by the young and the disillusioned for some resolution of attitudes, we live in a period of tenseness and unease.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that these are times of awareness for the new generation which does not accept without recrimination the fate of our generation, any more than we did that of our fathers. The difference lies in the fact that means of communication have greatly developed, allowing our youth contacts that would have been unthinkable a few years ago.

The Speech from the Throne says this, and I quote:

—It is an age frequented by violence—

I will add, since no one dared be specific in the Speech from the Throne, that this time that violence is directed more against the powers that be. That should encourage the members of this House, and the officials who often act as liaison officers between the departments and the big financiers, who control the economic blood of the nation, to seriously examine their conscience, if they still have one.

We must ask ourselves seriously whether our obsolete system has not always been the cause of a certain violence against the little people, violence far more subtle than that which manifests itself today, but which is no less cruel for it is applied to people who are totally helpless. I say this to the masters of finance, to their faithful servants the governments which have succeeded each other to this day, who should from time to time visit our under-developed areas: Go share the life of families in shantytowns or simply ask those fathers and mothers who must sometimes feed eight or nine children on $80 or $90 a week and, moreover, are unemployed three or four months a year, being forced to live on weekly unemployment benefits of $47.

In a tour of my constituency, I had the opportunity to see for myself all the deficiencies of the federal policy and I cannot forget the words of a mother of ten, who is living on a settler's lot and who had just been refused the assistance of a loan which was essential to the survival of their little farm: Ah, were I not such a devout Catholic, I would take some desperate action!

Is this not disturbing enough for a member of Parliament fighting for social justice? And this is but one example among hundreds of similar cases. You merely have to drive around in our rural areas to see for yourself the large number of our derelict farms and homesteads on the verge of bankruptcy. Half a century ago, many of these farmers were happy people living on unmortgaged land. Today, this is what I have heard from one of them: "We had to modernize to comply with government requirements, to a point where our entire inheritance which represents the hard work of two or three generations is mortgaged. It is thus that we have gone through all those efforts only to surrender the whole thing to the finance company. Such are the consequences of our system of perpetual indebtedness."

And as a crowning injustice, Mr. Speaker, while the federal government is paying western farmers not to produce, the Quebec farmers pay a fine of $1.25 per cwt. of milk, because they are unable to reduce their production.

You do not have to wonder why Quebec is on the brink of revolution. We are certainly passed the time when the father and the mother had to toil 20 hours a day to ensure three meals a day for their children, but we still live at a time—and this more than ever—when Canadians must pay three or four times the price for a small family home.

You will say I exaggerate. Even though we have already quoted all the relevant figures in this House, as proof of our statements, I want to give you, once again, a slight example.

If a young couple want to have a house built for around $12,000—it is certainly not a big house—they will have to pay 12 per cent for the federal excise tax included in the retail price, plus 11 per cent for the federal tax on building materials, plus 8 per cent for provincial tax. Thus, they will have to pay 30 per cent of the cost of the house or $4,000 on $12,000. The house value is then only $8,000 but the owner will have to borrow $12,000 because the federal and provincial governments will grant no credit. Our young couple will therefore apply to the CMHC, a federal agency, to finance $12,000 over 30 years at a 10 per cent interest rate. After 30 years, if still alive,

they will have payed over $55,000 for their small hut. If you add up the municipal and school taxes and the insurance premiums, you get a fabulous amount. You will understand that the house is to be rebuilt after 30 years. Bearing this in mind, how can we reasonably invite the middle income families to own their houses? This is mathematically impossible.

Our young people, who can count very well now, see in this system the most glaring theft ever supported by any government.

To quote again the words of the leader of the Ralliement Créditiste (Mr. Caouette): The cause of our social and political dissensions is mostly an economic and more especially a monetary one.

Quit playing the ostrich and be frank for once in your life.

Frankness that is what the people clamour for in all their demonstrations. They are fed up with all that hypocrisy in which our governments have so sumptuously wrapped themselves since Confederation.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the first time the system is contested. In his younger years, when he was a student, the right hon. Prime Minister himself could not escape the desire to tell what he thought of our capitalistic system. I think that he was sincere then when he founded *Cité Libre* with all his partners: Gérard Pelletier, Pierre Juneau, Roger Roland, Marc Lalonde, Naïm Kattan, Jean-Louis Gagnon, Jean-Pierre Goyer, Jean Marchand and other leftists of that time.

Now that our rotten system has absorbed them, they should be seen now in their present positions. What has happened to their sincerity of the past? Has the safeguard of the millionaires overridden the just society they wanted to establish? Why do they tolerate, I would even say protect, that financial dictatorship which chokes the people?

If the Right Honourable Mackenzie King entrusted the Bank of Canada with the absolute control of the printing and issuing of legal money in order to pull Canada out of the financial slump into which she had been thrusted by the chartered banks of that time, why does not this government direct that same Bank of Canada to issue itself and control as strictly as then the new monetary credits which represent more than 90 per cent of the money supply? That is the crux of the problem and all those whom I named a moment ago know it well. Why, since they are in power, are they acting like puppets and high financiers? How long are we going to allow private corporations, such as chartered banks, to play the main part of the Bank of Canada?

All young people know pretty well today that owing to that extraordinary privilege granted by the government, chartered banks take hold of the money of the citizens to lend it to those same citizens whom they just robbed. Indeed, if someone deposits $6 in his bank account, the chartered bank will lend him $100 at a 10 per cent interest rate. This trick is marvellous and especially profitable.

[Mr. Gauthier.]

Therefore, as long as this government does not remove this capital injustice by improving our monetary system, it will continue to finance its whole administration thanks to the money provided by taxes, without allowing the population to benefit from the issuing of new credits, the product of its work.

The government will continue to levy taxes on the citizens of the provinces and tell the latter that it has no money to transfer to them. All this will be another opportunity to get more and more involved in the provincial fields of taxation, leaving the provinces with the scraps from the table, in order to dominate them all the better by keeping them in poverty.

And, in an attempt to make people forget all that, they will try to stretch the time by promising to amend the constitution. What a farce, Mr. Speaker! They want to amend and even to renew a constitution which they were never honest enough to respect.

If the new constitution is to get the same treatment as the old one, it is really not worth sinking more millions of dollars into research and studies of all kinds.

This is the old story of the vicious circle, as when a hypnotist repeats the same formula to put his medium to sleep.

We have gone through the period of royal commissions which enabled the government to remove ticklish questions from the House for one, two or even three years, while getting good jobs for a number of their supporters. However, that cost Canadians tens of millions of dollars.

I hope last year saw the end of the big studies such as the ones undertaken by the BAEQ which meant jobs, during about three years, for 80 federal civil servants, but ended finally in utter confusion.

And now, we are entering the period of white papers, issued in order to tell the people why we have no money. We have none because a few of the big financial and banking interests control the release of today's economic blood, that is new credit to be doled out as they see fit and for their profits to government and municipal agencies, to school boards, because our governments do not have the courage to take steps that would make of Canada its own master.

The present government, far from assuming its responsibilities, likes to blame everything on inflation. However, it does not state that the problem is in the big finance companies and in the banks, whose profits are constantly increasing.

The people are faced with complete deflation since they do not have the money to buy products. As far as I know, inflation is when there is too much money in relation to the products on the market.

What is missing today? Certainly not the products since surplusses must be destroyed and farmers are fined for over-production. Financiers are still the ones who cry out against inflation and still, the people are the victims of this evil.

The first step of the government in his fight against inflation should have been to freeze banks interest rate.

To the contrary, every ceiling was eliminated. Big financiers were also allowed to raise their prices before they were asked to please refrain from increasing them for a little while.

And today, workers are accused of asking for wage increases because the administration fees charged by the bank have increased. Indeed, loans and taxes cost him more.

Therefore, I ask the government to revert to a more logical approach if it wishes to establish the justice of which our society has such a great need today.

• (9:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Hu Harries (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate both the hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel) and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) on their contributions. I should particularly like to say how much I admire the contribution that is being made by the hon. member for Assiniboia toward a better understanding of the Prairie grain economy. I think his efforts are dedicated, sincere and quite obviously effective.

As a new member from western Canada, I was initially distressed to find that some hon. members from outside the Prairies seemed to fail to understand the critical and continuing importance of the grain industry to all of Canada. While I sympathize with my colleagues on both sides of the House for what sometimes seems to be an unnecessarily protracted discussion on western grain, I nevertheless believe that western members must continue to press upon the House a full realization of the economic importance of wheat and coarse grains.

It is my view that alone among the major industries of this country, agriculture has been forced to adjust to a wholly new technology unaided by any control of the price system such as is found in so many other industries. Agriculture has faced production adjustments by exacting a fierce toll from the little farmer and small producer. Our economy today is cheap food at the farm level only, because virtually all the increases resulting from automation and technology have been passed on to the consumer and have not been, as in so many other instances, usurped in part at least by labour and capital. Imposing this new technology upon the usual climatic uncertainties of Prairie grain growing areas has meant that the normal economic instability of that region has been greatly increased.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Contrary to what some of my eastern-oriented friends seem to believe, the Prairie grain economy has not been and is not today being nurtured by public financing. On a per capita basis or on a basis of per dollar productivity, the grain economy gets virtually nothing from the government but, on the contrary, makes an enormous national contribution. People such as my friend the hon. member for Assiniboia know the grain industry of the west, its importance and its continuing impact upon our nation. Again I congratulate him on his seconding of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

I should like to deal very briefly with two matters. The first is the question of student employment. Because of the nature of the school population distribution that faces us today in Canada, we face a major problem over the next five years to find productive seasonal employment for senior high school students and post-secondary school students. The problem was made more difficult this year because of the generally quiet tone of the economy, but it would be wrong to suppose that this was the fundamental reason for the lack of adequate student employment opportunities.

It is quite clear that this problem will become worse and will reach very substantial proportions next year even if there is an economic recovery in the meantime. This, of course, is a problem that the government recognized and took steps to meet. I think many members will share my enthusiasm for the steps the government has taken, particularly in making hostel facilities available to the young people who were travelling across the land this summer. I believe this kind of activity ought to be encouraged.

It seems to me that with a nation which spans a continent, if we cannot do everything possible to encourage our young people to move from one part to another and visit people in other areas, we cannot possibly suppose that Confederation will be the success it ought to be. The idea of making money available in order to employ young people in government offices and government activities is generally one that is commendable, if not very imaginative. In view of the crash nature of the program this year, I think the results were quite clearly worth the effort; but surely we can conceive employment programs which do more than simply put young people into an office environment wherein they are clearly appendages and, for the most part, unnecessary to the successful functioning of the office. Apart from that, I believe it would be unfortunate if we educated the young people of this nation to believe that one can find the action in a government office while following summertime employment. I think there is a much broader sphere available to us.

I hope that during the next several months the government will find the opportunity to develop ideas that will look to the development of smaller group activities related to projects that have the support of the youth of this country. It is not everyone's bag to be a cadet for the summer. Surely, with the clear and continuing interest that youth has in environment, there are many places in which their enthusiasm, their talents and their energies can be profitably employed.

It is quite obvious that in the price system which we generally accept as a regulator of our economic activities there is a very large gap when it comes to costing the real social aspects of a particular activity. Surely, in both rural and urban settings we can find programs which will appeal to youth, give them the opportunity to work in areas they find challenging and, at the same time, enable them to make a significant and continuing contribution to national development. If we cannot keep youth involved in the system in which we believe, or alter that system to

make their contribution effective, then quite clearly we have failed.

My party owes much of its current success—and I am not thinking particularly of the recent election result in Nova Scotia—to a resurgence of interest by youth in the political process. I know that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his government are alert to both the challenge and the responsibility. I am sure that this House will do everything it can to encourage them to bring forward programs that appeal and are challenging to the youth of this country. It seems to me that this matter has No. 1 priority.

The second matter on which I want to speak for a moment or two is the oil and natural gas policy of this country. First, because export as it is conceived and presently controlled is so clearly in the interest of Canada, I am amazed that the obvious evidence can be so readily overlooked or misread by some hon. members opposite. It seems to me that talk of the need to use natural gas for the establishment of secondary industry ignores both simple petrochemical facts as well as the basis upon which the National Energy Board calculates Canadian need. If the record of the Energy Board is carefully examined, I am sure you will find that when there is any doubt about the need for gas for domestic, industrial or commercial use, that need is reflected in the volume of gas that is set aside and reserved for the national economy. So there is no constraint imposed upon the development of secondary industry as a consequence of exporting to an excellent market such as we have in the United States that which is clearly surplus to the needs of this country.

• (9:30 p.m.)

If the government can be criticized at all in respect of the export of gas, it can be criticized in that it took too long a time to arrive at a fairly obvious conclusion and that, if anything, it was too cautious in its calculations as to reserves. I remember the first gas hearing before the Dinning commission some 20 years ago. At that time exactly the same kinds of arguments were made as are made today. Surely, when we see what has happened in the past 20 years we must downgrade any argument that has attached to it the antiquity of those which we hear and which have been resurrected in respect of current permits.

The gas export policy, after the initial inquiries of the Dinning commission, the Alberta Oil and Gas Conservation Board and, latterly, the Energy Board, has brought gas not only to parts of the U.S. but also to the vast eastern Canadian market. It has brought millions of dollars into Canada by virtue of sales and in money saved on foreign purchases, because let us never forget that so far as energy is concerned, for a number of years we were in a most disadvantageous position. In view of the sales that have taken place over the last 20 years, surely it is not necessary to remind the House that the reserves available today are many hundreds of times greater than those available 20 years ago.

The geology of the great producing basins of western Canada shows beyond doubt that, given the incentive for exploration which comes with gas export and with a growing oil market, there are vast undiscovered resources which will be found and which will contribute to the requirements not only of the export market but, more particularly, of the Canadian consumer—so that 20 years from today we will be able to look back and will find the same ratio of reserves to requirements. This seems to be quite apparent from the history of the last 20 years.

There is one problem which I suggest the Energy Board might find time to consider. That is the question of the price differential which exists in areas proximate to the sources of gas. Here there is a problem that accounts largely for the overhead costs. I believe it is a problem that can be readily solved.

With respect to the national oil policy, one fact comes through clearly. It is that the policy we have been following for ten years must be drastically changed. The continuing insecurity in regard to Middle East oil supplies surely demonstrates beyond doubt that the first step in Canadian oil policy must be to ensure that the Canadian market can be substantially served by domestic oil supplies. There does not seem to be any sense in kidding ourselves that we can continue to expect the United States to carry for us the insurance policy in respect of our oil marketing.

More than 50 per cent of the Canadian market is served by foreign crude. It is apparent that so long as that situation continues, we cannot expect to have western crude serve the logical middle west U.S. market that is available to it. It seems to me that the construction of a 300,000 to 350,000-barrel line eastward from Toronto is a clear, first requirement in a revised oil policy for Canada.

I know that many people place reliance, with a good deal of reason, upon the eventual development of large reserves of crude oil on the Atlantic shelf. If these reserves are discovered, there will be still a very significant time lag between the initial discoveries and the development of an oil field capable of supplying part of the deficit that we now have in our balance of international crude. So I say that the mere possibility of the development of sources of crude on the east coast is not, and cannot be, sufficient reason for continuing to procrastinate with a view to making certain that the Canadian domestic market can be adequately served by domestic crude over which we have virtually complete control.

I think history shows that the major disability with respect to the eastward extension of the interprovincial pipeline from Toronto relates to a supposed price differential. Surely, the pricing policies pursued by the international oil companies are not so obscured as to hide from us the fact that talk of a price differential, when western crude goes to a market east of Toronto, is nothing but a red herring and that there is not an effective price difference.

The United States needs our crude oil, and will need it in increasing amounts. But it is obvious that we will not obtain any substantial increase, on a long-term basis, in our exports to that market until we remove the insecurity that attaches to our ability to serve that market when there may be difficulties in obtaining Middle East supplies of crude. They do not want us just on the days that we happen to have oil available; they want us on a continuing basis, one that ensures that their own security will not be placed in jeopardy. Surely this is not an unreasonable demand. There is no question that it is now economic to extend the interprovincial pipeline eastward as far as Montreal. If this is done on a basis that will capture approximately half the existing market, then as northern oil development proceeds it is entirely reasonable to suppose that a transcontinental crude line of substantial proportions can be tied into the whole eastern seaboard market of the United States and the mid-continent area of both that country and Canada.

• (9:40 p.m.)

In these circumstances we would be in a position to take full advantage of what seems to many people who have studied the question to be an economic opportunity that would be of very great benefit, not only to the provinces of western Canada which now have a modest crude production but to that part of northern Canada wherein the mineral rights are held largely by the national government; to that part of northern Canada where unquestionably there will be found large reserves of crude. What we are looking at now is a gradual development of a market approach to reserves, the ownership of which is vested in the people of Canada and which can mean tremendous benefits for the whole of Canada.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The House divided on the amendment to the amendment (Mr. Douglas, Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands) which was negatived on the following division:

• (9:50 p.m.)

Division

YEAS

Messrs:

Barnett
Beaudoin
Broadbent
Burton
Dionne
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Fortin
Gauthier
Gleave
Godin
Harding
Howard (Skeena)
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Lewis
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Mather
Nystrom
Peters
Rodrigue
Rose
Rowland
Saltsman
Skoberg
Tétrault
Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley)—26.

NAYS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alexander
Alkenbrack
Allmand
Asselin
Badanai
Baldwin
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Benson
Bigg
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Brown
Caccia
Cafik
Cantin
Chappell
Chrétien
Clermont
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crouse
Cyr
Danson
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Downey
Drury
Dubé
Duquet
Émard
Éthier
Fairweather
Flemming
Forget
Francis
Gervais
Gibson
Gillespie
Givens
Goyer
Gray
Grills
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Hales
Harries
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Howe
Hymmen
Isabelle
Jerome
Kaplan
Lachance
Laing (Vancouver South)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt)
Langlois
Laniel
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lind
Loiselle
Lundrigan
MacDonald (Egmont)
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLean
Macquarrie
McBride
McCleave
McCutcheon
McGrath
McIlraith
McIntosh
McKinley
McNulty
McQuaid
Mahoney
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Marshall
Monteith
Munro
Nesbitt
Noble
Noël
Olson
Otto
Peddle
Pepin
Perrault
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Ricard
Richardson
Ritchie
Robinson
Rochon
Rock
Roy (Laval)
Schumacher
Scott
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Southam
Stafford
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Sulatycky
Sullivan
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Thompson (Red Deer)
Trudeau

Division

Trudel
Turner
(London East)
Turner
(Ottawa-Carleton)
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whiting
Woolliams
Yewchuk—140.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the subamendment lost.

On motion of Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West) the debate was adjourned.

It being ten minutes after ten o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

APPENDIX

GOVERNMENT OF CANADA CASH REQUIREMENTS
(Millions of Dollars)

	1969-70	1970-71 Forecast
Budgetary Transactions		
Revenues	12,313	13,100
Expenditures	−11,938	−13,250
Surplus (+) or Deficit (−)	+ 375	− 150
Net Non-Budgetary Transactions		
Excluding foreign exchange transactions	− 293	− 1,185
Amount Required to Date to Finance Foreign Exchange Transactions	− 335	− 1,222*
Total Government of Canada Cash Requirements		
Excluding future foreign exchange Transactions	− 253	− 2,557

*As of October 1, 1970

GOVERNMENT OF CANADA BUDGETARY AND OLD AGE SECURITY REVENUES
(Millions of Dollars)

	1969-70	1970-71 Forecast
Budgetary Revenues		
Personal Income Tax	4,562	5,270
Corporation Income Tax	2,612	2,440
Non-Resident Tax	249	255
Estate Tax	101	110
Custom Duties	818	820
Sales Tax	1,717	1,785
Other Duties and Taxes	897	995
Total Taxes	10,956	11,675
Non-Tax Revenues	1,357	1,425
Total Budgetary Revenues	12,313	13,100
Old Age Security Revenues		
Personal Income Tax	1,027	1,140
Corporation Income Tax	227	215
Sales Tax	577	600
Total Old Age Security Revenues	1,831	1,955

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE ON A NATIONAL ACCOUNTS BASIS
(Millions of Dollars)

	1969-70	1970-71 Forecast
A—Revenue		
Direct Taxes, Persons	6,790	7,630
Direct Taxes, Corporations	2,256	2,105
Direct Taxes, Non-Residents	252	255
Indirect Taxes	4,024	4,200
Other Current Transfers from Persons	4	5
Investment Income	1,059	1,275
Capital Consumption Allowance	214	230
Total Revenue	14,599	15,700
B—Expenditure		
Current Goods & Services	4,453	4,875
(Non-Defence)	(2,610)	(3,030)
(Defence)	(1,843)	(1,845)
Transfer Payments to Persons	3,702	4,150
Subsidies	571	690
Capital Assistance	97	160
Current Transfers to Non-residents	196	200
Interest on the Public Debt	1,675	1,885
Transfers to Provinces	2,719	3,590
Transfers to Local Governments	88	100
Gross Capital Formation	450	500
Total Expenditure	13,951	16,150
C—Surplus (+) or Deficit (−)	+ 648	− 450

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT REVENUE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND NATIONAL ACCOUNTS RECONCILIATION
(Millions of Dollars)

	1969-70 Preliminary	1969-71 Forecast
1. Budgetary Revenue	12,313	13,100
Deduct		
2. Budgetary Return on Investment	− 860	− 950
3. Post Office Revenue	− 355	− 345
4. Other Non-Tax Budgetary Revenues	− 142	− 130
	(− 1,357)	(− 1,425)
5. Corporate Income Tax, Excess of Accruals (+) or Collections (−)	− 583	− 550
Add Extra-Budgetary Funds Revenue:		
6. Old Age Security Taxes	1,831	1,955
7. Unemployment Insurance Fund, Employer-Employee Contributions	494	515
8. Government Pension Funds, Employer-Employee Contributions	494	535
9. Prairie Farm Assistance Act Levies	6	5
	(2,825)	(3,010)
Government Investment Income:		
10. Interest on Loans, Advances and Investments	423	500
11. Interest Receipts on Social Insurance and Government Pension Funds	285	400
12. Profits before Taxes (Net of Losses) of Government Business Enterprises	351	375
	(1,059)	(1,275)
13. Capital Consumption Allowances	214	230
14. Miscellaneous[1]	128	60
15. Total Revenue, National Accounts Basis.	14,599	15,700

[1] These miscellaneous adjustments represent insurance companies tax revenues, miscellaneous indirect taxes, miscellaneous transfers from persons and adjustment for the supplementary period. In the national accounts, revenue in the supplementary period is shifted into the following fiscal year.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND NATIONAL ACCOUNTS RECONCILIATION

	1969-70 Preliminary	1970-71 Forecast
1. Budgetary Expenditures	11,938	13,250
Deduct		
2. Budgetary Transfers to Funds and Agencies[1]	— 551	— 570
3. Post Office Expenditures	— 341	— 385
4. Deficit of Government Business Enterprises	— 77	— 85
5. Reserves and Write-Offs	— 323	— 60
6. Purchase of Existing Capital Assets	— 9	— 10
7. Budgetary Revenue Items Offset Against Budgetary Expenditure[2]	— 80	— 60
	(— 1,381)	(— 1,170)
Add Extra-Budgetary Funds Expenditure		
8. Old Age Security Benefits	1,732	1,905
9. Unemployment Insurance Benefits	176	220
10. Government Pensions	542	745
11. Prairie Farm Emergency Payments	4	5
	(2,454)	(2,875)
12. Expenditure of Government Funds and Agencies[1]	646	660
13. Capital Consumption Allowances	214	230
14. Miscellaneous[3]	80	305
15. Total Expenditure, National Accounts Basis	13,951	16,150
16. Surplus (+) or Deficit (−), National Accounts Basis	+ 648	— 450
17. Surplus (+) or Deficit (−), Budgetary Basis	+ 375	— 150

[1] In the national accounts, budgetary appropriations to various funds and agencies are replaced by the expenditure actually made by these funds and agencies.

[2] This item mainly consists of revenue from sales of goods and services by the government. These sales appear as final expenditure of the private sector and are deducted to avoid double counting.

[3] This item includes the supplementary period adjustment. In the national accounts, expenditures on goods and services in the supplementary period are divided between adjacent fiscal years; most other expenditures are shifted entirely to the next fiscal year.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, October 14, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

THIRTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF ELECTION OF MEMBER FOR NANAIMO-COWICHAN-THE ISLANDS

Mr. Speaker: As hon. members know, today is survival day. That being so, I felt it might be appropriate if I were to mention one of our colleagues who has a survival rate rarely matched in the history of our chamber or, indeed, of Canadian politics. I refer, of course, to the celebration by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands and his friends and colleagues of the thirty-fifth anniversary of the hon. member's election to the House of Commons. The hon. member was first elected a member of this House in 1935 and served here until 1944, when he became Premier of Saskatchewan. In 1961 he resigned that office to become the federal leader of his party and returned to the House of Commons in 1962. I am sure I reflect the views of all hon. members when I extend on their behalf and, indeed, on behalf of the people of Canada, our congratulations on this occasion and our very best wishes for continued health and happiness in all the hon. member's endeavours.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I am seldom at a loss for words but on this occasion I am afraid that is the case. I had been hoping that my long period in public life could be kept secret. I want to thank Your Honour for your kind words and to say how much I have endured—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): —enjoyed these years in the House of Commons.

An hon. Member: Endured and enjoyed.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I know how much the public and hon. members opposite have had to endure during those years.

When one has served this long in public life one approaches the end with mixed feelings. Someone described mixed feelings as the feelings of a man watching his brand new Cadillac going over a cliff with his mother-in-law inside. I have a feeling of satisfaction for the associations I have developed over the years and at the same time a certain feeling of sadness because as one advances in years one recognizes that one's parliamentary career must eventually come to a close.

I should like to thank you, Sir, for your kind words and to say what a great pleasure and honour it has been to sit in this House under your direction. I have sat as a member under many Speakers but I do not know of any other Speaker under whom I have sat with so much pleasure and with such a great sense of appreciation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I should also like to say how much I have enjoyed the association with members of all parties in the House. We have our political differences but in the House of Commons, as in politics generally in Canada, there is a fellowship and an understanding of each other's viewpoints. We may not always agree but each of us recognizes and believes that other members are trying in their own way to serve the best interests of the country. I should like to say to my colleagues in all parts of the House that I appreciate very much the tribute they have paid me.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

NATIONAL CAPITAL COMMISSION

DELEGATION OF PARLIAMENTARY RESPONSIBILITY TO MINISTER WITHOUT PORTFOLIO IN CHARGE OF HOUSING

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 41(2) I should like to table copies of Order in Council PC 1970-1781 which designates the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing as the minister responsible to Parliament for the National Capital Commission.

* * *

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

RESTORATION FOR MURDER AND CERTAIN ACTS OF TERRORISM—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Cliff Downey (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43 I ask the unanimous consent of the House to present a motion on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. I think it very fitting that this motion be put on survival day.

There can be no greater and more pressing necessity for action by any government than when the rule of law, the foundation and framework of any society which aspires to be democratic and civilized, is mocked. The rule of law is mocked when weakened by permissive

punishment for the ultimate mockery of murder. The rule of law is mocked when it is suspended by a government sworn to uphold it. Mr. Speaker, when the rule of law is both weakened and, so weakened, suspended, then indeed must a government act to strengthen and restore the rule of law or else adopt that mockery as its own.

With the unanimous consent of the House I therefore move:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should immediately introduce a measure to amend the Criminal Code to restore the death penalty for the act of murder and to provide the death penalty for any person who, by an act of terrorism based upon the threatened sacrifice of human life, other than his own, intends thereby to force a government or a person who is charged with the safety of human life to conform to his purpose.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion proposed by the hon. member for Battle River. Standing Order 43 requires that there be unanimous consent before the motion can be put to the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimity. The motion cannot be put.

* * *

POWER

PROPOSED FLOODING OF SKAGIT RIVER VALLEY—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to move a motion under Standing Order 43. In the brief explanation I am permitted to make may I say that members of all parties in the House are concerned about the proposed flooding of the Skagit River Valley in British Columbia.

An hon. Member: Where is it?

Mr. Rose: It is because we are agreed that we should give our immediate attention to this problem that I believe there will be unanimous consent to the matter being considered by one of our standing committees. I therefore move:

That the whole question of the flooding of the Skagit River Valley in British Columbia be referred to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence for consideration and report.

Although my colleague the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding) is ready to second my motion, I am certain he would be pleased to give way to any other member from British Columbia.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion proposed by the hon. member for Fraser Valley West. It also requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Downey.]

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimity. The motion cannot be put.

* * *

CONSTITUTION OF CANADA

MOTION TO APPOINT SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE

On the order:

Government Notices of Motions—The President of the Privy Council:

That a Special Joint Committee of the Senate and of the House of Commons be appointed to examine and report upon proposals, made public, or which are from time to time made public by the Government of Canada, on a number of subjects related to the Constitution of Canada during the course of the comprehensive review of the Constitution of Canada, which review was agreed upon at the Constitutional Conference of the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premiers and Prime Ministers of the provinces in February, 1968, and alternative proposals on the same subjects;

That the committee have power to appoint, from among its members, such subcommittees as it may deem advisable or necessary;

That the committee have power to sit during sittings and adjournments of the House of Commons;

That the committee have power to report from time to time, to send for persons, papers, and records and to print such papers and evidence from day to day as may be ordered by the committee;

That the committee have power to adjourn from place to place within Canada;

That the quorum of the committee be 17 members, whenever a vote, resolution or other decision is taken, so long as both Houses are represented and that the Joint Chairmen be authorized to hold meetings, to receive evidence and authorize the printing thereof, when 7 members are present so long as both Houses are represented;

That the Committee be empowered to retain the services of three specialists to assist it in its work; and that it also be empowered to retain the clerical and stenographic help deemed advisable by the Joint Chairmen;

That papers and evidence received and taken on the subject in the preceding session be referred to the committee and made part of the records thereof;

That the following members be appointed to act on behalf of the House of Commons on the Special Joint Committee, namely: Messrs. Alexander, Allmand, Asselin, Breau, Brewin, Dinsdale, Fairweather, Fortin, Gibson, Hogarth, Hopkins, Lachance, MacGuigan, Marceau, McQuaid, Osler, Ouellet, Roberts, Rowland and Woolliams; and

That a Message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours thereof.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to section 2 of Standing Order 21 this government notice of motion stands transferred to and ordered for consideration under Government Orders at the next sitting of the House.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

NATIONAL SECURITY

INQUIRY AS TO INTRODUCTION OF EMERGENCY POLICE POWERS—APPROVAL OF HOUSE OF COMMONS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether,

in view of statements he made outside the House yesterday, consideration is being given to the declaring of emergency police powers of the sort, for example, to permit the police to search without warrant and arrest and hold individuals for questioning without having to lay a specific charge or justify any such action? Is any such consideration being given?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Since the beginning of this emergency, Mr. Speaker, the government has considered all possible types of action including this and many others, but there has been no decision made along these or any other lines which is not obvious to the country and to Parliament.

Mr. Stanfield: Will the Prime Minister give the House the assurance that no action of this nature will be taken without the approval of the House of Commons?

Mr. Trudeau: I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this is a matter of law. Quite frankly, I do not think this type of suspension of civil liberties, if I understand the Leader of the Opposition, would be possible without some amendment to our statute or some action by the government which would have to be brought before the House at some point.

Mr. Stanfield: Will the Prime Minister give the assurance that even if the government has this authority in law no such action will be taken without seeking the approval of the House of Commons?

Mr. Trudeau: This is completely hypothetical. I repeat that if such action were ever contemplated it would certainly be discussed in the House of Commons. Whether it would be immediately before or immediately after would depend, of course, on—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: I am sorry to observe the lightness with which the opposition treats this question. It is obvious that if urgent action is needed at some time in the middle of the night we cannot ask Parliament to approve it first.

Mr. Aiken: All these things happen in the middle of the night.

Mr. Diefenbaker: You have no power to do it except through Parliament.

* * *

PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION

EXTENSION OF LIFE—RETENTION OF DR. YOUNG AS CHAIRMAN

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the fact that the Order in Council appointing the Prices and Incomes Commission will expire at the end of the present calendar year, is it the intention to extend the life of the commission by Order in Council? Will there be the same terms of reference or does the minister envisage some legislative enactment?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): The commission will be continued as long as it is considered by the government to be playing a useful role, which it is certainly doing now.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I ask the minister whether he expects to retain Dr. Young as chairman of that commission, bearing in mind that his credibility has been destroyed by his attack on the arbitrator—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member will recognize that the question as asked is not in order. Even on this day I do not think he should be allowed to ask a question in those terms.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I rephrase my question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the chairman has criticized the business community for its lack of readiness to face strikes, does the minister consider that the present chairman should be kept in that position?

Mr. Basford: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

CONTINUATION OF WAGE INCREASE GUIDELINE POLICY

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs a question which the Minister of Finance indicated he would answer yesterday in his speech but did not. Is it the intention of the government to continue the guideline policy for a further period when the year originally contemplated expires?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I think this is something to be announced in due course by the commission and by the government, as to what action will be suggested for January, 1971.

Mr. Stanfield: In view of the emphasis placed by the Minister of Finance on stepping up the private sector, would the minister not agree it is important that the uncertainty as to government policy in this area be cleared up as rapidly as possible?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Leader of the Opposition is inviting the minister to express an opinion and the question is not in order in those terms.

STEINBERG WAGE INCREASES—CLARIFICATION BY CHAIRMAN OF PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION OF EFFECT ON PRICES

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): In view of the complaint by Steinberg's Limited concerning an inaccurate and unfair statement made by the chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission, will the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs discuss with Dr. Young

the necessity of issuing a statement making it clear that the wage increases recently negotiated have not resulted in price increases?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I am not sure that Steinberg's will ever recover from the shock of being defended by the hon. member.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Basford: I might say that the consumer price index to be released later today will indicate the success the policies of the government and the commission have achieved over the last few months.

Mrs. MacInnis: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I raised the question of a company which is aggrieved and which has sent a wire to the minister alleging unfair treatment. I do not care who it is; if there is unfair treatment—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

MONTREAL—PRESENCE OF FLQ CELL WITHIN FRENCH NETWORK

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the honourable minister responsible to Parliament for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.

Would the Secretary of State tell us whether he has been informed about the possible existence of an FLQ cell within the CBC in Montreal?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): No, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

[*English*]

UNITED NATIONS

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATIONS—NON-ATTENDANCE OF PRIME MINISTER

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Prime Minister. On the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary celebrations of the United Nations, when all leaders of governments which are members of the United Nations will be present at this historic event, would the Prime Minister explain to the House and through the House to the Canadian people why, when he has ten days available to visit the U.S.S.R. he cannot spare a few hours to represent Canada—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will recognize that the question as asked is not in order. He is putting an argument, not a question. The hon. member for Grey-Simcoe.

[Mrs. MacInnis.]

Mr. Thompson: I will rephrase my question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Chair has recognized the hon. member for Grey-Simcoe.

* * *

TRADE

PROTEST AGAINST IMPOSITION OF QUOTAS BY UNITED STATES ON CERTAIN IMPORTS FROM CANADA

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, may I direct my question to the Minister of National Revenue. Is the government making any representations to the United States government by way of protesting trade Bill H. R. 18970 now before Congress which proposes to impose quotas on several imports by that country from Canada which are vital to our economy?

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I think that question relates more directly to the responsibilities of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, and I shall be pleased to draw it to his attention.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Noble: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of National Revenue. When he refers my first question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, will he also ask the minister whether the government is aware of the disastrous effect that the bill to which I have referred can have on the already depressed mink producing industry in Canada?

Mr. Gray: I shall be happy to do that, Mr. Speaker.

PROTECTION OF CANADIAN TEXTILE AND FOOTWEAR MANUFACTURERS AGAINST IMPORTS FROM PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. W. M. Howe (Wellington-Grey): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Revenue in connection with the greatly increased trade and business contacts that are expected to follow diplomatic recognition of Red China. In view of the fact that many of our textile and footwear manufacturers have already experienced great difficulty because of foreign imports, what steps is the government going to take to ensure that these new business associations will not eliminate many of our well established commercial organizations and greatly increase unemployment?

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, as far as my own responsibility is concerned, I shall certainly see that the department vigorously enforces the law under its jurisdiction in this regard. Also the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce recently announced to the House a new textile policy which is being put in place and which I think is designed to assure the interests of one industry the hon. member mentioned, while paying due regard to our trade relations with other nations.

UNITED NATIONS

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATIONS—NON-ATTENDANCE OF PRIME MINISTER

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, if I may rephrase my question, I merely wanted to ask the Prime Minister whether he would explain to the House why he was not representing Canada at the anniversary celebrations of the United Nations?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the answer is quite simple. The invitation to visit the U.S.S.R. was extended to me nearly a year ago, I believe, by the then visiting Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union. Dates began to be negotiated between both governments, and some time last—

An hon. Member: Who was it who arranged the dates?

Mr. Trudeau: Well, if you do not want an answer, talk to your own member.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, with due deference to the right hon. gentleman I think we deserve an answer to what is a straightforward question. If the Prime Minister does not choose to answer that question, then could I ask the right hon. gentleman whether or not the FLQ precipitated crisis is going to interfere with his plans to visit the U.S.S.R.?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Ha, ha, ha!

Mr. Trudeau: Someone thinks it's funny. Ask the right hon. member for Prince Albert, who says "ha, ha, ha."

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Has the right hon. gentleman a supplementary?

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister pointed at me a moment ago, and I would like to ask him whether he is sure he is going to have the necessary protection, with armed guards in battle dress, when he goes on this trip?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not think that question is acceptable.

* * *

INDIAN AFFAIRS

STERILIZATION OF ESKIMO WOMEN

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, if I may interrupt the exchange between the two right hon. gentlemen, may I direct a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development which I asked him last Friday. I intended to follow it up by asking a question of the Minister of National Health and Welfare but

he is absent even though he is scheduled to be here. May I ask the minister whether any investigation has been made into the question of sterilization of Eskimo women, particularly on Victoria Island in the Holman Island community?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I got in touch with the Minister of National Health and Welfare and I am informed that there is no program of sterilization of women in this government, I mean in this area. However, a few women from the Holman Island community and from other villages have been sterilized. I think there were seven such cases during the year at Yellowknife. In each case, the written consent of the wife and husband, as well as that of two physicians, have been secured.

[*English*]

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, when the minister says that there was the consent of the woman and the husband—

Mr. Trudeau: And two doctors.

Mr. Lewis: —and two doctors—by the way, Mr. Speaker, I was not talking about sterilization of the government—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Lewis: —this conveys to me that somebody sought the consent of the people involved. I should like to ask the minister whether an inquiry has been made to determine if these people were approached by someone representing the health department seeking their consent and, if so, would that not represent a program of seeking consent? Were they talked to in their own language and, if not, was there an interpreter present? If the minister does not have that information, would he be good enough to find out these very important details about what happened?

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I can find out all those facts for the hon. member but I think what happened there is exactly what happens elsewhere in Canada. There is consent of the people concerned and two physicians. I think that is a fair policy, but I can inquire to find out if there was any pressure. If there was some pressure it should be condemned, but according to the facts I have there was no pressure at all. It was done with the consent of the woman and her husband and after consultation with two physicians.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, to follow up the preceding question and the answer given by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, could the latter inform the House at whose request such sterilization was done? Was it at the request of the Indians themselves?

Mr. Chrétien: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to know how this took place. Probably the women were admitted to hospital, the doctors discussed the matter

between themselves, and this solution was offered. The wife and husband both gave their consent and the two doctors were in agreement. I believe that is normal practice, a practice that is not incompatible with the freedom of individuals to make similar choices.

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Following the study made by officers of his Department on sterilization, could the Minister tell us if sterilization is preferable to abortion which is so much appreciated by our friends of the NDP?

* * *

[*English*]

AIRPORTS

TORONTO—MEASURES TO RELIEVE OVERCROWDING OF FACILITIES AND TRAFFIC CONGESTION

Mr. S. Perry Ryan (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport but in his absence I should like to direct it to the Acting Minister or the Parliamentary Secretary. Has the minister's department any immediate plans to deal with the serious overcrowding of counter facilities, parking facilities and the congestion of people and automobile traffic at the Toronto international airport?

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport): In the absence of the minister, Mr. Speaker, I should like to take the question as notice.

* * *

LABOUR RELATIONS

NOVA SCOTIA FISHERMEN—FEDERAL GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATION IN APPEAL COURT CASE

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Justice or the Minister of Labour. Will the government of Canada be represented a week today when the appeal division of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia meets to consider constitutional questions involving labour relations of fishermen?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I should like to answer that question at a later date. Whether the government would intervene at this stage before the Court of Appeal of Nova Scotia or at a subsequent hearing is something I have not had an opportunity to discuss with my colleagues.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Speaker, may I present a supplementary question to the minister for an answer at the same time. Will the government, when the announcement is made, indicate whether it will decide to accept the findings of the court? I ask this question because time is somewhat of the essence when dealing with long drawn-out labour problems such as this.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can make any commitment as to the acceptance or not of the findings or judgment of the court until we see the judgment.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO CANADIAN FIRM IN SALE OF RUSSIAN FARM EQUIPMENT

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): My question is for the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. In view of the difficulties that a Canadian firm is having in selling Russian farm equipment in Canada, has the government been requested or is it considering offering financial help to the said firm?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I have had some letters and other communications in respect of the financing of some of these tractors in the normal or ordinary way that other imported tractors are financed for the farmers of Canada. We have had some discussions with the Department of Finance, but no consideration is being given to any special financing, only in the normal way under programs such as the Farm Improvement Loans Act so that the application to these equipment sales will be equal to other imported goods.

FARM MACHINERY PRICES—ACTION BASED ON BARBER COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the high farm machinery prices as pointed out by the Barber Commission report, can the minister indicate what action the government has been taking in accordance with the recommendations of that report?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to but there would not be time at this stage of the proceedings to make a detailed statement on what has been done.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I was going to suggest to the minister that this is the kind of information which ought to be given by way of a statement on motions.

Mr. Nystrom: Mr. Speaker, will the minister be in a position to make a statement on motions within the next week?

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, nothing has transpired recently that would be news to the House. I could provide my hon. friend with a resumé of what has been done and what has been announced in the House from time to time.

FARM MACHINERY PRICES—LEGAL ACTION AGAINST MACHINERY COMPANIES

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the apparent monopoly practices by certain machinery companies in this country

as indicated by the Barber Commission report, is the department preparing any legal action against such firms?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we are acting on the recommendations of the Barber Commission.

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabaska): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. Can he tell us when, as a result of his action on the Barber Commission recommendations, we can expect a decrease in the price of tractors? Can he give us an approximate time?

Mr. Olson: Many weeks ago there were alternatives offered to the farmers of Canada of tractors of the same horsepower at a much lower price, per horsepower.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

ELEVEN PER CENT PAY INCREASE—POSITION OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS MINISTER AND PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address my question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Was the recent increase in pay of approximately 11 per cent granted to a group of civil servants by the Treasury Board with his permission and was the Prices and Incomes Commission consulted?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the Prices and Incomes Commission is independent of the government and is free to comment on any wage settlement it wishes and in fact has commented on some government settlements or recommendations made by government mediators and arbitrators. As to whether I gave permission or not, I am not in a legal position, of course, to give or withhold permission.

Mr. Hales: On what basis was the guideline of 6 per cent broken?

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, that question should properly be directed to the President of the Treasury Board.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question I should like to ask the minister. In light of—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I believe the hon. member for Wellington has a supplementary. I shall come to the hon. member in a moment.

Mr. Hales: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to continue. I shall direct my supplementary question to the President of the Treasury Board. On what basis was the guideline of 6 per cent broken?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member alleges that a guideline was broken. If he would be more specific, perhaps I could answer.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Hon. members will recognize that we are entering a field of argument between the hon. member and the minister. I think we should give an opportunity to the hon. member for Calgary North.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs whether this is evidence of a new policy since he has vacated the 6 per cent guideline set out by the government?

Mr. Basford: No, Mr. Speaker.

ALLEGED DEMOTION OF K.A. STEAD BECAUSE OF INABILITY TO SPEAK SECOND LANGUAGE

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State. On Friday last the Prime Minister, in answer to a question on this subject, advised the House that he would ask the Secretary of State to obtain a report on the charge levelled by the Public Service Alliance that Mr. K. A. Stead of the National Museums Branch had been demoted because of his inability to speak a second language. Has the minister received the report yet? If so, will he advise the House tomorrow on motions about this matter?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, it is a very short report. In answer to the question as formulated by the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings I am informed by the National Museums of Canada as follows:

1. Mr. K. A. Stead has never held the position of chief of the education and extension services branch of the National Museum.

2. Mr. Stead continues to hold the classification of IS3 and to receive the maximum salary rate of that classification, which level he attained in 1968.

3. Mr. Stead has been assigned duties which it is believed he is competent to perform. These duties are not considered to require a knowledge of a second language. Mr. Stead's inability to speak a second language was not a significant factor influencing the decision to assign to him these duties.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh

* * *

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INFLUENCE OF FLQ ACTIVITIES ON RECOGNITION OF PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

Have the activities of the Quebec Maoist FLQ had anything to do with the sudden announcement of the recognition of Communist China by the Canadian government?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I am under the impression that a somewhat similar question was put yesterday, and that the Chair raised objections thereto.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*English*]

FISHERIES

NEGOTIATIONS WITH SOVIET UNION RESPECTING FISHING OFF PACIFIC COAST

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries. Can the minister say whether discussions are continuing between the Soviet Union and his province of British Columbia regarding the depletion of our fishing resources? If so, how long will they continue and can he say when he will be able to make a report to the House on the discussions?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I hope these discussions will be completed either today or tomorrow and that I will be able to make a report before the end of the week.

CLOSURE OF CERTAIN WATERS TO FOREIGN FISHERMEN

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary for the Minister of Fisheries. In view of the situation on the west coast and the overfishing which is depleting our resources on the east coast, can the Minister of Fisheries give any indication when action will be taken to close off the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Bay of Fundy as exclusive Canadian fishing waters in Atlantic Canada as well as Queen Charlotte Sound and Hecate Strait on the west coast?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Very soon, I hope, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

POLLUTION

SALVAGING OF GASOLINE FROM BARGE SUNK IN ARCTIC

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport or in his absence his Parliamentary Secretary. Was any attempt made by any government department this past summer to locate and salvage the 2,000 tons of light diesel and aviation gasoline which was lost with the sinking of a barge in Arctic waters just over a year ago?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would think that this question could well be placed on the order paper.

* * *

UNITED NATIONS

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATIONS—NON-ATTENDANCE OF PRIME MINISTER

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. I am wondering whether the right hon. gentleman would take the House into his confidence and tell us why, apparently at the last moment, his plan to make the lead speech at the United Nations today was cancelled—it would have taken only two hours—and was turned over to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I ask the question because this does appear to many Canadians to be a snub to the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I understand that the hon. member is pursuing a question asked earlier in the question period.

* * *

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

RECOGNITION OF PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA—DISCUSSION RESPECTING NUCLEAR TESTS

Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

Since the recognition of Communist China by the present government, does the Prime Minister know that this morning an atomic bomb was exploded on the Chinese communist mainland, and did the Canadian government, during the talks which resulted in this official recognition, demand that China stop atomic tests as a prerequisite to recognition by Canada?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The answer to both questions is no, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a supplementary question.

I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether, during his visit to Russia, he will take this opportunity to discuss the suspension of atomic tests in Communist Russia and in Communist China as well.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the discussions will cover the problem of disarmament in general and nuclear disarmament in particular. It is also possible that we will talk about international relations in general and China in particular.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL PARKS

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—ESTABLISHMENT OF SECOND FACILITY

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. I will try not to take advantage of his bruised condition. Can he advise if his department has abandoned his commitment given in the House some time ago to establish a second national park in Prince Edward Island? If so, is he contemplating the provision of an equal or better value substitution?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member, I am sure, will admit that this is the kind of question which should be on the order paper. If there is urgency, I am sure we would profit from the pleasure of hearing the hon. member at the time of adjournment.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION ON SMOKING

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to direct to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Is it his intention to produce at the present session of the House legislation on smoking, health and advertising?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Yes, Mr. Speaker. This area of subject matter is on the proposed list of legislation, if it can be reached at this session.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

UNEMPLOYMENT—MEASURES TO STIMULATE ECONOMY

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Finance whether the measure he proposed yesterday with regard to stimulating the economy is based on the assumption that the seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment will remain the same or is this the policy of the government even in the event of the seasonally adjusted rate increasing?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): What I spoke of yesterday was not a single measure but rather a number of measures the government has taken which are very significant over the period since last March in order to stimulate the economy generally. The measure I announced yesterday for the first time was simply another measure and rather small compared with the vast measures the government has taken since last March.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree that the measure taken is rather small, but I am asking the Minister of Finance whether he is prepared to take additional measures if the seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment increases? When the next figure is produced, which I predict will be higher, will the minister produce additional measures?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I hesitate to suggest to any hon. member in the circumstances that the question asked is hypothetical, but I would think that procedurally I would have to make that ruling.

* * *

HOUSING

HAMILTON—AMOUNT OF MONEY FOR LOW-INCOME HOMES

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question which I should like to direct to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing. Unfortunately he is not here this afternoon, but I should like to place it on the record and have it taken as notice. It comes about as a result of information I received to the effect that some $18 million which had been earmarked for the city of Hamilton and district for the purpose of low-income housing has been reduced by some 60 per cent. I should like the minister to confirm or deny this statement. If it is a fact that the amount has been reduced, I should like the minister to give the House the detailed reasons for the reduction. If it has not been, I would like to have the assurance of the minister that the $18 million earmarked for housing in the city of Hamilton and district will be available until the time of expiration as set out in the criteria announced by the minister.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I assume the hon. member wanted the question to be noted by someone on behalf of the government.

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to remind the hon. member that it was not quite correct form to ask that a statement be confirmed or denied, but I will take it that his question has been asked directly and noted.

Mr. Alexander: If anybody on the other side is in a position to answer that question, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly appreciate it.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

SUPPLYING OF RAPESEED FREE OF ERUCIC ACID TO FARMERS

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. In light of the importance of increased sales of rapeseed to our western economy and in view of the high level of erucic acid in present samples of rapeseed oil, which is being frowned on by the federal Department of Health, what steps is the Department of Agriculture taking to assure farmers of an ample supply of rapeseed low in erucic acid?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, we are taking some steps now to increase rapidly the available supply of Oro seed which is not only low in erucic acid but registers zero in content of that acid.

* * *

HOUSING

NURSING HOMES—DECISION RESPECTING USE OF LIMITED DIVIDEND HOUSING LEGISLATION

Mr. Doug Rowland (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the same anonymous person who took note of the question put by the hon. member for Hamilton West. Would the minister responsible for housing indicate to the House when a policy decision may be expected with respect to the use of limited dividend housing legislation for the construction of nursing homes?

Inquiries of the Ministry

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

GREAT SLAVE LAKE LINE—ACTION TO ESTABLISH INQUIRY INTO CONTRACTORS' CLAIMS

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Transport. Can he say whether or not action has been taken on the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Transport to establish an investigation or inquiry into the claims of contractors against the CNR with regard to the construction of the Great Slave Lake Railway?

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to look into this matter and take it up with the minister and then send an answer directly to the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

ATTENDANCE OF MINISTERS UNDER ROSTER SYSTEM

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a question of privilege at this time concerning the attendance of ministers of the Crown in this House. I do not raise it with any particular malice against any minister of the Crown, but I bring it up because this is the start of a new session and we in the opposition who wish to ask questions consider it important that ministers be present.

I direct my remarks to the right hon. Prime Minister and remind him that of the 20 ministers who are supposed to be present today five are absent, or some 25 per cent. I hope that during this new session we will be able to have a full complement of those ministers who are supposed to be here. I wish to emphasize that I am not in sympathy with the roster system for the attendance of ministers, but I will accept it provided they are in attendance when they are scheduled to be present.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, at the outset of the session I am glad to try to clarify the position. I think the hon. member has made a valid point. If we are to expect the roster system to operate at all it is important that the ministers be here. But I must bring to the attention of the House that there are some occasions, as is the case today, where there may be three ministers absent. There are 16 ministers here. The three ministers absent, who should be here according to the roster system, are away from Ottawa, one at the United Nations, another one in the United Kingdom, and the third in Europe on government business. In cases such as this it is expected that the Acting Minister, if there is one, or the Parliamentary Secretary, if there is one, will answer questions directed to a minister. But of course there is no provision for anyone to answer questions when a minister is not expected to be here, which is the case with the housing minister to whom a question was directed a moment ago.

[Mr. Rowland.]

[*Later:*]

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the new House Leader. In view of the fact that the right hon. Prime Minister has today indicated that when a minister is not due in the House according to the roster system no acting minister is appointed to answer questions, and in view of the fact that this was the case last year, can he indicate the reason for this downgrading of Parliament just one step further?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

PROVISION FOR CONTINUING SPEAKER

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. Is the Prime Minister giving consideration to the making of arrangements for discussions amongst all parties, either through the party leaders or other representatives, as to the possibility of making provision for a continuing Speaker for the House of Commons, especially in view of the fact that at the present time we have one who enjoys the confidence of the entire House?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: I am not sure that this is a matter of urgency. Perhaps the hon. member might consider putting the question on the order paper.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): May I ask, Mr. Speaker, that this question be taken as notice by yourself.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this is something in which Your Honour should not be involved, I wonder if the Prime Minister would perhaps take notice of my question. Would he consider arranging for discussions among the representatives of the parties on what I believe is an important issue so far as this House of Commons is concerned?

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

* * *

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

CONSIDERATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The House resumed, from Tuesday, October 13, consideration of the motion of Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Stanfield (p. 29).

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, my first remarks should be to congratulate the mover of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, the hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel).

I have had the opportunity this year to get to know the hon. member for Bourassa since he was a member of the Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs. I can say, without fear of giving him a swelled head, that he is a very sensible man. We both agreed after all on the report of the Finance Committee and on taxation.

He has showed he is a most sensible man and the only thing I could have against him is that he is a member of the party in power.

[*English*]

At the same time, I would like to offer my congratulations to the seconder of the motion for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas), whose constituency I have had some pleasure in visiting, not when he was the member but under other circumstances. It is a very pleasant part of the country. All I can say of both these hon. gentlemen is that their advocacy was polite and courteous, but I did not detect any scintilla of enthusiasm on their part for the speech that they were asking the House to support. They did not seem to have conviction, or heart. One has only to look at the list of the legislation that has been tabled—

Mr. Gibson: Yes, indeed.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): The hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Gibson) loves to sit back on that part of his anatomy which seems to give the greatest sound, because that is all we ever hear from him. Many of the items listed are more or less pedestrian, housekeeping items. There are pieces of tidying up legislation, and that is the fate of most Speeches from the Throne.

Then, there is another category of bills which last year made part of the grade, but for one reason or another they died on prorogation. After all, some of those bills deserved to die; they were bad. In so far as others are concerned, the legislative hurry caught them so they died in committee. Then, there were other bills that had been announced but never made it to first reading. There is the very famous and hardy veteran, the bill on the Canada Development Corporation. It may be that because it is now somewhere around No. 10 on the list it has better priority than the Prime Minister gave it last year when there were 75 items on the list and this one would have been the 76th. Presumably, it has been upgraded.

• (3:00 p.m.)

Then, there are some new matters. Some will meet with approval in principle without hesitation, although there may be some differences in detail. Some others will obviously be more controversial.

In the last group—and here is a point that I wish to draw to your attention, sir—there appear some innocuous items simply titled "taxation legislation". We and the country are anticipating with a great deal of interest an early decision by the government regarding its tax proposals. I agreed with the issuing of a white paper on tax reform which allowed for a consultative process with the country, but that did not mean there had to be a rush to consider the matters included in the white paper. Certainly, in the beginning, we did not give any approval in any way whatsoever to the contents of that white paper. The government must bear the full responsibility for the uncertainty that has been created in the country arising out of the proposals in the white paper.

It is not just the responsibility of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) but the responsibility of the whole ministry under the Prime Minister that this country has been thrown into economic doldrums, in part caused by the uncertainty over the rather wild and irresponsible proposals in the white paper on tax changes. Whatever the government decision may be, you may rest assured, Mr. Speaker, that all tax legislation will receive very close scrutiny in this House and some of it may face very protracted and bitter opposition.

Then there is another bill, No. 38 on the list, called an act respecting the auditor general. I can promise you, Mr. Speaker, and members of the House, that if there is the slightest move on the part of the government to restrict the scope of the operations of the auditor general either directly or indirectly there will be fierce opposition. That office is responsible to Parliament. The government has nothing to do with it, either through Treasury Board control of its staff or as the result of any wish of the technocrats that occupy ministerial seats or their advisers. There should not be the slightest reduction of the freedom of the auditor general to comment on any or all matters that appear before him in the way of government expenditures.

Curbs have been imposed on Parliament before. We have a system of rules now that is a great gag, and I am surprised that some of the exponents of free speech in the House and some of those who allege to be the great exponents of our rules should have consented at any time to the curb imposed on Parliament by the last rule changes.

Mr. Gibson: So we go back to minority rule again.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Here is another emanation of the sound to which I referred earlier. In so far as the curbs on Parliament are concerned, we know what can be done to publicize government activity either on the floor of this House or in committee before the press who, apparently, do not attend committee meetings unless something highly sensational is likely to develop. The reports of the committees do not come out until weeks later.

Mr. Gibson: They do their best.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): As a member of the Committee on Procedure and Organization, I know that efforts are being made to improve the publication of committee reports. However, until that is done and becomes a realized success, the work of this House will suffer. It is an indirect curb on the right of examination by the House. The delay in the publication of committee reports as a result of certain difficulties is an indirect choking off or snuffing out of information.

Last week the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) put certain questions to the Minister of Finance on the nature of the economy and on unemployment. That esteemed minister replied that early in the week he would make a full statement on the state of the economy, a sort of mini-budget review. He was believed by the press, oh yes. So, what do we get on Tuesday? We heard a really low profile performance, what could be called a non-speech, which completely failed to meet the demands of the occasion. The minister did cover some very gloomy aspects of the moment, apart from a little contribution of about $60 million—some of which, frankly, would have been covered by supplementary estimates anyway because the department in question had run out of money—and a few other matters to which my colleagues, particularly the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath), will refer to later today. The minister gave no indication whatsoever as to what the government proposes to do with two very important questions at present: the real downturn in the economy, and mounting unemployment.

With regard to unemployment, I will not engage in a battle of semantics involving seasonally adjusted figures and what have you. All we know is that it is agreed that 6.7 per cent of the working force was unemployed at the last report. What will the next report indicate? Will it be 7 per cent plus or minus a fraction of a point? I do not know, but we will see tomorrow when the figure is published.

Early on in his review, the minister indicated the following:

> The economy has been growing less rapidly this year than last. In the first half of the year the national output apart from price changes grew at an annual rate of just under 2½ per cent. This compares with a rate of a little below 4½ per cent in the last half of 1969.

You did not have the privilege of being in this House in 1958 and 1959, Mr. Speaker, nor did most of the members on the government side. If the minister of finance of the day had read figures like this, one would have heard groans on the then Liberal opposition side that would have been heard clear to the Pacific Ocean—and they did groan. There were difficulties in 1958 and 1959. But now the minister says it is not so bad. However, if one goes to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics reports, one sees what use the government made of statistics. The minister used selective statistics, which is particularly evident when he says that the present rate compares with a rate a little below 4½ per cent in the last half of 1969.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Let us look at what the Dominion Bureau of Statistics says in its weekly bulletin for Friday, August 28, 1970. On page 16, under "Real Domestic Product, June 1970" the report reads:

> Canada's real domestic product, seasonally adjusted, fell by 1.0% in June. This downturn in aggregate production, which was almost as sharp as the strike-affected drop that took place in May of last year, marks the fourth time in the first six months of this year that aggregate production has either decreased or shown no growth. This latest decline places the R.D.P. index at a level lower than that for the previous November. In June both the goods-producing and service-producing industries declined.

I ask, is this just a little bit below the 4½ per cent average of the last half of 1969? Let us look at another index, now.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I confess that I do not know of a standing order that covers my point, but would it not be a matter of courtesy for at least one cabinet minister to be present in the House of Commons when an important member of the official opposition is making his speech?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Fairweather: The government does not seem to care in the least for Parliament.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I had been aware of this situation, but we know what the attitude of the government is towards Parliament.

Mr. Fairweather: It does not care for Parliament.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): In fact, we have only two parliamentary secretaries present.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I also know the direction in which the cabinet has run. There is a little red light in front of a television camera and cabinet members seem to be struck with the idea that they shall be stars at the moment. They have all run breathless to that idiot box. No wonder they do not appear in Parliament. This is not the first time that someone has mentioned this administration's contempt for this House. May I continue the point I was making about industrial production? I wish to quote from the September 18, 1970 DBS Weekly Bulletin. At page 4 under "Index of Industrial Production, June 1970..." we find:

> The seasonally adjusted index of industrial production (1961 = 100) declined by 0.6% in July, falling to 170.2 from the revised June level of 171.2. All of the decrease was due to the durables-centered drop in manufacturing, as both mining and utilities rose fractionally. The durables' decline was largely caused by sharp drops in the primary metals (where labour disputes were a factor) and metals fabricating components.

It is interesting to note that the July figure of 170.2 is fractionally below the 170.5 figure for May.

This reflects the true picture of the economy at the present time. Let us look at the minister's speech. He has talked about investment in residential construction. It was very much lower in the second quarter of 1970. It is at a lower level than it was in 1969. The government put $150 million into the building industry as a result of changes in the budget provisions of March, but still housing construction, including residential construction, is off. The cause, first of all, is extremely high interest rates. In considering the construction of multiple residences and large apartment buildings as well as other large developmental projects, it is clear that the spectre of the proposals contained in the white paper has closed off every-

thing. It will take a long time before there is that degree of confidence that will bring businessmen and people with money to invest in Canada. And that is the name of the game—people with money who are prepared to put up their money for investment on which they will obtain a reasonable return.

We are told that business spending on new capital has been sluggish so far this year. Of course it has been. Businessmen have been stung by the proposals in the white paper. In the exporting industries, we note that since last May there has been a continuing decline in certain types of exports. Here, one must look at the heavy chemical and forest products industries, where Canadian exporters are now competing on a foreign market at a price disadvantage. Not only have there been inroads on their sales in Canada as a result of accelerating the Kennedy Round reductions on certain domestic products so that imports have been competing against domestic products, but their exports have also increased in price on foreign markets as a result of the floating of our dollar. Why is there this difficulty with industrial production and with the economy of the country? Mr. Speaker, it is the result, frankly, of a crisis of confidence in this government. Businessmen have lost confidence. The government does not seem to know where it is going in so far as its economic programs are concerned.

We saw the wild ideas contained in the white paper. They alarmed the country tremendously. They alarmed foreign investors who wished to invest in Canada. Actually, they have caused the withdrawal of some funds from Canada. A very successful foreign investor actually told me this past summer that at present there is just no case to be made for investing in Canada if one compares investment opportunities and returns on investments in the United States, Australia, South Africa and a few other countries which have demands that are as strong as our own for development capital. The United States, notwithstanding that it is a major country with a fully developed economy, still offers opportunities for development capital. I refer to innovating capital, with which people are prepared to take a chance. According to the white paper we, in Canada, were denying people the opportunity of taking a chance. This has created an element of uncertainty.

Let me refer now to the gyrations of our dollar. There may have been a case, since the minister explained that there was pressure on the dollar, for something to be done with respect to it; nevertheless, I suggest that the answer is not in bringing about a breach of our obligations under the International Monetary Fund and being the one left-footed soldier in all the squad. We got away with it once, years ago. Is it right that we should now go back again and say to all the other countries, "You must respect your responsibilities under the International Monetary Fund regulations but we, in Canada, choose to opt out and, when we find it suitable, we will come back in." That is not the way to conduct our financial relations with our trading partners. In so far as the Canadian economy is concerned, confidence will be restored when the government makes up its mind, I hope soon, to peg the dollar. By saying that I do not for one moment want it to be understood that I approve of the narrow range of plus or minus 1 per cent existing under the present Bretton Woods Agreement. I suggest either that there be a wider range or that there be a moving average rate. Canada must return to a pegged dollar in order to give business the degree of stability that it requires and in order that our exporters can put into effect those plans and operations that must be implemented in order to compete internationally.

It is no answer to the problem put forward by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) to say that Chemcell is laying off 300 people in Edmonton—these are people with Phd's and other degrees—and that Dupont and other large chemical companies may lay off hundreds of people. People like these are not mere sweepers; the companies are laying off from the backbone of their work force. How does one expect them to start operating again a few months later or even a year later when the economy may have recovered? This is where we all lose as Canadians.

• (3:20 p.m.)

The other question is the crisis in confidence. The minister pointed out that there is now far more industrial unrest than ever before. This, of course, causes a lack of confidence both in businessmen and organized labour. As the minister indicated, we are now getting wage demands and wage settlements to cover future inflation because no case has been made that productivity is even approaching wage increases.

I am not going to get into the hassle of whether a 6 per cent or 12 per cent increase in wages is right or wrong, but if there is a consistent increase in wages, salaries and profits, and profits that are withdrawn are the wages of management, and if these are in excess of the increase in productivity there will be continuing inflation. A study made last year by the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs amply proved that this is the case as far as Canada is concerned. We see the case being made in other countries where there are rapidly escalating wages which are ahead of the increase in productivity.

One does not quarrel with the disruptive effects of work stoppages. No one gains from a work stoppage, including the employee and employer. Where there have been work stoppages in major industries a great deal of consequential unemployment has resulted. Although this has affected the figures, the net result is that our rate of productivity has declined. This was discussed earlier. Why is it declining? It is simply because the base of operation has been narrowed so much that the overhead and fixed costs have to be paid for by the much narrower base of operation. The consequences are apparent.

We did not get any answers from the Minister of Finance. He mentioned an acceleration of payments to the provinces, but that is not encouragement to the private sector. This is where the government should have support for its programs. There should be incentives for business to invest in capital assets, but they are declining.

The Chairman of the Economic Council of Canada and other members of the Council stated the year before last that the government's fiscal and monetary policies ought to be very carefully assessed and watched because it is very easy to overstep the mark. We must remember that these fiscal and monetary policies of taxation and tight money have very deep effects. All too often the federal government is unable to stop the downward trend. Adequate measures should be taken soon. Somewhere along the line the government economists and the advisers to the minister have missed the boat. They have not seen the warning lights.

The Minister of Finance talked about relaxation of fiscal and monetary policies, but it has been proved that he is too late. When the Economic Council of Canada gave a very mild warning they were bitterly condemned by the minister and his advisers for doing so. However, they were correct. The minister has said that the government has now taken certain steps. The government is going to pump some extra millions of dollars into the hands of the provinces.

The government is making available $150 million for housing and $60 million, which is peanuts, for advancing maintenance and repairs. What are they going to do? Are they going to paint garages of DND establishments? Are they going to renew doors and partitions of government buildings? Are they going to overhaul and instal more luxurious furniture in ministerial offices and the offices of senior civil servants? What are they going to do with $25 million? There will be $15 million for certain work projects. I repeat, $15 million. This is like giving a man who is dying of thirst a drop of water. A much more massive injection must be furnished by the government.

I am conscious of the time I have left, Mr. Speaker. At page 106 of *Hansard* there is a table which is headed, "Federal government expenditure public accounts and national accounts reconciliation". It is the same table that appears at page 4749 of *Hansard* for the last session. This is included in the minister's budget speech of March 12.

Remarkably the 1969-70 preliminary figures in the left-hand column of the table shown on page 106 are somewhat different from those that appear at page 4749 of last session's *Hansard*. I do not know how preliminary figures can change, if they are preliminary figures. There is also a major change with respect to the 1970-71 forecast. The total expenditure on a national accounts basis proposed for 1970-71 is $16,150 million while the total of budgetary expenses is $13,250 million. This is again a big increase, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): I am sorry to inform the hon. member that his time is over.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Could the House grant me a few additional minutes, Mr. Speaker?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel:) Does the House agree to the member for Edmonton West continuing his speech?

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

Some hon. Members: Agreed!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Agreed.

[*English*]

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Thank you, Mr. Speaker and hon. members of the House. I have only a short bit to add.

In years past, we have been told by successive ministers of finance that what must really be considered are the surplus or deficit figures on a national accounts basis. Those were the true ones. I remember when the Hon. Walter Gordon instituted this basis. This was to be the real basis of comparisons. The budgetary basis was considered to be nothing, but strangely enough if the national accounts basis is to be considered on the revised figures as they appeared in the minister's speech on Tuesday, we have gone from a budgetary surplus of $250 million in March through the successive changes announced at the dominion-provincial conference to a deficit position of $450 million on a national accounts basis. In his speech the minister said that instead of having a budgetary surplus, we will have a budgetary deficit of $150 million on the basis of our present estimates.

I am often reminded of the time in February of 1968 when the present Minister of Finance stood opposite and said, "I guarantee we will balance the budget". In October figures were tabled showing that the budget was $825 million in the red. I have as much faith in the minister's figures now as I did at that time.

Mr. Woolliams: I rise on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. During this important debate on the economic condition of the country no minister of the government has seen fit to attend on this debate this afternoon, even though a point of order was raised by another member in the House of Commons. In view of that fact, I wish to move the following motion:

• (3:30 p.m.)

That this House adjourn and report progress until a member of the government sees fit to attend this most important debate.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): I wish to bring to the attention of the hon. member the fact that, according to the advice I have received, since, he rose on a point of order, it is not possible for him to make such a motion.

Mr. Woolliams: What I did, in fact, Mr. Speaker, was to raise a question of privilege. A question of privilege can be raised at this time because this is a matter which affects the proceedings which are taking place in the House at this moment.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): In my opinion the hon. member's motion should be related to the question of privilege. The point which the hon. member raised just now was made previously by another hon. member.

It is well taken but, in my opinion, I should not put the motion he suggests at this time.

Mr. Woolliams: May I speak further to that question of privilege, Mr. Speaker? My motion is based on the question of privilege, one which affects every member of this chamber. It has always been the practice that when a debate of this nature, or, indeed, of any other, is in progress, one or two cabinet ministers, at least, are present. Members of the ministry have today seen fit to ignore this debate completely. As I say, this is a matter which affects the privileges of every member of this House. I ask that the motion be put.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): I repeat that there is some propriety to the comments which have been made, but the hon. member has heard the decision of the Chair and the Chair has no alternative but to call on the hon. member for Peel South.

Mr. Nesbitt: On a point of order. I move that this House do now adjourn.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): I am again informed that such procedure is not provided for under our rules. An hon. member is not able to rise on a point of order and then move a motion to adjourn the House, as the hon. member seeks to do. It is my feeling, if not my experience, that if this were to be allowed then at any moment during any debate, for any reason at all, an hon. member could get up, raise a point of order and move the adjournment of the House. Accordingly, it is my intention to adhere to my earlier decision and call upon the hon. member for Peel South.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would invite Your Honour to reconsider your decision with regard to this particular question. I said nothing on the subject during my speech, although my speech was interrupted while the point of order was originally raised. Nothing was said by me at that time, but the matter has now been raised at the first opportunity. I put it to Your Honour that a point of order with regard to attendance in the House is admissible at any time and, therefore, that the motion is not out of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): I wish to remind the hon. member for Edmonton West that the point of order raised while he was speaking was not followed by a motion. It was well taken, and, indeed, the point of order raised by another of his hon. friends was well taken. I have rendered a decision. I am ready to take this question under consideration with the Speaker for another occasion but, from the advice I have received until now, I have no choice other than to call on the next speaker who is the hon. member for Peel South.

Mr. Baldwin: Before we leave this point, may I say this: I see several assorted Parliamentary Secretaries present; they might possibly send for a minister so that the cabinet might be represented.

The Address—Mr. Chappell

Mr. Hyl Chappell (Peel South): At the outset of these observations, Mr. Speaker, might I offer my congratulations to all those who have spoken before me and in particular to the mover (Mr. Trudel) and the seconder (Mr. Douglas, (Assiniboia) of the motion before us?

Some have criticized the Speech from the Throne, but I think when one considers it together with the list of proposed legislation tabled by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on October 8, it is a most comprehensive and excellent document. A debate on the Address gives each of us an opportunity to speak on what he believes to be the most important issue facing us. Mine is the need for quick and substantial changes to our criminal law.

Last year, at this time, I spoke of the need for discipline in democracy. Thinking of the George Williams University affair, the LaPalme lawlessness, the bombing and the airport riots, I said we had seen a glimpse of chaos which amounted to a gun pointed at democracy and I expressed the view that unless democracy immediately developed a stronger discipline we were on the way to a dictatorship. I thought then that we had five or ten years in which to make our choice. Now, one year later, we do not have any time left. The challange is here, now. Democracy in Canada is threatened. Can we quickly produce the teeth and muscle to save it? The eyes of the world are upon us. The stake is not just our national reputation but our way of life—democracy itself.

To obtain freedom, each of us gave up his jungle right to behave as he wished and submitted to a code of conduct called laws, in return for protection from those who refused to follow the code. Equal freedom of action and opportunity should exist within these rules. The criminal law deals with those who interfere with our rights within these rules. Without that protection, we are without freedom. The question is: can democracy provide it, or will we slip into dictatorship to provide the discipline and save us from mob rule or revolution?

Our criminal law mainly deals with those who interfere with the life or security of another individual or who steal from the state. These people usually have had protection from, and obeyed, the laws in other respects. For many years we have been humanizing the use of the criminal law sanction, hoping to rehabilitate criminals by more positive and less punitive treatment. This attitude led to the suspension of the death penalty except in very limited circumstances. What we are faced with today in the bombings, air piracy and kidnapping for ransom is very different from ordinary criminal activity. These groups would destroy the whole basis of our law and society. They fight to take away democracy and force their will upon us. Is the concept which we have developed for the criminal sanction of the individual suitable for application to these groups, or must we introduce a whole new concept?

So many Canadians have said in the last two or three years that this is the greatest country in the world. How many have thought to themselves that mob rule and organized gangsterism can not happen here, but only in faraway places. Some will now say, what a disturbing or unpleasant thought and brush it off in the hope that the

police will soon catch a few of the FLQ and that the situation will return to normal. I ask you, is there not a gun at the nation's head when it is demanded that convicted criminals be freed and transported to a nation which encourages and trains them? I ask you, how many hostages need be taken, or how many of our police must be diverted to protecting rather than apprehending roles, before we consider freedom to be on the brink?

• (3:40 p.m.)

We must realize these people are not ordinary individuals and ordinary products of our society. Neither are they political prisoners, as they are so often called by the press. A political prisoner is one who does not wish to live under the laws of a given country, and he is punished because he cannot conform. These "political prisoners" deliberately broke our laws, were apprehended under the law, tried and sentenced. They are led by international political gangsters who roam everywhere looking for a vacuum in authority and discipline and take advantage of it under foreign training and foreign support with the purpose of destroying our way of life. Needless to say these people always pick a group name associated with a local cause; thus they gain some sympathy and recruit the misguided and uninformed.

We have been living in an age of change and protest, of new demands and new strengths. Threats and selfish force have entered into protests, often joined by violence and complete disrespect for the rights and dignity of others. Important people in prominent places, both in the field of communications and in elective office, have often unwittingly, and sometimes deliberately, encouraged these people to violence by sympathizing with some seemingly worth-while element of their cause and by giving their acts excessive news coverage. People who commit violent and criminal acts are often given the chance to appear on television to try to justify them, by extolling some cause that they personally wish to espouse. This has tended to make heroes out of them in their own group, and thus has assisted their recruiting.

While protest was descending into violence and our criminal sanctions were being softened—I believe properly so far ordinary individuals—our social mores have accepted the philosophy of unrestraint and permissiveness. In this environment these selfish and destructive people have been allowed to flourish, often nurtured by the comfort that they may be accepted as the radical wing of a political philosophy. Their initial success has led them to think that if they act in mobs, and boldly enough, our laws are impotent to deal with them. If caught in crime they simply commit a worse one and demand exemption from penalty for the first.

Refusal to deliver hostages is not enough; we need tougher laws to fit this type of activity. As I said earlier, this is not ordinary crime by ordinary criminals; this is sedition and revolt against law and order. It is in fact a form of warfare. Our police are not sufficient in number to cope with such organized crime, and they are handicapped because of our strict rules which protect the suspected criminal. Our ordinary judicial process is slow, and wisely so to avoid mistakes. But will it do for the present situation where those who are apprehended could be freed by commission of another crime? We must remember that many of these people already face charges which could lead to life imprisonment if they are caught. As the law stands now, they have nothing to lose from adding kidnapping and murder to their list of crimes.

Should we not amend the Criminal Code, first of all to provide the strictest penalty for those who kidnap people and hold them as hostages, or pirate a plane or vessel, or place bombs where there is a reasonable chance of causing death?

Second, should we not also re-examine, and perhaps widen, the definition of "conspiracy" and "conspirators", so that those who openly support and encourage conspiracies can be charged?

Third, should we not re-examine, and if necessary enlarge, the section of the code dealing with treason and sedition, so that people who commit crimes of theft in order to finance revolutions are properly charged?

Fourth, should we not amend the Criminal Code to provide for speedy trial and appeal procedures so that the final penalty is carried out and attempts to rescue them by committing further crime are thwarted?

Fifth, should we not for a temporary period at least during this emergency, provide for a new type of hearing where people are forced to disclose the names of their fellow conspirators, and enable the police to use all reasonable means in order to apprehend? This would be a bold but I submit effective move, and this House has the authority to make such an amendment.

Sixth, should we not also consider making membership in organizations such as the FLQ a crime in itself? Lastly I suggest that we tighten our immigration laws to forbid entrance to Canada of those who preach the violent overthrow of our system; and I suggest we improve our intelligence in those foreign nations that assist such groups so that we know their plans in advance.

Liberty is precious. The pain and fear of those hostages and their families must be immense. But we must guard against oppression and act within the law. We cannot distort law and order by using their illegal methods—that is to say, by lining people up and shooting them—as many of our constituents have been suggesting to us during the last week end. If we did this then we would destroy that which we seek to preserve—the rule of law.

I do not call for any abandonment of the democratic or judicial process, but rather for proof that democracy can move quickly and toughen its criminal laws in times of emergency in order to save itself. I fear that if we do not show this firmness, use of the innocent hostage will spread like wildfire to other groups. Under fear of mob rule people seek protection at any cost, and we might be stampeded into a dictatorship.

In closing, may I speak for a moment for comparative purposes about my own riding of Peel South, which is composed of Mississauga, its port town of Port Credit, and Streetsville, the most dynamic and fastest growing area in the world. It demonstrates what can happen in a free and healthy democracy. Last year an immense amount of new industry settled there. By the second election to come we will have a population, I believe, of perhaps 400,000 people and will require four members to serve us. Quebec desires and deserves this same growth, and all of us look forward to similar economic growth there. But can it happen if we allow this lawlessness to continue? Surely for Quebec and for Canada the most important issue facing us is the need to strengthen immediately our criminal laws.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): First of all, Mr. Speaker, as is customary I should like to join with other hon. members who have preceded me in this debate in extending my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the address in reply, the hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel) and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas).

I too, subscribe to many of the thoughts expressed by the hon. member who has just taken his seat. I find myself at this moment pre-empting some of the thoughts and observations that I had intended to make in addressing myself to the crisis facing our country at the present time. It is difficult if not impossible for any member to rise in his place during this debate without making some reference to the events that are taking place at this moment in this city of Ottawa and in the province of Quebec. The presence of armed troops on parliament hill is an awesome and frightening spectacle. It is so awesome and so frightening that we have to stop for a moment and ask ourselves over and over again, can this be happening here, can this be happening to us? What in the name of God is happening to our country?

As we contemplate these events, there is one thing that emerges very clearly, at least to me at any rate, and that is that this country will unhappily never be the same, no matter how successfully concluded are the negotiations now going on to free other unfortunate men who are the victims of this conspiracy. No longer can we, as Canadians, look at this world through rose coloured glasses. No longer can we view the violence, turbulence, and unrest of other countries with smug complacency in the knowledge that it cannot happen here. It is happening here and it is happening now.

I am one member of this House who finds himself at a loss to explain to my children just exactly what is happening. It is difficult for me to understand, hence it very difficult for me to explain it to them. Certainly, as members of this House, we at this time in this place can give voice to the thoughts of the vast majority of Canadians in this country who view, through the medium of television day by day and hour by hour, the drama and crisis that is unfolding before them. We can give voice to their concern on the floor of this House. We can give voice to that concern as Members of Parliament and we can express our own individual concern for the future of this country.

I believe that the majority of the people in this country feel that the Government of Canada has acted wisely in not yielding to the demands of these criminals.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McGrath: I believe that the government acted responsibly in placing paramount importance on the maintenance of the rule of law in this country. That is certainly the government's responsibility and they would stand condemned by the people of Canada if they did otherwise. We must ask ourselves whether the government, in their attempts and in their human desire to save the lives of these men, have gone a little bit too far? Have we perhaps in the process lost something?

There should be no question of absolution and there should be no question of a deal. A terrible and heinous crime has been committed. The only course to be followed now is that of the due process of law, otherwise where will this end? Who will be safe in this country? Certainly, there will be no security for those who have the responsibility of government or have the responsibility of representing other governments in this country.

At the same time, I cannot help but feel that we have perhaps slightly overplayed our hand with the presence of armed troops in Ottawa and on parliament hill. To my mind, this dramatically illustrated that we have overplayed our hand and have hurt the prestige of this country in the eyes of the world. Surely, the government did not have to resort to armed troops in full battle dress. Surely, this could only have the effect of aggravating an already aroused public and of hurting our reputation which has already been badly tarnished in the eyes of the world. I say that with all earnestness and at the risk of being classed as one of the Prime Minister's bleeding hearts. I say that because I believe that even though this is a time of great crisis some other provision could have been made. Some other forces could have been called upon without having to resort to calling in troops in full battle dress.

Perhaps the government would be better advised, while at the same time maintaining the security of our public officials, to look at the cause of the great problems that face this country. I cannot help but note that we are not going to solve the great economic problems of this country, the problems of regional development and disparity, as well as the attendant problems of unemployment, by the type of band-aid treatment announced in the House last evening by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson). He laughs at the winter works program, yet he has had to draw in his horns and bring in a program which can only be classified as band-aid treatment. They will not get at the heart of the matter and will not in my view help to reduce the growing rate of unemployment, especially in the province of Quebec, the Atlantic prov-

inces, certain parts of northern Ontario and the Prairies. Sixty million dollars is a nice round figure, amounting to about $3 for every man, woman and child in this country. This amount would not solve the unemployment problems in the province of Newfoundland alone, let alone the vast unparallelled unemployment which exists in this country today.

Having said that, I should now like to refer to another matter than concerns me. This is an item to which I have given a great deal of thought as of late. The hon. member for Peel South (Mr. Chappell), who just took his seat, said among other things that democracy in Canada was threatened. He was referring to the presence of troops and the crisis in Canada today as a consequence of the happenings in Quebec.

Mr. Chappell: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The hon. member said I was referring to the troops on the hill that put democracy at stake. I referred to no such thing. I said it was the type of warfare that was going on that led to the kidnapping, and that unless this was stopped, democracy was threatened, not because there were troops on the hill, which I supported.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Mr. McGrath: All right, Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the hon. member. I was merely trying to paraphrase him, but he did say democracy in Canada is threatened as a consequence of what is happening. I am sure I am quoting the hon. member correctly.

I believe the greatest threat to democracy in this country is the destruction of Parliament by this government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McGrath: I believe that poses a greater threat to my freedom than what is happening in Canada today. When a government refuses to allow the legitimate expressions of the people in a free country, that is precisely what takes place. The armed troops move in. This brings me to the point where I am concerned about what is happening in this Parliament. As a member, I am concerned about what is happening to this Parliament. I am concerned about a debate which is taking place in this House in this moment of crisis without any ministers present.

An hon. Member: That is not true.

Mr. McGrath: Now, we have two but only after they were flushed out by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) and the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). We have some of the newfound Parliamentary Secretaries. They are here only because they are new to the job. Were it not for that fact they would probably join the other members of the cabinet elsewhere.

I believe what is happening in this Parliament and in this House is a cause for great concern. We have lost something since this government came to power. We, as Members of Parliament, have lost our rights, our privileges and our prerogatives. No longer do we have the traditional rights, the long fought for right, to withhold supply to the government. Hence, we have no power and hence we stand accused by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) of being nobodies. Let me quote what the Prime Minister said as recorded at page 11,635 of *Hansard* of last session:

> The opposition seems to think it has nothing else to do but talk.

I suggest we are here to talk. That is our main role as Members of Parliament. Then, the Prime Minister continues:

> They say: if there is a problem, we will talk.

That is precisely what we should do. We talk instead of resorting to armed troops because when there is no talk there is armed conflict. The quotation continues, and I repeat that these are the words of the Prime Minister:

> If there is difficulty we will talk about it.

That is precisely our responsibility. I now quote the Prime Minister further:

> If the government is going too slowly, we will talk about it.

That is what we have to do; that is our responsibility. That is precisely what we have to do. Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister continues:

> The best place in which to talk, if they want a forum, is, of course Parliament. When they get home, when they get out of Parliament, when they are 50 yards from Parliament Hill, they are no longer hon. members—they are just nobodies, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Woolliams: We are the only thing between him and tyranny.

Mr. McGrath: We are nobodies because the government has systematically set out to destroy this institution. It has taken away from the House the traditional right to grant supply.

Mr. Gibson: You are against participatory democracy.

Mr. McGrath: The hon. member who sits on his brains is making his usual contribution. The government has set out to take away the only right we have to withhold supply from the government when we have a grievance.

An hon. member spoke about the committees. What is happening to the committees? The committees are partisan. The chairmen of these committees consider themselves to be members of the government. They do not consider themselves to be non-partisan chairman representing Your Honour in the committees. They consider themselves to be stooges of the government and representatives of the government. Only in the past few months in my own province, I have seen two members who were committee chairmen during the last session. The hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Watson) Chairman of Northern Affairs Committee, came to my province during the recess representing the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) at a ceremony. The hon. member for Halton-Wentworth (Mr. Morison), who was chairman of the Committee on Regional Development, accepted a position as consultant with the govern-

ment of Newfoundland in the very department charged with the responsibility of administering the program under regional development.

We know of other instances where committee chairmen have been the stooges of the government. For example, when a committee brings in a unanimous recommendation to this House which just does not fit in with the government plans, and is not acceptable to the government, the committee chairman quietly acquiesces to the wishes of the Government House Leader. All that the committee chairman needs to do is to remain seated and not rise in his place to move a motion of concurrence in the hope that the report will die. Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, that has not been allowed to happen because of the vigilance of the opposition in this House. Members of the opposition on more than one occasion have moved concurrence in committee reports, only to have the motion for concurrence talked out by government members. Then, the motion has been put on the order paper as a government measure and allowed to die a slow death.

The report of the Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development which studied the question of sovereignty in the North was moved by the hon. member for Athabasca (Mr. Yewchuk). It was talked out by the government and died on the order paper. I can think also of the report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications dealing with the problem of transportation in Labrador and the north shore of Quebec which presumably was destined to die by virtue of the lack of a motion for concurrence by the Chairman. The motion was moved by the hon. member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Peddle). The motion was allowed to die. I could cite other instances to illustrate that the committee system is a failure as it is now constituted. It is an absolute failure and it is destroying Parliament. Let me quote the hon. member for York Centre (Mr. Walker) who is one of the Parliamentary Secretaries who have been put out to pasture. I am quoting from the *Financial Post* of July 9, 1970:

> The new committee system is working excellently, so well that it is superseding the work of the Commons. With so many committees (24) operating there is difficulty in getting a quorum in the House itself. That is a bad situation.

There are no committees sitting today.

An hon. Member: Yes, there are.

Mr. McGrath: Well, I apologize. Perhaps there are one or two committees sitting. This still does not alter the fact that the government and its members choose to ignore the debate which is taking place at this moment of great crisis.

When the new rules were adopted by Parliament there was a debate, as indeed there should have been because these rules as we now see them would have the effect of taking away our rights and prerogatives. A solemn undertaking was given by the then President of the Privy Council that the rules would in fact be reviewed. I shall throw this undertaking right back in his face. I am talking about the former President of the Privy Council, the present Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) who is involved with soldiers on Parliament Hill at the present time. Perhaps that is why he is not in the House. The minister's remarks appear at page 3792 of *Hansard*. I quote:

> I would be glad to give an undertaking on behalf of the government that after we have had experience with these suggested standing orders for the balance of this session, we would at the commencement of the next session in September or October of next year, be prepared to refer these amendments to the new committee on procedure and organization, which I trust will be established by this motion. That committee could consider these procedural changes if not within one year, within at least nine months later.

That brings us to the present time. In other words, Mr. Speaker, a solemn undertaking was given by the government that it would be prepared to take a long, hard look at these rule changes after they had been in operation for a short period of time, so drastic were they in their impact. Now, Mr. Speaker, I call upon the new Government House Leader, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), who has been called upon to pull predecessor's chestnuts out of the fire, to try and restore some of the lost prestige of this Parliament that has been taken away by the actions of the government. I call upon him to fulfil that undertaking made by his predecessor to refer these rules back to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, and to take a long look at the committee system of this House.

• (4:10 p.m.)

I suggest to him that consideration should be given to the following: That committees should not under any circumstances be allowed to sit without a quorum.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McGrath: That, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion is fundamental if this whole committee system is to be anything but a farce.

Secondly, I suggest to the government through you, Sir, that committees, except under special circumstances which have been predetermined by the House, should not be allowed to sit while the House is in session. I consider that to be a fundamental condition.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McGrath: Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, we must give consideration to doing away with the roster system in this House—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McGrath: —which, more than anything else, is taking away the rights and privileges of Members of Parliament—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McGrath: —our inherent rights to represent our constituencies, to represent the people of Canada and to direct questions to the members on the treasury benches.

That right, Mr. Speaker, I submit is being taken away from us by the roster system. It was only today, this third or fourth day of the new session, that it was pointed out that 25 per cent of the ministers were absent.

What about Standing Order No. 5, Mr. Speaker? Standing Order No. 5, which is still part of our Standing Orders, very simply says:

> Every member is bound to attend the service of the House, unless leave of absence has been given him by the House.

I know, Sir, that this Standing Order has been taken under advisement by the Speaker. I know this matter has been raised on a number of occasions, but I believe this Standing Order was left in the rule book precisely for the reason to which I am alluding, namely, that no group of members may be absent from this House at any one time without the express consent of the House. But that is precisely what is happening under the roster system. When a group of members, especially a group comprising members on the treasury benches, are absent from this House then I, as a member of the House, am being deprived of my rights. This is nothing short of being deprived of my rights—it is contempt.

Mr. Jerome: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. McGrath: I would be glad to allow the Parliamentary Secretary to ask questions when I conclude my remarks.

The other provision I would ask the Standing Committee to take a long, hard look at, an earnest and sincere look at, is a provision which in my opinion is making the committee system inoperative in terms of providing collegiality, if you like, and expertise amongst the members of the committees. It is the provision whereby the membership of the committees can be changed. This is Standing Order 65(4)(b) which reads:

> Changes in the membership of any standing, joint or special committee may be affected by a notification thereof, signed by the member acting as the Chief Government Whip, being filed with the Clerk of the House who shall cause the same to be printed in the *Votes and Proceedings* of the House of that sitting, or of the next sitting thereafter, as the case may be.

That rule should go, Mr. Speaker. That rule must go if the committees of the House are to work effectively and if they are to work properly. Otherwise, we will continue to have this roving parliamentary goon squad which does nothing else but move into a committee where it feels the government is in trouble. This squad votes at the direction of the government, and then moves on to do its dirty work in the next committee.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McGrath: I say that is an obnoxious and reprehensible rule, and it should be taken out. If a member wants to get on a committee he should do so by resolution of this House. There is no other way that he should be allowed to sit in a committee which is charged with the responsibility of examining bills and the spending estimates of the government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[Mr. McGrath.]

Mr. McGrath: Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we at least give consideration to restoring just a part of our traditional rights and prerogatives. We can do this by making provision to bring back into Parliament certain predetermined departmental estimates, without any time limit on their passage. This would be done by agreement of the different house leaders. These estimates would come before Parliament, and would be examined by the committee of the whole house, without a time limit, so that members could give voice to their grievances, question government expenditures, and indeed withhold voting money for a department for that year unless they received a legitimate explanation with respect to their grievances.

If we did that you might see a lot more interest in this chamber by members of the Treasury Board than is now manifest.

Mr. Woolliams: And an effective opposition.

Mr. McGrath: And you would probably have a more effective opposition, more effective Members of Parliament. This institution would be restored to its traditional role. Mr. Speaker, democracy in Canada is indeed threatened. Democracy in Canada is threatened because the government chooses to do away with Parliament very surreptitiously by taking away its rights, prerogatives and privileges. Until these rights, prerogatives and privileges are restored, then parliamentary democracy in this country is a farce and freedom is threatened.

Mr. Jerome: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was kind enough to say he would permit a question at the end of his remarks. I wonder if the hon. member is in a position to commit his party to a general review of the rules by the Procedure Committee. That seems to be what he is anxious for, and I am sure he will find a good deal of support for that in the House. However, so far his party has resisted. Can the hon. member commit his party to having a general review of the rules by the Procedure Committee?

Mr. McGrath: Let me answer that question by asking the new Parliamentary Secretary if he is prepared to commit the government to the same?

Mr. Jerome: Certainly.

Mr. Ricard: What authority have you got?

Mr. Jerome: That isn't an answer.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. The hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Jerome) asked a question. He cannot make a speech at this time. I now call on the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Badanai).

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I should like to join those who preceded me in this debate in congratulating the mover (Mr. Trudel) and the seconder (Mr Douglas (Assiniboia)) of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne for their well conceived addresses. By all standards, the Speech from the Throne was one of the best to which I have had the privilege of

listening. In it we find the promise of legislation which translates into being the goal of a just society set by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) when he was chosen to lead the government two and a half years ago.

No one expected that members of the opposition would agree it was a good speech. According to them, it was an empty effort. Let us examine the emptiness of the declarations contained in it: the promise to provide adequate protection to Canadian consumers as a result of unfair trade practices; the planned provisions dealing with pollution, and the widening of the benefits of unemployment insurance; the revision of labour management relations and new labour standards for industries within federal jurisdiction; programs to establish national marketing boards to improve market potential for agricultural products; and the reorganization of the department concerned with environment about which the Prime Minister already acted today by appointing one of the ministers responsible for housing to be also in charge of this new department.

• (4:20 p.m.)

White papers will be presented to Parliament on income security, national defence, communications, citizenship and immigration. The value of these white papers cannot be underestimated. They are vehicles designed to involve interested Canadians in every walk of life in government policies, examples of which are the white papers on veterans affairs, tax reform, and the unemployment insurance. The tremendous response of the people to all of these has contributed to the decisions made and those yet to be made.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is this an indication of emptiness? Does this Throne Speech, as implied by members opposite hard pressed to find fault with it, fail to offer hope for the enactment of measures that would stimulate the economy, reduce unemployment, etc.? Within the limit of my time in this debate, I shall attempt to discuss a few subjects which I hope will be of interest to hon. members.

For some time now, I have noted disturbing trends such as an economic nationalism and a heavily disguised anti-Americanism in this country which, while not widespread, is nevertheless to be deplored by responsible Canadians. I regret that the Leader of the New Democratic Party—for whom I have great respect and to whom I wish to extend my congratulations as he celebrates today 35 years in public life, and may he enjoy many more years of active service—never misses an opportunity to blame the Americans for all the ills of the world. His special target is American investment in Canadian industries. He seems to harbour a pet hate against the United States, and he has recently demonstrated this attitude by criticizing the government for the sale of natural gas to our neighbour to the south, a sale which would bring $2 billion to Canada in the next few years.

I wonder if it has ever occurred to him and to his followers that friendly co-operation with the United States is a sure way to stimulate growth and bring prosperity to Canadians. Canada needs a great deal of investment capital to provide opportunities for expansion and a higher rate of employment.

Those who are indulging in the barren role of anti-Americanism would have the government withhold industrial incentive subsidies from U.S. companies which want to invest in underdeveloped regions of Canada. I congratulate the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) for treating equally all industrial concerns that can qualify under the act, regardless of whether they are Canadian, American, or of any other nationality. The unemployed certainly do not worry about who owns the shares and who will collect the dividends, if and when they are paid. They are simply concerned with a greater number of jobs in their community, bigger payrolls and more people to pay taxes for expanding municipal services.

Premier Bourassa of Quebec was in New York recently for the purpose of soliciting U.S. investors to put some of their money into his province. His major concern was to increase American investment in his province to finance a hydro electric development, for which he needs $2 billion, This development would ensure adequate supplies of electricity for Quebec, with a surplus being left available to help supply some eastern parts of the United States. I hope that he will convince the U.S. investors to accept his proposal which, in the end, would be in the interest of both countries.

While I am on this subject, I wish to quote an editorial which appeared in the Ottawa *Journal* of May 5, 1970. It reads as follows:

> The following basic premise is too often forgotten by the shriller anti-American voices:
>
> One fact of life that must be recognized is that Canada, if it continues to exist, will do so by sufferance of the United States. We shall continue as always to depend upon the United States forbearance. If the Americans turned ruthless, they could extinguish us. They are unlikely to do so by old fashioned military methods or positive economic sanctions, but by ceasing to take our economic interest into consideration they could make life for us as Canadians on our part of the continent unacceptable.
>
> Canadians may not like this "fact of life"; indeed, the resentment of it is one cause of anti-American attitude. But wishing will not change anything. Since the fact of life is inescapable, wise Canadian policy starts with the need to maintain, as Holmes says, "the basic goodwill of the Americans and their government".
>
> None of this is to say that we must support everything the U.S. does. But it does suggest an examination, an analysis, an enlightened arguing rather than the shrill response of the last few days to the Cambodian adventure. It does suggest that the CBC might not cater principally to the critics of United States policies; and it does suggest that the Commons might more usefully debate a matter after thinking about it rather than in the hot flush and confusion of surprise.

On June 13, 1970, the *Times Journal* of Thunder Bay, in my own constituency, had an editorial expressing similar sentiments on the subject. I wish to quote three short paragraphs from it as follows:

> Radio and television documentaries, editorialized newscasts and commentary programs being what they are, provide an ideal forum for anti-Americans, despite the fact they constitute a small minority of Canadians.

Some are transplanted Americans, others are Canadian born actors, writers, and others who've discovered their talents aren't duly appreciated on the U.S. side of the border and return to Canada frustrated and angry. Even an individual announcer with an anti-American streak can give a platitude a derisive note by the inflection of his voice.

And like it or not, this is the basis on which most Americans judge us on our attitudes—another instance of the silent majority being judged by the views of a few.

Last March I made the suggestion in the House that the time may come, when and if it is established beyond the shadow of a doubt that we could have a surplus of fresh water, when we can export this valuable commodity to the United States at a good profit. And why not? Since that time, I have seen nothing valid to change my views on the question.

The United States is our closest neighbour, our best customer, our main supplier, our major source of capital, and our shield against any possible military attack. The Hon. Lionel Chevrier, who was minister of justice when the Right Hon. Lester Pearson formed his government in April, 1963 and former Canadian High Commissioner to London, speaking to the Canadian Club in my constituency had this to say about Canadian-American relations:

• (4:30 p.m.)

We are pulled together by our bilateral trade relationship and by our joint defence efforts, not to mention the joint development of Canadian water resources.

He was referring to the Columbia River Treaty and the cultural exchange between our two countries. I wish to take this opportunity to congratulate the new Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Lang) on his onerous appointment to what I consider one of the most important cabinet positions. I express the hope that in following in the footsteps of his distinguished predecessor he may continue an aggressive immigration policy designed to fill this empty land of ours. This is still a country of few people. It still has a weak policy towards the acceptance of eager applicants who wish to be admitted to Canada as landed immigrants, notwithstanding some sincere efforts made by some previous ministers. I have stated before on several occasions, and I repeat now, that the Canadian government's immigration policy, while far better than that of former governments, is still like a cold water tap turned on and off according to the economic winds. I maintain that it is an arbitrary theory which defeats what ought to be the whole purpose of an immigration policy, the enrichment of national life, socially and economically, by a systematic flow of people. Australia, with half the number of habitants, admits nearly double the annual number of immigrants and pays their passage as well. Immigration has helped to give Australia a population of which 50 per cent is under the age of 21. At the present rate of admission, Canada remains a nation underpopulated, with whole regions seriously lacking sufficient people to provide those regions with the energy required for their development.

One of Canada's major industries has a problem that is rather unusual these days. Even though unemployment is high, the Canadian mining industry cannot get enough skilled, as well as unskilled, workers. The world demand for metals is growing steadily and Canada, being a major supplier of the world's requirements, has a social and international responsibility to continue to provide the world's needs which, at the same time, provide Canadians with employment and a higher standard of living. It has been reported that our birthrate is dropping, which is another important factor to be considered in relation to our growth.

I was pleased to note that the Throne Speech contains a promise of a white paper on immigration. I shall look forward to it with keen anticipation, coupled with great expectation, confident that it will spell out in no uncertain terms a new selection criteria designed to attract more people willing to help in our development.

A white paper on citizenship will be indeed welcome, because our present Citizenship Act contains a discriminatory section whereby a naturalized Canadian citizen under certain circumstances is subject to the loss of his citizenship. I submit that if a naturalized Canadian citizen were to commit an offence of a treasonable nature, there is a law that will take care of him. The same law would apply to a natural born Canadian citizen. The present Canadian Citizenship Act needs revision in another important aspect, which is this: at present citizenship is denied for various reasons which are not made clear to the applicant. I have in mind cases where applicants with a good reputation, with no police record and who have lived in Canada for more than 20 years, have had their applications for citizenship rejected time after time because at one time or another they have been members of certain organizations. I sincerely hope that the proposed white paper will indicate the repeal of these objectionable features in our present Citizenship Act.

The Prime Minister in his speech on Friday, October 9, indicated his concern for the plight of those on fixed incomes and said that something has to be done to alleviate a condition created by inflation, from which pensioners have suffered most. Increased benefits under the Canada Pension Plan and Old Age Security, effective on January 1, 1971, do not meet the increases in the cost of living. I, therefore, urge the government to consider, without delay, a reasonable upward revision of pension benefits in line with the reality of the rising cost of living index.

In a Speech from the Throne debate it is almost invariably the custom for a member to bring to the attention of the government some particular need of his electoral riding. I have a very special project to which I trust the government will give favourable consideration.

Fort William is the constituency that I have the honour to represent. It is an old city which, since amalgamation with the former sister city of Port Arthur, is now part of the city of Thunder Bay.

The Historical Society of Thunder Bay is composed of members dedicated to the preservation of its rich history, dating back 300 years. With the advent of the explorers Greysolon and Sier Dulhut, Fort Kaministigoyan was

built in 1687. It was later renamed Fort William after William Magillivray, one of the most distinguished governors of the Hudson's Bay Company. Here it was that a city was born, at a time when men developed a mystique about their land. The society has been active in a project to acquire the oldest surviving historic house built and occupied by the last factor, John McIntyre, of the Hudson's Bay Company post at Fort William. It is the hope of its members to restore this house as a living museum for this generation and generations yet unborn. The history of the early years of Fort William is best known because it was the rendezvous of the Northwest Company and because of the bitter rivalry with the Hudson's Bay Company.

When these two companies made peace in a merger of interests in the fur trading business, events of significance in the development of the modern city of Thunder Bay took place. John McIntyre was intimately associated with these developments. The life of this man spanned the great era of the fur trade and the early years of mining, railroading and agriculture. He lived in the spacious, white elegant house which he built. After retirement from his duties with the Hudson's Bay Company, he continued to serve the people of the district and the Government of Canada as Indian Agent, Customs Officer and Justice of the Peace. On behalf of the city of Thunder Bay, I appeal to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien), who is responsible for the restoration and establishment of historic sites, to look upon this project which is near and dear to the hearts of the people I represent in this House as being worthy of being among the monuments of our nation which record the events of the past for the benefit of future generations.

• (4:40 p.m.)

The government is certainly going to do something about pollution, but it must be borne in mind that this is not a new problem. It is a man-made condition detrimental to the environment and threatening to our well being. It is a problem about which we have become aware only recently. It is ironic that today those industries which are considered to be the great polluters have, in many cases, credible records of battles to protect the environment.

The Great Lakes Paper Company in my constituency has a good record in this regard. The Canadian pulp and paper industry has reduced the load of suspended solids in water by 60 per cent in the last seven or eight years. It has spent millions of dollars in a joint effort to combat air and water pollution, and intends to step up its battle against the problem.

Pollution, in the sense that it is being looked upon today, is almost a universal threat to all forms of life. It is a threat that must be met in co-operation with every industry, and with our neighbour to the south, as it affects our waters. But we must recognize that this problem was a long time developing and we cannot expect instant solutions. What we can expect is that the government will put into motion measures designed to prevent the problem from becoming worse. Then, having stopped it, it will be our job to see that our environment is reclaimed from present contamination. The battle against pollution is not going to be easy; it will take a long time, but persistence will eventually pay off. Some industries, such as pulp and paper, are making an honest effort to solve the problem and they deserve credit for trying.

The Throne Speech also made reference to the visit of the Royal Family to Manitoba, the Northwest Territories and Yukon. Next year, when British Columbia celebrates joining the Canadian Confederation one hundred years ago, Her Majesty, the Duke of Edinburgh and Princess Anne will join in the centennial celebrations.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Badanai: These royal visits bring to the attention of Canadians the value of the Crown. While I have lived in Canada practically all of my adult life, I was not born under a British flag. Nevertheless, I began to appreciate the British concept of justice and freedom. I join with the newly appointed Senator, Eugene Forsey, when he stated in an address to the United Services Institute:

> Let us have an end to ignorant chatter about the Monarchy having been imposed on us or the Fathers of Confederation having accepted it just because they were too timid or stupid or absent-minded to do anything else. We have a Monarchy because they uanimously insisted on it.
>
> The Monarchy is part of what makes our Canadian identity, makes us different from the United States and almost every other country in the two Americas.
>
> To substitute a republic would mean a political organ transplant, cutting out parts of ourselves and transplanting into our body politic something alien borrowed from other peoples with a different history, different traditions, different needs.

As a loyal subject of The Queen, I say in any revision of the Constitution let us uphold the principle of the Monarchy.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, before getting into the body of my speech, I cannot refrain from commenting on the observations of the previous speaker regarding the speech made by the leader of the New Democratic Party. The hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Badanai) suggested that the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) is anti-American. On his behalf, I would like to assert in unequivocal fashion that that is absurd. At the same time, I should like to assert that people who talk about building an independent Canada, achieving control of our own destiny, need not and indeed, for the majority, should not be seen as being anti-American or anti any other group or nation in this world. This is one of the most specious arguments to present against that view, suggesting that it is based on an anti feeling of any sort.

The hon. member for Fort William said that he was proud to be born under a British flag. I recall that was the argument with which he concluded. The very real danger that a number of us fear is that the hon. member might well die under an American flag. That is the issue. It is not a matter of being anti-American. It is a very

real, and I think legitimate, matter of concern for Canadians to preserve a distinctive Canadian society and Canadian nationhood. I hope we have heard the last of the kind of argument that he presented this afternoon against those who argue for a positive form of Canadian nationhood. I should like now to get into the main body of my comments.

The Speech from the Throne, in the opinion of some members, had some quaint and inappropriate phrases. I do not see them as such. There was a reference to a society as necessarily being "inspired by love and compassion" if it is to be worthy of the name of society. Further on, the same document calls for a society "which encourages imagination and daring, ingenuity and initiative". Again, in the text, there is reference to the importance of developing in Canada a spirit of friendship amongst our people.

Depending on the source, this kind of phraseology could be seen as merely platitudeness or as a genuine expression of some deeply felt intention, the kind of phrase that one now finds Rotarians and Socialists alike using. One has to make an assessment of the source in order to reach a serious judgment about the intent behind the phrase. I do not dismiss in any cynical fashion phrases of this nature which are found in the Speech from the Throne. To try to build a society with many of the characteristics of friendships, one which is conducive to producing people that are imaginative and daring, is something we should all try to achieve. What we should do now is pass serious judgment on the government's performance; how well it has established its record and decide whether it is to be believed to be likely to act to implement these goals.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has established himself very clearly as one of the most powerful Prime Ministers in Canadian history. He has the largest staff of any Prime Minister in Canadian history. He has established regional desks. He has reasserted the principle of cabinet solidarity and secrecy and has streamlined the organization of cabinet. All of these changes I think are desirable. All should contribute to effective government. In addition, the Prime Minister has improved or expanded his position of influence in the country by very effective and adept use of television and by very intelligently planned, well spaced trips around the country. He has communicated with the people of Canada. He has attempted to justify what he is doing. He has built his personal popularity and, therefore, his power as Prime Minister.

All of this taken together has established the Prime Minister as the most powerful head of government in Canada since Mackenzie King. I find nothing undesirable about what he has done to build up his position of power within the cabinet and within the office of the Prime Minister. In my view, it is constitutionally legitimate. From a democratic point of view it is quite sound.

The serious question we must put to the Prime Minister is not how he has built up his power, since that is essentially trivial for a man seriously concerned about what is taking place in Canadian society, but how he is using that power to bring about the objectives stated in the Speech from the Throne presented to the members of this House and to the Senate. That is the serious question. If we are going to pass judgment or make Canadians guess about what this government is likely to do, the best we can do is look at its record in this area.

• (4:50 p.m.)

The Prime Minister has been in office over two years. He has had plenty of time to clearly establish for us and the people of Canada a certain pattern of behaviour and to establish certain expectations about what he is likely to do in the way of implementing the serious and desirable goals alluded to in the Speech from the Throne. I suggest that in the last two years the Prime Minister has accomplished almost nothing which could be described as contributing to these ends. We have seen during that period only four complex bills, two of which were hangovers from the previous Liberal administration. The first was the languages bill, a desirable item in the main and one which was accepted by the majority in all parties. The second was the omnibus bill amending the Criminal Code. Again, most parts of this measure were accepted by majorities in all the parties. I repeat, each of these pieces of legislation was a hangover from the Pearson administration.

The only other measures of any complexity introduced in more than two years of government were the Regional Development Incentives Act and the Canada Water Act. The first was good in principle and this party supported it, but the amount of money devoted to making it effective in the areas of Canada which most need assistance was about enough to buy a weekly subscription to a newspaper for every poor person in Canada. The Canada Water Act, a quaint piece of legislation which took up many weeks of parliamentary time last session was deficient in two crucially important areas. In the first place, it failed to set universal standards for pollution control; amendments which would have rectified this error were put forward on behalf of the New Democratic Party but were turned down. Second, the bill contained nothing which would have obliged the cabinet to bring before this House any proposal for the export of Canadian water to the United States. The New Democratic Party put forward an amendment which would have made this procedure mandatory, but again the Liberal government in its wisdom turned it down.

This, in my view, is the legislative record of the Trudeau government in the past two years. Let us turn, now, to an examination of the government's record in terms of policy decisions. I suggest it is, if anything, worse. Consider something which is very real and very important to millions of Canadians—housing. I would remind you, Mr. Speaker, that at the present time 20 per cent of Canadian homes lack flush toilets and another 20 per cent lack either a shower or a bathtub. In metropolitan Toronto alone, 22,000 families are on the waiting list for public housing right now. In terms of housing, in the opinion of the Canadian Welfare Council, and I am quoting, there is

now "an emergency for people of low income and a serious problem for middle income Canadians."

The current rate of starts, about which the government boasts, is some 180,000 a year but the Canadian Welfare Council says that even if 250,000 new homes—the target figure—were built each year for the next five years we should still fail to meet the immediate basic needs of all the Canadians who are doing without adequate housing or who are living in grotesquely inadequate housing.

What kind of people are able to buy, and live in, new housing today? The figures for home ownership by low income families have shown a marked change in the last five years. In 1965 people in the lower third of the Canadian income scale owned 17.9 per cent of the houses. Last year the figure had fallen to 6.4 per cent, a decline of some two-thirds. Let us bear in mind for a minute or so the significance of these statistics. They mean that thousands of low income Canadians see no prospect of owning their own homes; their number is rapidly increasing when it should be decreasing. Who, then, is getting the benefit of NHA subsidies, that is, of federal subsidies made possible by taxing the people of Canada as a whole? We find it is the rich who are being subsidized when they buy houses, not the average man or the poor. The average income last year of those receiving NHA mortgages was $10,810. I do not need to tell hon. members of this House how many people of Canada fall into this category. It means that the taxpayers' money is being used to subsidize the rich. It means that the poor people and the average people are not able to buy homes under the NHA. And this situation has not been changed during the term of office of the Trudeau government; in fact, it has become worse.

There is an alternative. It is that we subsidize NHA loans at 5 or 6 per cent for average or low income families and make sure that they get these loans first. We should prevent those earning higher incomes from getting them until the needs of our poorer citizens have been met. Second, banks, trust companies and mortgage loan companies should be required by law to put more money into housing. This could be brought about by amending existing acts of this Parliament. Something could and should be done now along these lines. Third, we need a great and immediate expansion of public housing. In 1969, only 3.9 per cent of all housing starts were in the public housing field. The federal government spent only $12.6 million in this field, amounting only to 60 cents per capita. And this, to repeat a point I made some minutes ago, is the situation in a country in which some 20 per cent of the people are badly housed or else housed in conditions vastly inferior to those in which the majority of Canadians are living, and where in one metropolitan centre alone some 22,000 families cannot get suitable homes. The federal government should immediately put money into this area, particularly to meet the needs of those in the larger cities.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Let us leave housing and take a look at this great progressive government's proposals for tax reform. These proposals came from the Prime Minister, a man who talks of the importance of friendship, community and so on. What do we find? In the white paper presented to this Parliament we find proposals for tax reform. I do not say that literally, of course, but with some degree of irony.

One proposal is to reduce income tax paid by all those earning more than $35,000 a year. At the same time, people living at the poverty level in Canada are still taxed. Under the new proposals, a man earning $100,000 a year would save some $5,000 income tax. I pointed this out to a Liberal colleague, who will go unnamed. I said to him: "My friend, that great progressive party led by the Prime Minister keeps taxing the poor, as defined by the Economic Council of Canada, and don't you find this bizarre when a man who earns $100,000 a year will have his income tax reduced by $5,000?". He replied: "Well, Ed, you don't understand politics". That seems clear. So I said: "Well, maybe I do not understand politics".

Following that I did a little more thinking and I now think I understand the reason. My friend said to me: "Don't you see that we are introducing a capital gains tax in Canada?". We are the only country in the western world that does not have a capital gains tax! He went on: "(So we cannot really tax those poor people who are struggling to get by on incomes beyond the $35,000 a year level. We cannot impose on them a capital gains tax with the left hand without reducing with the right hand their level of income tax".

What this seems to suggest to me is that the Liberal party of Canada is saying, consciously or unconsciously, to its wealthy contributors: "Don't switch your allegiance to another political party. Don't abandon us or leave us in the lurch, you people who live in the middle class suburbs. We are not going to hit you too hard. We will reduce your income tax even if we do introduce a capital gains tax". This seems to me to suggest that the words in the Speech from the Throne are cynical, that they were written by those who really do not intend to redistribute power and income in this country.

What else do we find in the white paper? We find a proposal to give special tax credits to people who own shares in private companies, but no such credits to those who have purchased public bonds. Once again, this is important to the poor and to those of average income, because public facilities, whether they be a park, a hospital, a school, a community theatre—you name it—are shared by all Canadians on the basis of equality. Whether a child's parents are rich or poor, he can enjoy all of these facilities.

Real social progress, in my view, is achieved by expanding the public sector, by providing more such facilities on an egalitarian basis so that our children can grow up in a non-competitive way, knowing that many of the essential requisites of a civilized society are provided by the community, as they are presently provided as a matter of right only to the children of the wealthy.

The white paper on taxation proposes to maintain special tax incentives for investment in the private sector

but not the public sector. This seems to me clearly to reveal the commitment of the Liberal party to the economic status quo. Those who attack the white paper for being a socialist document are, to say the least, a little misguided.

Finally, the white paper does nothing to bring about a real shift of the tax burden away from indirect taxation and toward corporate and income taxes. Canadians pay 52 per cent of all tax revenues by an indirect means. Both rich and poor Canadians pay the same form of indirect taxes. This is not the case with the corporate and income tax structure. Any reform that was directed toward the well-being of the average and poor families of Canada would have proposed some changes in this regard, a move away from reliance on indirect taxes, yet none are to be found in the white paper. An NDP government would have made shifts in all of these directions, shifts that the government, if it had so desired, could have made.

To turn to a different area, another practical day to day measure that involves people in our society is manpower retraining. We find all kinds of negative aspects of the manpower retraining program have lingered—I repeat, lingered—during the term of office of the Trudeau government. For example, at the present time an unemployed miner in Cape Breton of less than grade 5 or grade 6 education has virtually no realistic chance of completing a manpower retraining program to bring him up to a skilled level because there is a ceiling of 52 weeks on the amount of academic training that he can take in the program. In other words, the manpower retraining program is effective only for those who do not need it as badly as others, those who are half way there. It is useless for those at the bottom. In this respect we proposed a change, but it was not accepted.

Similarly, the manpower retraining act provides that only those who have been in the labour market for three years are eligible for retraining. This means that the young people of the country, the Métis, Eskimos and Indians, are effectively excluded under the act. I do not have to remind hon. members that the unemployment rate among the young is the highest of all age categories, and the rate is increasing. This is a change that should and could have been made by a progressive Prime Minister, but which was not.

Finally, under the manpower retraining program a man or woman with a family is given an allowance for the duration of the course. However, this allowance has not been changed for years. In other words, a man with a family taking a course has to live on an allowance that is at the poverty level as defined by the Economic Council of Canada. Once again, the NDP argued for a change in this regard so as to enable a man, not to live in affluence but on an income that would allow him to pay his rent and to buy food for his family while he undergoes retraining. But our proposal was turned down by the Trudeau government.

The policy that characterises this government more than any other is the government's magnificent war on inflation. There was no justification for launching this war. Our trade figures have been getting better for the last two or three years. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson), in his folksy way yesterday, pointed with great pride to the most recent trade figures showing that Canada is doing very well in terms of international trade. But we are not doing well for the reasons that he seemed to suggest, namely the austerity program. We are doing well on the basis of orders that were placed a long time ago, before his anti-inflation program. So the anti-inflation program was not justified by our trade figures. They could be and are an important reason for tightening up. But trade figures at the time did not warrant it. What did justify it? One argument that was used related to the increase in prices which affects our pensioners and unorganized workers. I will come back to that in a moment.

• (5:10 p.m.)

One method the government used which need not have been chosen to fight that battle was the tightening of the monetary and fiscal screws. What effect did that have? Once again, it affected the public sector. It affected hospital building, school building, municipal street construction and so on. It did not affect in any significant way whatsoever the private sector of this country. It did not inhibit the construction of offices or the expansion of automobile factories and so on. Once again the people who were affected were those who most benefit by public facilities and public expenditures—all the average and poor in this country. The private sector was negligibly affected.

What is the reason for this? I should have thought the Prime Minister, who spent some time at the London School of Economics and even trotted off to Harvard for a while, would have realized that the modern corporation in Canada does not go to the market for most of its financing and does not respond in the main to the so-called market forces. General Motors in my constituency, for example, did not lower its prices. It did not cease to expand because of the Prime Minister's anti-inflation policy. The reason it did not, of course, is that it has operations all over the world. It does not just make cars and sell them in Canada. It is producing in the Argentine, Australia, West Germany and Great Britain. General Motors is only symptomatic of all big international corporations.

General Motors, in effect, said to our Prime Minister: Look, fellow, you have your quaint, old fashioned fiscal and monetary policy but we operate on a global basis. It is true that automobile purchases might drop. That is bound to be true with 750,000 Canadians out of work. You can be sure that will affect the rate of purchases of automobiles but it will not affect the pricing policies of General Motors. General Motors, in effect, says it will just sit this out because it is planning for profits not for the next year or for two years but for the next decade. General Motors is not only planning for profits in this country, General Motors is planning profit expectations determined on a global basis. General Motors, and all other major corporations in this country can sit back and ignore the Prime Minister, Mr. Young, the Minister of

Finance (Mr. Benson) and all those caught up in this quaint, old fashioned type of economic policy.

This policy did not affect the prices established in industries that are foreign owned or of an international nature. However, it certainly reduced our growth rate and it certainly did create the highest level of unemployment in a decade. I have been informed by a private source that when the figures for September are released we will see another increase in unemployment. Unemployment in Canada in September was 6.9 per cent, which is another increase in the number of Canadians out of work, with the consequential suffering families. That is the result of a needless anti-inflation policy, a policy which would not have been initiated by a Prime Minister who really intended to do something about those laudable goals referred to in the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for the hon. member to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Speaker, I thank hon. members and will try to conclude quickly. The other method used by the government to fight inflation was, of course, the 6 per cent guideline policy. I will be quick on this point because of the courtesy shown me by the House.

The point I want to make is that it was completely ineffective and that should be clearly known throughout the country. Again in this House the other day, the Minister of Finance referred to the efficacy of this great program. The fact is that we had settlements in the private sector up until August 1, 1970 averaging 8.5 per cent, well beyond the guideline. The way this policy did affect the working people was through the public sector, because the government could control that. The average wage settlement in the public sector up to August 1 was 5.5 per cent, below the guideline.

The postal unions, to their credit because they were a militant group, broke the guideline and got a settlement which exceeded the 6 per cent level. The point I make here is that all the verbiage which went into justifying and explaining this guideline policy—not justified in the first place—was a cover up for a program which had no effect on most Canadians but which did affect in a serious way public employees.

The President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury), after the postal strike, and after spending $30 million of taxpayers' money—that is what the post office lost trying to break that strike—had the gall, and I think that is the right word in a free society, to suggest that collective bargaining was now an anachronism. Any private company would have settled this strike long before the government did because it would have seen the drain on its cash. The President of the Treasury Board spent, and I say this deliberately, $30 million of the taxpayers' money in trying to break that strike.

This was not serious bargaining and that is the opinion of the working people of this country. This was part of the war against these working people. The war on inflation was not needed and not required in any way. It was fought by techniques that did not work. They have had no effect, quite contrary to what the government suggests. The reduction in prices I suggest is due to quite different causes.

I should like to draw these observations to a conclusion by suggesting there is no good reason at all for the people in Canada to take seriously the laudable objectives stated in the Speech from the Throne. This is true if we use as a test, and it is the only test available, the record of this government for the past two years. We have seen it in respect of housing, the manpower retraining programs, the proposals for taxation, and in the government's vicious anti-labour campaign. We have seen an attitude on the part of this government not designed in any way to cohere with what should be the ultimate objective of a democratic government; that is, to use political power for the benefit of the average and the poor. There is no reason to expect a change. Therefore, I suggest that in the days and months ahead the Liberal backbenchers of this government should talk to their Prime Minister. They should say to him, get away from your tough minded speeches, get away from your merely colourful existence and start doing something about the well-being of the average Canadian.

• (5:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, with my first words at the beginning of the 3rd session of the 28th Parliament, I want to offer you my respectful greetings and assure the Chair of the constant co-operation of the Ralliement Créditiste.

Secondly, I take this opportunity to congratulate, as is customary, the movers of the Address in reply to the Throne Speech (Mr. Trudel and Mr. Douglas).

Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech, the Liberal government has presented the general program of the 3rd session, which comprises about 68 various bills. They also announce the publication of White Papers on communications, citizenship, immigration, national defence and income security.

As several other members said, it will be difficult to assess the various bills sponsored by the government before we know their content. But even now, basing our judgment on the experience of the two previous sessions, we can imagine the spirit and the great principles which will guide this government.

In short, it is nothing new; it is nothing more or less than the repetition of an old slogan never carried out, that of the just society and, in this connection here is

what the Speech from the Throne calls upon us to do, and I quote:

—to share the excitement, to face the challenge, to pursue the distant ideal of a just society.

Mr. Speaker, the Canadian people shy away neither from excitement nor challenge and their most fervent desire is to see the advent of this just society which every citizen legitimately craves. But our population is on the brink of despair and I am altogether convinced that the social stability referred to in the Speech from the Throne and considered as already achieved is in fact only wishful thinking. Indeed not only do several thousands Quebecers and other Canadians unfortunately doubt the merit of the federal system and protest against it during electoral campaigns, but thousands of English-speaking citizens are doubtful about the usefulness of Canada as a separate entity, bearing in mind regional disparities, what they gain from it and what they pay for it. And this national disintegration, which no one can deny, will go on as long as our governments ignore the legitimate aspirations of our fellow-citizens, both in the social and the economic fields.

Protests, as a phenomenon, are not about to disappear because they are the result of a deep feeling of frustration. May I list some of the causes: increasing unemployment, lack of decent housing, closing-down of some plants, excessively high interest rates, social injustices of which thousands of citizens are victims, and many others of this type.

As long as our governments do not ensure, through concrete economic measures, the sound and normal development of each citizen, without at the same time adversely affecting economic liberty and security, a stable social climate, such as that in the existence of which the Throne Speech would have us believe, will not

Discontent is so widespread that people cannot endorse the idealized and unrealistic content of the Speech from the Throne.

This government is noticing it itself. In fact, we can read in the same speech and I quote:

—Canada faces a new age; an age which will be subject to forces not all of which are yet comprehended or understood, forces which will proceed from external as well as internal origins.

Mr. Speaker, the wide spread phenomenon of protest in which an ever increasing number of citizens from all walks of life take part is a real fact and a power which governments, in particular the federal government, must acknowledge and compromise with. If the federal government keeps hiding in its ivory tower, refusing to recognize the daily reality with the ugly and frustrating aspect it takes for the greatness of the liberal party, this phenomenon will keep growing, and it is not sure whether the established order will last. Current events show where frustrating feelings may lead.

Besides, the government is aware of the situation while not doing anything to cope with it. I quote the Speech from the Throne:

It is a new age not so much because of changed circumstances, but new because of changed values and attitudes.

Because of the clash between these new values and the old, because of the quest by the young and the disillusioned for some resolution of attitudes, we live in a period of tenseness and unease.

It goes on as follows:

It is an age frequented by violence as desperate men seek ill-defined goals.

In short, it is a period of frustration. But it is not good enough to recognize the evil. There most be a reaction, and not necessarily by resorting to force.

The people are not asking for hand-outs, but merely for their most legitimate rights, which are security of income, freedom of the individual within security and order, the opportunity for the individual to fulfill himself socially, economically and culturally, and finally the possibility for each citizen to get his fair share of the national production.

A study of the list of bills to be introduced shows, once more and once too often, that the present government is increasingly remote from reality, entrenched in its complacency and in an attitude or self-sufficiency which is highly offensive to the Canadian people, mainly the young ones who expect more than words, more than academic statements, more than stuffy sentences which are so numerous in the Speech from the Throne.

This government was elected two years ago and we are still waiting for the first positive step that would prove that the government actually wants to achieve the just society. I do not believe at all in this just society mentioned in all the speeches of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). I do not believe in this just society as advocated by the Prime Minister because everywere in Canada there is misery in the midst of plenty. In fact, everywere in Canada, poverty, unemployment, slums, starvation wages, employees crushed by their bosses, uncertainty about income, political patronage, policies that discourage initiative and ambition such, as for instance, the dairy or grain policies, are a continuing scandal in a country which still is bursting with resources and offers plenty of opportunities.

No, Mr. Speaker, we do not believe in this just society and we look forward to the day when the government will listen to our Social Credit proposals. Our task is to build a country, not to create frustration for our people.

I do not believe in Prime Minister Trudeau's just society because I can see all over Canada young people dejected at not finding suitable jobs that could enlist their knowledge and their energy in the service of their country. I do not believe in this just society because the vast majority of our students have been unable to find jobs this last summer, and after they complete their education, nothing is changed; because all over the country, the people of Canada have had enough of this mock fight against inflation which the government carries on the back of the small taxpayer, of the labourer, in short, on the back of all those who cannot afford to withstand the effects of such restrictive and limiting policy.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, the immediate result of the sham fight against inflation that the government undertook last year was to send the unemployment rate sky-rocketing, thus preventing young people and grown-ups, fathers and students, old people and children from sharing fully in our rich production, from getting their share of national production, with the result that they are poorer and more dissatisfied. The government is responsible for that on account of its false policy on inflation.

Besides, this is a scandalous situation to be in, in a country as rich as ours.

In such a critical and desperate situation, the Créditistes have kept saying over and over again that every Canadian must have his share of the national production. We suggest that this should come about in a near future, otherwise things will get out of control in Canada. It is not a matter of taking away from those who have to give more to those who have not, as suggested by socialists, but of acknowledging everybody's right to his share of the national production. To achieve that, Mr. Speaker, changes will have to be made in the present monetary system.

Here is another extract from the Speech from the Throne:

> It remains the goal of the Government to be concerned with the production of wealth. It also remains the goal of the Government that Canadians be given the opportunity to enjoy that wealth.

That is an example at a bombastic but meaningless speech. I go on with my quotation:

> Income security programmes offer one means by which this latter goal can be attained. To this end legislation will be introduced.

Mr. Speaker, that is an indirect way of announcing what the Ralliement Créditiste has always been clamouring for, that is the vital minimum. The Ralliement Créditiste has always maintained that every citizen should have his share of the national wealth and production, through a national dividend of the compensated discount.

Since the government has announced that they will be concerned with these matters, we dare sincerely hope, at the beginning of this session, that they will study the Créditiste proposals in this connection. Whatever the suggestions of the government members, there is certainly something good in the philosophy put forward by the Créditistes.

We recognize that human beings must be free and respected in order to enjoy security and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, in the hours which we live now it is most tragic that this freedom is being eroded by the deliberate interference of the right hon. Prime Minister and this is due to a situation for which he is himself responsible.

We recognize that for a society to be just each human being must get his share of the national production or, in other words, a guaranteed minimum income. We recognize that our society will be truly human only when all our legislation will be focused on the well-being of the human person.

Social Credit provides the true and up-to-date answer to the problems faced by our society. Social Credit is truly the tool which would make it possible for every human being to get his share of the wealth through the national dividend.

The Social Credit, as I said before, provides the government with a solution in its search for a just society which will become a reality only if we seriously tackle the economic and monetary aspects of the question.

Once more the government agrees with the Créditistes when it says in the Speech from the Throne, and I quote:

> However worthy our goals, and however strong our will to attain them, they will nevertheless be denied to us in whole or in part should our economy be malfunctioning.

Mr. Speaker, this is why the members of the Ralliement Créditiste are so anxious to know what legislation will be introduced in that respect, if however the government is really conscious of the problem as it leads us to believe in the Speech from the Throne.

When we look at the list of 68 bills which are referred to, we notice that if, on the one hand, the government puts its finger on the major problems facing our country at this time, on the other hand, it does not offer any appropriate measure to actually solve them.

Everything in the Speech from the Throne is but rhetoric, because it is full of grandiloquent and bombastic sentences. Here is an example, and I quote:

> This stability is not simply a matter of luck. Good fortune is a factor, but we should accept gracefully the fact that we are also more amenable to reason and, perhaps, more capable of wise decision than we are normally willing to admit.

Mr. Speaker, to say such words is to laugh in the face of Canadians. Here is one of those bombastic sentences which make the people despair of ever finding a dynamic government, or seeing the government take concrete action in order to bring about a just society.

And there is more. The Speech from the Throne ends on this line worthy of a lyric comedy, and I quote:

> We stand on the threshold of greatness.

Mr. Speaker, this is ridiculous! It is to make fun of the people to utter such bombastic and empty sentences, which show to what extent this government has lost touch with everyday reality in the exercise of power. The numerical strength of this government makes it forget its weaknesses in action, and indeed that is the drama of this administration.

Mr. Speaker, it is therefore not surprising to realize that large sectors of our Canadian population are dissatisfied, impatient, and that they question the efficiency of the democratic means used to improve society, in order to make it more human, more just and more sociable.

That is why the Ralliement créditiste has tried harder than ever to offer a clear, precise and modern answer to the normal problems of a modern economy.

All the time, we have stressed national production and the means to increase it. Through our policies of assistance to industry and subsidies of all kinds, the productive sector of our economy has increased its efforts and efficiency, so that gradually, the machine has replaced man at an accelerated yet normal rate.

The citizen, who was above all a producer, progressively became isolated from production and, thus, the security of his income was jeopardized.

The Ralliement créditiste has always maintained not only that human beings produce wealth, but that they also are agents of consumption and that, consequently, the first responsibility of any government is to ensure human being security of income or, in créditiste terms, a minimum income so that they may have their share of the national wealth.

But this can only be achieved through a thorough monetary reform with a view to, at long last, having money serve man. Our needs are ever increasing. The cost of living keeps going up. Unemployment is beyond control because of the government, and this is inevitable in the present economic situation because of the modernization of our industries which tend to produce more at lower costs.

As a result, human beings are once again denied their share of the wealth as consumers.

Mr. Speaker, a national dividend and compensated discount are precisely the type of legislative and monetary measures that would enable every citizen to get his share of the wealth and to play his full role as a consumer. We claim, and rightly so, that only in consumption does production achieve its goal and value.

During the third session of the twenty-eighth parliament, in view of the present economic situation, we will endeavour with renewed vigor to make the government understand the importance of the consumer, of every Canadian citizen, and the urgency for the members, regardless of their political affiliations, to adopt legislation to ensure every citizen his rightful share of the national product.

Mr. Speaker, more than ever we, parliamentarians, must give priority to the interest of the citizens over political interests, and fulfil our role as spokesmen for the Canadian people in this supreme institution of parliament, that the people might renew their confidence in democratic institutions.

The old man who must be content with his meagre pension to survive, the mother who is scoffed at each time she cashes her family allowance cheque for $6 or $8 a month in 1970, the student who year after year is refused a scholarship and must go into debt and who during the summer months tried to work but could not find employment, the unemployed who spends his days going from one manpower centre to another, from one counselor to another, and spends his evenings completing his education with other adults and who, finally, is a gain refused a job, the industrial milk producer discouraged in his attempts to improve his herd and his production, whose income is limited and who, besides, is taxed for his work, and who gives up one day or the other, dairy production, the wheat producer who is paid for not producing, all Canadians expect us, parliamentarians, to do more than just make speeches.

• (5:40 p.m.)

If we should continue to be satisfied to listen to such empty speeches from the throne as the one we have heard recently, it would not be surprising to see the feelings of frustration now shared by thousands of Canadians change to feelings of anger and revolt.

It is not sure that the peace and social stability referred to in the Speech from the Throne will be our lot for very long.

Mr. Speaker, I am worried about the economic and social future of our country if the government does not immediately take concrete steps to satisfy those thousands of Canadians who at present are denied their share of the national production.

Seconded by the member for Bellechasse (Mr. Lambert), I should like to move following sub-amendment to the amendment proposed by the official opposition:

That the amendment be amended by replacing the final period by a coma and by adding, immediately after, the following words:

"and we particularly regret the failure of the government to increase family allowances as a first step towards the establishment of a system ensuring a guaranteed annual income which would facilitate the advent of a just society.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Hon. members have heard the amendment moved by the hon. member for Lotbinière.

[*Translation*]

I would like to ask the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) if he has completed his remarks.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I was just reaching the end.

To really show the significance of this subamendment and also the importance of stopping fighting inflation on the back of the Canadian taxpayer, it is necessary to understand the contents of this subamendment. Interest rates are excessively high and they should be reduced.

In the constituency of Lotbinière, *La Fonderie de Sainte-Croix* needs coal which it buys from its supplier, Lasalle Coke Company. Besides, it is the only supplier of the kind in Canada.

The cost of a net ton of foundry-size coal was $38.25 in 1966, and $38.75 in 1967. The same ton cost $40.25 in 1968, $43.25 in 1969, $48.25 last March 23, and $59.25 on September 29. Therefore, the directors of *La Fonderie Sainte-Croix* are getting worried about that, and rightly so, since their costs have greatly increased. This is a factor of inflation, according to the reports of the Young Commission.

I obliged to the request of the directors of *La Fonderie Sainte-Croix*. Upon the request of the Lasalle Coke Com-

pany, I got in touch with members of the Prices and Incomes Commission to let them know about the steady and uncontrollable increase of coal and the control the companies have on that product.

I therefore wrote to the Prices and Incomes Commission asking for action, as increases are in fact about 10 per cent every time, which is tremendous.

Well, here is the answer from the Prices and Incomes Commission dated April 30th 1970 to a request made on March 23rd.

On March 23rd, the price of coal had gone up 10 per cent per ton. We therefore lodged a complaint and received from the Prices and Incomes Commission the following reply, and I quote:

We acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 14th in which you inform us of the recent increase in the price of smelting coke.

We called your office on April 21st to let you know that we were preparing our reply. Lasalle, the supplier, has informed the Commission that the increase in price of $5 per ton as of April 1st 1970 was due to recent advances in the cost of raw materials.

To our knowledge, the Lasalle Co. purchases large quantities of coal in the United States. Coal prices have increased by as much as 44 per cent, without taking into account tariff rises on goods in the United States.

Considering that one ton of coal produces only half a ton of coke, it is obvious that the increase in price by Lasalle will barely cover the cost of the coal.

Lasalle's production costs, labour included, have also gone up considerably. Furthermore, the price of coal may rise again later in the year when the miners receive the last increase provided for in their present agreement.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the Lasalle Co. that said that the price would rise again, it is the Prices and Incomes Commission. And that was said on April 30, at which time there had been a 10 per cent rise in the price of a ton of coal. With the blessing of the Prices and Incomes Commission, the Lasalle Co., once again, on September 29, announces another increase in the price of coal of about 10 per cent, thus bringing the price to $55.25 a ton. This means that in 1966, it was $38.25 and $55.25 in 1970.

I sent a copy of this answer to the Fonderie Sainte-Croix as a proof of the steps we had taken. They evidently protested and rightly so.

If the government cannot control this increase, if the Prices and Incomes Commission can only consider without making any suggestion, without proposing any solution, this means that the fight against inflation by the government is only a joke. In fact, it would have been possible to tell the coke company that a 30 per cent increase per year on the price of a ton of coal was too much.

As a result, the prices of products manufactured by La Fonderie Sainte-Croix, which employs 135 workmen, are increasing at a galloping rate.

That is why I say that the fight against inflation, in the light of experience acquired in our respective districts, is a monumental hoax and that the government cannot disprove it. Let us take as an example La Fonderie Sainte-Croix, which must submit to the increases of The Lasalle Coke Company, which in turn will probably have to increase its costs some day.

In reply to a question put by an hon. member, the Prices and Incomes Commission could give no better explanation of the situation than a statement to the effect that they hope there will be no further increase or, at least, that they do not anticipate any.

Mr. Speaker, the *Ralliement créditiste* moves an amendment in order to remind the government that in raising the spectre of inflation, it succeeds at the most in making our people believe that they can be destroyed by it. What a laugh, as inflation is being fought on the back of Canadian taxpayers, especially the little people.

Therefore, we want to remind the government that family allowances, in particular, have not been raised for quite a while, being still at $6 and $8 per month, which is ridiculous, considering that the government approves increases in production of 30% per *year* for a single company.

Mr. Speaker, if the government can allow private enterprises to keep on increasing their prices in such a way, thus raising the cost of living, it should realize that, on the other hand, the people of Canada cannot live on peanuts, that children cannot be fed with prayers. The rate of unemployment and the lack of income for these people are well known. The authorities should once and for all acknowledge that these people need financial support from the government to fight inflation in their own right and to cope with the cost of living increases backed up by the government.

Those are the reasons why, Mr. Speaker, by way of this sub-amendment, we assert that the Speech from the Throne does not forecast any positive or forthcoming action to revise family allowances and we want to urge the hon. members and ministers to ponder over the issue and to submit a bill during this session to increase family allowances, because we still claim that the basic unit in Canada is the family. It is high time for the government to take a concrete step to encourage the raising of families instead of discouraging it as it is doing now with all kinds of measures.

The basic unity, the family, is still the best guardian of our values, of our traditions and of order in Canada. This government, by measures such as those on abortion or the fight against inflation, which end up by increasing unemployment, are depriving family heads from their means of living, etc.

If a student is unable to obtain a scholarship or to find work, his father is obliged to go into debt. The mother is often compelled to borrow money to buy food for the family. If the father cannot afford a car to drive to his place of work, he must borrow. Then, the basic unity in Canada is no longer the family but the finance company.

It is high time that the government takes sides with the citizens and not with the companies. It has to take sides with the human person and not with the finance companies so that at last man can find his place within this system. Indeed, money has to be in man's service. Man has not always to creep before money.

Considering that it is important and necessary to give back to the Canadian family its prime importance in order to encourage the parents who have at present so much difficulty in enforcing order and justice, it is important that the government realizes the urgency of the situation and proposes a measure to increase family allowances up to an adequate level.

It would be better—and I say so straight out—not to pay any family allowances at all than to give $6 or $8 a month, because it is more or less to laugh at people.

I know that for a family of ten children the amount paid may sound interesting, because these allowances represent $60 or $80, but a family of ten has even more financial responsibilities than a family of three.

I renew this request on behalf of my colleagues in the sincere hope that base party interests will be overlooked and that, at least, once during this session, we will consider the interests of the Canadian family, of the human person, in order to achieve in our society law and order and to allow every human being to live in freedom and to enjoy political, social and especially economic security.

In conclusion, I want to thank my colleagues for their attention and patience towards me and to assure them of the co-operation of the members of our party during the debates of the House, hoping finally that the work of this session will benefit the whole population, in particular the voters whom I represent, those of the electoral district of Lotbinière.

• (5:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, many previous speakers complained about the lack of members in the House. I do not mind that, prefering to speak to a small group. I think that is a little more intimate. I wonder if Your Honour would mind calling it six o'clock. There are only a few minutes left.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Does the House agree to calling it six o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): It being six o'clock, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at eleven o'clock pursuant to section 2 of Standing Order 2.

At six o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, October 15, 1970

The House met at 11 a.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

CALLING OF MOTION TO APPOINT SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE CONSTITUTION OF CANADA

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, we have had further discussions with regard to the re-establishment of the Special Joint Committee on the Constitution of Canada. As a result of these discussions there may be unanimous consent for an order that would provide that the first item of business called today would be the motion under government orders to re-establish the Special Joint Committee on the Constitution.

• (11:10 a.m.)

After this motion has been discussed for perhaps one or two hours, notwithstanding Standing Order 38(2), the address debate will continue for the rest of the day. This day will be regarded as the fourth appointed day. There will be a division as scheduled at 9.30 p.m. this evening. Monday next will be the sixth appointed day. There will be a division at 9.30 p.m. on that day. In other words, despite the interruption of the debate for a short time today, we are providing that the votes will take place at the normal time. We also undertake that the time lost because of discussion of the motion to establish the Special Joint Committee of the Constitution will be compensated at the end of the debate on the Speech from the Throne or in some other way.

It has also been informally agreed that because the vote tonight will be on the Creditiste subamendment there will be special consideration to ensure that the members of that group will be able to express their point of view before the vote on their subamendment is called. If that is agreeable, Mr. Speaker, I can send Your Honour a copy of what I have stated which may be of some help.

Mr. Speaker: It appears that the suggestion made by the President of the Privy Council is clear. Does the House agree? If so, there will be an order accordingly.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is so ordered.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

LABOUR CONDITIONS

UNEMPLOYMENT—INCREASE IN SEASONALLY ADJUSTED RATE—MEASURES TO STIMULATE EMPLOYMENT

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment just announced is nearly 7 per cent—6.9 per cent—does the government intend to propose any new measures, especially in view of the fact that the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate for those between the ages of 14 and 24 is now 11.7 per cent, some 67,000 higher than last year?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The answer is no, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Stanfield: In view of the sense of disillusionment and alienation likely to arise among this very large percentage and vast number of unemployed young Canadians and in light of the tensions existing in the country, will the Prime Minister give the House some assurance that the government will take vigorous measures to stimulate employment and reduce this very serious damage to this considerable percentage of Canadian youth and, indeed, to the social fabric of the country?

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We have taken vigorous action and we will take more.

Mr. Stanfield: I am not sure who is the minister responsible, but can someone explain why in this Dominion Bureau of Statistics bulletin the usual figures relating to hard core unemployed have been omitted?

Mr. Trudeau: Perhaps the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, who is responsible for DBS, might give the answer.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): I do not know, Mr. Speaker, but I will find out.

UNEMPLOYMENT—INCREASE IN SEASONALLY ADJUSTED RATE—YOUTH EMPLOYMENT AND WINTER WORKS PROGRAMS

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In view of the very serious figures that have just been released with respect to unemployment, and the effect on young people in particular, I ask the Prime Minister

whether the statements made by the Minister of Finance in the House the other day are the government's final answer with respect to coping with the unemployment situation or whether the government is giving any consideration to a program for young people throughout this winter similar to what was undertaken last summer, or some more useful undertakings? Is the government now prepared to consider seriously discussing with the provinces, and through them the municipalities, a winter works program inasmuch as it is not too late yet to implement such a program on the thesis that the public would prefer to pay people to work rather than pay people to be idle?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in the sense that the Minister of Finance and the government are reviewing the economic situation constantly—they have from time to time, over the past weeks and past months, announced new measures and new changes in our budgetary and our fiscal and financial position—the position stated by the minister obviously is not final. The situation is constantly being studied and analysed and new measures have been announced over the past weeks and months. I cannot, of course, say that there will not be any more new measures. I cannot say today what they will be, if any, but I cannot say that the statement is final.

May I remind the leaders of both parties that I am pleased to see they are using the seasonally adjusted figures now when not so many months ago they were blaming me for using them and saying it was a fraud to use such figures. I hope they remember that in a few months.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Prime Minister to show where I ever said it was a fraud to use the seasonally adjusted figures.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The Prime Minister seems to want to argue about which figures to use, though this is not of much concern to those who are unemployed. Since the programs put into operation by the government have not been very effective in reducing unemployment, will the right hon. gentlemen tell the House when the government, following its review, will be prepared to make some statement as to the additional measures they propose taking to grapple with this serious question?

Mr. Trudeau: No, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Finance made a statement the day before yesterday and I do not expect he will want to make another the day after tomorrow.

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): As the figures on unemployment produced today make it clear that whatever steps the government is taking to stimulate the economy are not having the desired effect, will the right hon. gentleman and his friends now give serious consideration to the positive measures which have been put forward by the opposition to revive the economy and stimulate employment?

[Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have the impression that the question as asked is somewhat in the form of an argument and I doubt whether it is acceptable.

Mr. Hees: May I ask a supplementary question, then? I shall be glad to send the Prime Minister a list of the measures the opposition have advocated to stimulate the economy so he will be aware of these proposals. Since it appears impossible to get any positive statement of policy from the government in the House, will the Prime Minister consider debating this important matter in the near future on a public platform at a time and place of his own choosing so that we can get down to actual cases?

Mr. Trudeau: I am very disappointed to see the hon. member downgrading Parliament in this way.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

POSSIBLE EXPORT OF ARMS BY BRITAIN TO SOUTH AFRICA—EFFECT ON ATTENDANCE AT COMMONWEALTH PRIME MINISTERS' CONFERENCE

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs or perhaps to the Prime Minister. Has the government received representations or information indicating that certain of the Commonwealth governments might be unwilling to attend the forthcoming Commonwealth Prime Minister's Conference—I believe it is to take place in Singapore—if the British government proceeds with the export of military arms to South Africa?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): The only information I have received on this subject is probably the same as has been received by the hon. member for Greenwood. I would suggest, however, that the conference should go ahead if only to enable the members of the Commonwealth to express their views to the British government and to one another on this important subject.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

INAPPROPRIATE ADVERTISING ON CHILDEN'S TELEVISION PROGRAMS

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

Could the minister tell us if he has received protest letters from some parents against noisy television advertising directed at children and if he intends to take steps to prevent it?

[*English*]

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any particular letter, but I am aware of what I would call general complaints in this area from consumer groups and parent-teacher groups—that type of representation.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

USE OF EMERGENCY POWERS UNDER WAR MEASURES ACT

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon during the question period a question was asked by the Leader of the Opposition concerning whether or not consideration was being given by the government to asking for emergency powers. I now ask the Prime Minister whether the government has given consideration under the War Measures Act to bringing in emergency powers.

In particular, has the government secured from the law officers of the Crown, inasmuch as the Prime Minister described what is happening as a result of the kidnappings as "this emergency", any opinion on whether or not the present situation falls generally within the wording of the Act to which I have referred which empowers the Governor in Council to do and to authorize various things because of the existence of "real or apprehended insurrection"? Would the Prime Minister take Parliament into his confidence with reference to this matter?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, my answer would be in the same terms as the answer I gave yesterday to the Leader of the Opposition. In effect, it was that we have considered such matters, that we have considered every possible way in which the government of Canada, in conjunction with the government of Quebec, could meet this very difficult situation. Therefore I would not be truthful if I said that we had not considered such measures. However, the fact that we have not taken them indicates that we have not considered them in a way that would cause us to act upon them, at least at this time.

As to the more precise question whether I have sought advice on this matter, the answer is that we have discussed the matter because in considering the various possibilities we have to know what are the conditions. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that he would agree he has raised not only a legal question but, perhaps even more importantly, a question of fact which can best be understood and discussed by people who are aware of politics in this country as well as those who are aware of the law.

I might add that I would gladly seek out, perhaps in a private way later, the opinion of the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert on this question. Quite frankly, I would be interested in knowing what he thinks about the situation, and he can either tell the House or tell me privately.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I appreciate the attitude taken by the Prime Minister, but I would ask him what he meant yesterday when he referred to "this emergency". Did he mean that there was a national emergency? If so, is it not a fact that the only provision that permits action to be taken in this regard is under the War Measures Act?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, there are many words which could be used, but when two lives are hanging in the balance I do not think it is exaggerated to talk of an emergency. As to the steps which would be necessary to meet this particular emergency, whether national, provincial or regional, I can only repeat the answer I gave yesterday. But I quite seriously repeat that I am very interested in knowing the opinion of the House and particularly of the leaders of the opposition parties and the former Prime Minister who has a distinguished record in the matter of civil liberties. If he is now suggesting that this might be a national emergency which might call for the application of the War Measures Act, I will certainly take that into consideration.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I would say, of course, that the Prime Minister has misinterpreted what I said.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: I asked him what he meant yesterday when he made a statement that could only be understood as meaning that the government was considering the abdication of civil liberties as it has abdicated its responsibility for the protection of diplomats by placing the whole matter in the power of the Premier and government of the province of Quebec.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

CANCELLATION BY PRIME MINISTER OF VISIT TO SOVIET UNION

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the right hon. Prime Minister. I am sure the House is anxious to know, in view of the words the Prime Minister used yesterday—"this emergency"—whether there are any new developments surrounding the Prime Minister's intended trip to the Soviet Union which was to begin this weekend?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would confirm to the House, with reluctance, that I have cancelled my visit to the Soviet Union which was to begin on Sunday. I gave notice of such possibility of cancellation to the Soviet authorities on Tuesday. I must say that now I have received a very understanding reply from Premier Kosygin. I expressed to him my hope that the visit could be reinstated at a future date which would be convenient to him.

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the right hon. Prime Minister this question. If this

information was given to the government of the U.S.S.R. on Tuesday, why it was withheld from the House yesterday when I asked a question?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: I believe the hon. member misunderstood my answer, Mr. Speaker. I think I said quite clearly that I had advised the Soviet authorities I was considering a possible cancellation. I only authorized the telegram cancelling it definitely some time last evening. I did not want to make it public here before it had reached the Soviet authorities.

* * *

INDUSTRY

FOOTWEAR—EFFECT OF IMPORTS ON JOBS—POLICY STATEMENT—IMPOSITION OF QUOTAS

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In view of the many representations from workers in the shoe industry pointing out the increasing loss of jobs because of imports, can he tell the House whether he is developing a new policy for the industry and, if so, when will he be in a position to announce that policy?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend was present at the meeting I had with the association representing the producers of footwear in Canada. He will recall that one of the conclusions was that we needed a lot better information as to how imports of footwear affect the Canadian industry, specifically in certain areas. This information has now been developed with the help of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, and I am to meet the association again in the coming weeks. In the meantime, as he is aware, my department has made a tremendous effort to support sales, exports in particular of footwear in Canada. For example we have sponsored foreign buyers coming to Canada and we have made the IRDIA and PAIT programs applicable to this industry. We are also making the General Adjustment Assistance Program applicable to companies which can use it for exports. We are doing our best while developing the information that is needed to cope properly with the situation.

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): I have a supplementary question for the minister. In view of the fact the Throne Speech mentions that legislation will be introduced to protect the textile industry, would the minister make representations to his colleagues to have the footwear industry included in the same legislation?

Mr. Pepin: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I just said, I do not think we have the proper information to make that move, but if it should be demonstrated in the coming days that this is necessary I am quite sure my colleagues will consider that possibility with sympathy.

Mr. Saltsman: Mr. Speaker, while we are aware that some measures have been taken by the department to assist the footwear industry, the fact is that the industry is in a pretty critical position despite these measures. While the minister is working on a long-term policy for the industry, is he prepared to impose immediate quotas on footwear as he did in respect of the shirt industry in a similar emergency?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, the situation is quite different. I do not have time to go into details, but in general the import of shoes into Canada is not exclusively a problem involving low-cost countries. It applies also to countries in Europe which are exporting to Canada and apparently are doing well because of factors other than cheaper labour. It is more complex than would appear and I regret that I am not able to go into details now.

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, is the minister not aware that there has been a very large increase in imports of shoes—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member's question is not in order in those terms. He asks whether the minister is aware.

Mr. Hees: I will rephrase my question, Mr. Speaker. As these imports, particularly of cheap shoes, have increased by a large percentage this year, does the minister not consider that this is a very similar situation to that in respect of the import of cheap textiles and will he not consider applying the same measures?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's question is argumentative. In essence he is asking the same question as that asked by the hon. member for Waterloo.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

LOOTING OF ARMOURY IN BRITISH COLUMBIA—ADDITIONAL SECURITY MEASURES

Mr. Robert Borrie (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to direct to the Minister of National Defence. With the looting of an armoury in British Columbia yesterday and the experience of similar activity in the past, would the Minister of National Defence advise the House whether plans are under way to provide 24-hour security at armouries where weapons and ammunition are stored?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): Yes, Mr. Speaker; additional security measures have been initiated at other Canadian forces bases and stations in the area.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

INTERPROVINCIAL MARKETING—FEDERAL INTERVENTION IN COURT PROCEEDINGS

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice. I welcome him

back from Australia where I hope he observed the greater degree of latitude allowed to private members in the legislature there. Has the minister discussed with the Minister of Agriculture my request that the government of Canada involve itself in the proceedings now before the Supreme Court in Quebec or in the proposed proceedings which the province of Manitoba has indicated it intends to take before the Supreme Court of Canada concerning the prohibition of the interprovincial marketing of agricultural products?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his kind remarks. I think he and I know that we get along very well with the Australians who are plain-speaking and forthright. The practical solution the federal government has always sought to this problem is the farm products marketing agencies bill which was before the House and a committee during the last session, which we felt could resolve the problem and for which we had unanimous provincial co-operation at the end of the last federal-provincial conference. As to the legal problem involved, the federal government is concerned, of course, about any barrier to interprovincial trade. In so far as there may be a constitutional question involving federal jurisdiction we will, of course, ensure that the federal point of view is presented to the court. Whether the province of Manitoba can successfully bring the matter before the Supreme Court by way of reference is perhaps doubtful.

I am not sure, as I said before, that a reference to the Supreme Court is the proper way to handle the matter because in a reference, as the hon. gentleman knows, the facts have to be specific and ascertained. The difficulty here is that we are dealing with various types of legislation and several marketing boards and broilers and eggs. There is no consensus concerning what the facts are. If there is to be a court action, I think it would have to proceed in the ordinary way. As I say, the best solution is the legislation placed before this House.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Peace River.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary of the minister. Having in mind that the passage of Bill C-197 introduced last session may not now be as rapid owing to the notorious stubbornness of the Minister of Agriculture in adapting to what the farmers want, would the minister not consult with the provincial governments to see whether or not terms of reference could be framed? The ingenuity of members of the bar is well known, and surely terms of reference could be framed to deal with and have this matter disposed of in one swoop.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): It is not just a matter of terms of reference; it is a matter of agreement on the facts. That is what is at issue. It is not just the legislation; it is how the legislation or regulations are being used, as I understand it, that provokes the problem.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, is it now the position of the Minister of Justice that whenever the constitution is challenged in a number of ways the government will not seek an authoritative answer?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): No. We will seek an authoritative answer but in the best way. I suggest to the hon. gentleman that that is not the correct way.

* * *

TRANSPORT

BUS SAFETY STANDARDS

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, I had a question I wanted to ask the Minister of Transport but possibly his Parliamentary Secretary can reply. I have in mind the fact that the United States Department of Transport has just ordered 404 interstate buses off the roads because of major safety standard violations. What is our department doing in this same potentially dangerous area?

Mr. Speaker: It would seem to me that the question asked by the hon. member is very general in nature. Any statement which might be made should normally be made as a statement on motions, unless the minister has a very brief and concise answer to give.

* * *

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with the hon. member for Peace River in welcoming back the Minister of Justice. In his capacity as Minister of Justice I put this suggestion to him in the form of a question. In view of the federal government's direct responsibility for the safety of foreign diplomats in Canada and in view of the support of the Confederation of National Trade Unions for the FLQ's position, would the minister consider getting assistance from the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, past president of that union—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Grey-Simcoe.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

TERRORIST OPERATIONS—ACTIVITIES OF CANADIANS RETURNED FROM ALGERIA, CUBA AND JORDAN—REPORTED GUERILLA TRAINING CAMP

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of the fact that terrorists now operating in Canada are reported to have been trained outside this country, is the government thoroughly investigating the activities of those Canadian citizens who have returned to Canada in the past year from Algeria, Cuba and Jordan?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the question is rather broader than the scope of the responsibilities of this department.

Mr. Noble: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary which I should like to direct to the Prime Minister. Can the Prime Minister give the House any information regarding reports that there is a guerilla training camp operating in northern Quebec?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, directing the previous question to me, I can answer as the minister has that this is not a question of immigration, I understand, but a question of returning Canadians. Indeed, if they are suspect as the hon. member suggests, it would not be a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration but rather a question for the Solicitor General. I would appreciate it if he would also direct the latter question to the Solicitor General who would know more about it than I.

Mr. Noble: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a further question to the Prime Minister. Perhaps he will remember that when he was Minister of Justice I directed this question to him. Would the Prime Minister not make an investigation as promised when I put the same question to him in March, 1968, with regard to a guerilla training camp in northern Quebec?

Mr. Trudeau: Would the hon. member read my answer at that time? I do not remember it exactly.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I believe that the hon. member for Sainte-Marie wants to ask a supplementary question.

[*English*]

PROHIBITION OF ENTRY INTO CANADA OF KNOWN ANARCHISTS AND REVOLUTIONARIES

Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie): I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. In view of the serious problems in Quebec, does the federal government intend to amend the immigration laws so that we do not tolerate the entry into this country of known anarchists and revolutionaries from other countries?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): The government has under consideration the whole question of our present immigration laws and procedures, and further comment on these subjects will be put before the House in this session, as hon. members know from reading the Speech from the Throne.

[*Translation*]

PUBLICITY GIVEN BY CBC TO PROFESSIONAL AGITATORS AND REVOLUTIONARIES

Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question I wish to direct to the Secretary of State.

[Mr. Noble.]

Since he is official spokesman for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, would he tell us whether he intends to issue guidelines for bringing an end to the continuing broadcast from the transmitters of this Crown corporation, of statements made by well-known revolutionaries and professional agitators?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the Broadcasting Act, it is not the responsibility of the Secretary of State to issue such guidelines but that of the Governor in Council, the Cabinet in other words. I do not think any such action is being considered at this moment.

* * *

[*English*]

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

PLANS TO DEAL WITH PROBLEMS FOLLOWING CLOSING OF RIVERS AIR BASE

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): My question is for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Is the hon. gentleman meeting with a delegation from western Manitoba today led by the Manitoba Minister of Industry and Commerce to discuss ways and means of dealing with the economic problems created by the closing of the Rivers air base?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest to the hon. member that it is not in order simply to ask the minister whether he is meeting with a delegation. I fail to see how that can be accepted as a question during the question period.

Mr. Dinsdale: May I rephrase my question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion be making an announcement soon on specific plans and proposals to deal with the economic crisis created by the closing of the Rivers air base?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, it is my intention, and I believe arrangements have been made, to go to Rivers and Gimly early next week in order to study this problem with provincial authorities and draw up a plan likely to assist those involved.

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

Will the minister go to that province and tell citizens, as he did last week in Val-d'Or that they are negative people?

* * *

[*English*]

SOCIAL SECURITY

INCOMES—TABLING OF WHITE PAPER—PENSION LEGISLATION

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of

National Health and Welfare. In view of the statement in the Speech from the Throne that Parliament will be asked in this session to examine a white paper on income security policy, can the minister say whether this is the same white paper that was to have been tabled in the last session, and can he now say when it will be tabled?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): It includes many of the considerations that would have gone into an earlier paper, and I expect that it will be tabled shortly.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): May I ask which we will see first? Will it be the white paper, or the pension legislation which was also referred to in the Throne Speech?

Mr. Munro: I would advise the hon. member that that has yet to be decided as a matter of policy by the government, and when we have decided the House will be advised.

* * *

[*Translation*]

BANKRUPTCY

INQUIRY AS TO AMENDMENT OF ACT

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

As during each session for over three years now we have been promised a reform in depth of the Bankruptcy Act, could the minister renew that commitment for the current session?

[*English*]

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I know the hon. member's great interest in the subject and I would direct his attention to a speech I made this summer in which I indicated that in a matter of weeks from now I will be publishing a report on the subject.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

PROTECTION FOR AIRLINE AND RAILWAY PASSENGERS AND PROPERTY FROM POSSIBLE FLQ ATTACKS

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): I have a question for the right hon. Prime Minister. In view of reports that the FLQ is about to set out on a program of attacking airlines and railways all across Canada, can the Prime Minister or one of the other ministers give an assurance that adequate protection is being provided for airlines and passengers thereon as well as for railway trains across the country?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The question of the hon. member really spells out the dilemma which faces the government and which apparently exists in his own party also. His former leader a moment ago was beseeching us not to move in any way which might infringe civil liberties, but in order to move in the way which the hon. member now suggests this danger might well be present.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): This is the all or nothing philosophy.

Mr. Nesbitt: Have the Prime Minister or his colleagues given consideration to the rather simple expedient of searching passengers and their luggage before boarding as is being done in Europe at present with no inconvenience?

Mr. Trudeau: I am informed that this is being done at this time.

* * *

LABOUR RELATIONS

NON-COMPLIANCE OF CHATEAU LAURIER HOTEL WITH MINIMUM WAGE LAW—POSITION IN OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Has a settlement been reached with Canadian National Railways regarding the application of the minimum wage laws of this Parliament to its hotels, and can the minister assure the House that no other federal agencies are ignoring the minimum wage laws in this country?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): No settlement has been reached as yet. An order was given yesterday to proceed against the CNR in the case of the Chateau Laurier.

Mr. McGrath: Would the minister reply to the second part of my question? Would he assure the House that no other federally controlled agencies or Crown corporations are defying the minimum wage laws of this Parliament?

Mr. Mackasey: I will have the matter investigated this afternoon to be certain of my answer, but I can assure hon. members that at least under the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act Crown corporations have to observe the labour laws of this country like any other enterprise under federal jurisdiction.

* * *

GRAIN

STUDY BY WHEAT BOARD OF WORLD FEED GRAIN SITUATION—AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION TO AGRICULTURAL CONGRESS

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): I have a question for the minister in charge of the Wheat Board. Is the Wheat Board making a study of the world feed

grain situation, particularly with regard to the corn supply in the United States this year and possibly the corn seed supply there next year?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): The Wheat Board keeps very closely informed on world market conditions in every respect, and this includes the situation in regard to supplies and probable supplies from the United States.

Mr. Thomson: Would any recommendations that the Wheat Board might make be available to the task force which will be meeting in November, the reason being that we might want to grow different crops next year?

Mr. Lang: I presume the hon. member is referring to the agricultural congress. It would, I am sure, be the hope of my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture, that a good deal of information may be made available at that time, and when it is it will become available to hon. members.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INDUSTRY

TEXTILES—APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF COMMISSION

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

Would he tell the House when the government has the intention of creating the Textiles Commission?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, the three members of this Commission have now been selected, and all we need before announcing these appointments is to have the Governor General's consent. I want to point out that the Commission will operate for the time being, under the legislation governing my department. Therefore it will not have the powers to inquire into various matters until the law is introduced and passed later this session.

I am sure the Commission, once it is created, will immediately start to work because it will have extremely important problems to study.

[*English*]

[*Later:*]

TEXTILES—COMPOSITION OF COMMISSION

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a question supplementary to the last one asked of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Will the new textile commission also be representative of the trade?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I made sure that the commission would not be representative of the trade in the sense that it would be made spokesmen for employers or employees. The commission will be made up of people extremely well informed on these matters but with a more general background. I do not think it would have been wise to select people on the basis of representation of the different sectors of the industry. Such a step would damage the credibility that the commission is expected to achieve in the true interests of Canada, its reputation for objectivity in world trade circles.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

REFERENCE OF WHITE PAPER AND AMENDMENTS TO APPEAL BOARD ACT TO COMMITTEE

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): My question is to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. A few moments ago he referred to matters dealing with immigration to be brought before the House. Can he tell the House whether the proposed white paper on immigration and the amendments to the Immigration Appeal Board Act will be brought in simultaneously and referred to the committee and whether this will be done at an early date so that positive action can be taken with regard to the Immigration Appeal Board?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Work is going forward in regard to both matters. No decision has been taken about the timing and whether they should be brought in simultaneously. Certainly I am as concerned as the hon. member about these matters.

* * *

FISHERIES

CLOSURE OF CERTAIN WATERS TO FOREIGN FISHERMEN—DISCUSSIONS WITH FRANCE AND UNITED STATES

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs, who apparently has been called out of the chamber, so I will bring it to the attention of the Prime Minister. It arises from the fact that in the House yesterday the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry said that he hoped the fishery closing lines on our two coasts, east and west, would be proclaimed very soon, which was essentially the same answer that he gave to the committee last spring. Are general negotiations being pressed with France in such a manner as to clarify and expedite the proclamation on the Atlantic coast? Also, is the position of the United States with regard to a certain portion of the Alaska boundary complicating the situation on the Pacific coast and, if so, are we pressing negotiations with the United States in a way that would lead to an early proclamation of the lines in the interests of the survival of fish?

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Ouellet (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): I will take this question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

AIRPORTS

STE SCHOLASTIQUE—PREPARATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF AREA

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

Can he tell us whether discussions are being held with the Quebec government regarding the development of the airport at Ste Scholastique or if, at least, agreements in principle have been concluded between Quebec and Ottawa?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, there has been a meeting at the departmental level where we agreed upon the general outline of co-operation. There will be other meetings in the near future.

[*English*]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CONSTITUTION OF CANADA

APPOINTMENT OF SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council) moved:

That a Special Joint Committee of the Senate and of the House of Commons be appointed to examine and report upon proposals, made public, or which are from time to time made public by the Government of Canada, on a number of subjects related to the Constitution of Canada during the course of the comprehensive review of the Constitution of Canada, which review was agreed upon at the Constitutional Conference of the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premiers and Prime Ministers of the Provinces in February, 1968, and alternative proposals on the same subjects;

That the Committee have power to appoint, from among its members, such sub-committees as it may deem advisable or necessary;

That the Committee have power to sit during sittings and adjournments of the House of Commons;

That the Committee have power to report from time to time, to send for persons, papers, and records, and to print such papers and evidence from day to day as may be ordered by the Committee;

That the Committee have power to adjourn from place to place within Canada;

That the quorum of the Committee be 17 members, whenever a vote, resolution or other decision is taken, so long as both Houses are represented and that the Joint Chairmen be authorized to hold meetings, to receive evidence and authorize the printing thereof, when 7 members are present so long as both Houses are represented;

That the Committee be empowered to retain the services of three specialists to assist it in its work; and that it also be empowered to retain the clerical and stenographic help deemed advisable by the Joint Chairmen;

That the papers and evidence received and taken on the subject in the preceding session be referred to the Committee and made part of the records thereof;

That the following Members be appointed to act on behalf of the House of Commons on the Special Joint Committee, namely:

Messrs. Alexander, Allmand, Asselin, Breau, Brewin, Dinsdale, Fairweather, Fortin, Gibson, Hogarth, Hopkins, Lachance, MacGuigan, Marceau, McQuaid, Osler, Ouellet, Roberts, Rowland and Woolliams; and

That a Message be sent to the Senate to acquaint Their Honours thereof.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the minister in allowing me to speak first, particularly for the reason that I will have certain propositions to put before him and he might well seek the chance, in closing the debate, to answer the suggestions I make. We already dealt with this matter very lightly last Friday when I indicated some preliminary objections which I then had to the motion in the form it is put. Because of that the government has now seen fit to introduce it in this way, it having been properly placed on the order paper.

By this motion the government has actively taken the initiative to re-establish a special joint committee to deal with constitutional problems. It is asking the House to vest in the committee the widest possible powers, including the right to travel in Canada. I interrupt my remarks on the subject to suggest that some hon. members might take this opportunity to travel outside the chamber and there continue the very important discussions they are having here.

A proposed itinerary which was discussed by the committee at the conclusion of its meetings last session indicates, as I see it, that the committee plans to be absent approximately 45 days, most of them sitting days, during the next eight months. This, of course, is a matter for the committee to consider and to propose in view of what it feels is its responsibility, and we have got to give the utmost consideration to its proposals, particularly having in mind that it is a joint committee. But that does not relieve this House of the ultimate responsibility, of the need to examine and accept or reject or even possibly modify committee reports. This, as a general rule, applies to any committee report.

I was one of those who first suggested six years ago the need to have a committee of this kind. I said it could exercise a useful and even an essential function in dealing with constitutional problems. If it had been set in motion at that time, or even three or four years ago, Mr. Speaker, I think there would have been a different climate and a different awareness of our constitutional problems today.

I was quite prepared for and, in fact, I advocated a reasonable amount of travel by such a committee—certainly at least its attendance in the provincial capitals possibly by the use of subcommittees, because in an area of this kind there was need not only for a pipeline from Members of Parliament to the people but for the people to be able to make known their thoughts to Members of Parliament through the committee. But I must honestly say I did not envisage a safari of quite the same dimensions as is now being proposed, with beaters, trackers

and all the rest of it. However, that is a matter we may discuss later.

But I say too, Mr. Speaker, that three years ago when I again discussed this matter in the House I felt that the rigidity of the then Minister of Justice who has now become the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), and his exceedingly narrow and overly legalistic approach to constitutional issues, would likely provoke similar sentiments amongst the provinces, and any meaningful consensus was not likely to be achieved. The facts have borne out this view. There have been a number of meetings of the first ministers. There have been committee meetings with all kinds of media coverage. There has been a pouring out of papers, position papers, provincial statements, federal statements, committee reports, but virtually nothing in terms of real achievement.

The government and the Prime Minister through a very dull and pedestrian approach have managed to throw a smokescreen of boredom around the subject and have really turned the people off. I suppose what the Prime Minister is saying to the simple folks around Camelot is, "Go home and leave this to me and all the other knights around the Round Table."

The thrust of the discussion has been directed above the heads of the people, perhaps deliberately in the expectation that they would not see what was really involved, that 11 sets of hands were tightly gripped about the levers of power and none had any intention of releasing any of them. Only if Canadians as a whole can be made to realize the issues, and to understand that there are some very simple but exceedingly important decisions to be made, can we get anywhere. At the present time it is too much like the discussion that Alice had with the Cheshire cat when they agreed between them that she was walking somewhere, that she did not know where she came from or where she was going but that if she kept on walking she would get somewhere. I feel that this is the case with these federal-provincial conferences.

Should the ultimate decision on issues such as pollution be left to the provincial governments or to the federal government? Should the federal government take some greater and more meaningful roles in the problems of the great cities, such as housing and transportation? This could be applied also to consumers' interests, and there are other areas. An active parliamentary committee set in motion some three years ago, reasonably free from political rancour, could have set out these issues in a simple way and developed an awareness which might well have led to public pressure to compel the men in the various establishments who play the power game to adjust the constitution to the realities of today. I am not talking about a new constitution; I am talking about those necessary and essential decisions made to conform with what we have found from our experience needs to be done today.

• (12:00 noon)

But at present there is a general nausea at the artificial mixture of mystique and mugwumpery which surrounds these constitutional discussions and which persuades too many people now that reform or change is only a big yawn. I doubt very much now whether anyone can change this fact of life, but I am willing to go along and give the benefit of the doubt to the committee to be re-established for this session. We must make sure that we exhaust any doubt on this issue with respect to this committee which is to be re-established. We must seek the opportunity to make the people of Canada aware in the simplest possible way of the issues which face us.

[Mr. Baldwin.]

Having said that, and my colleagues may have something more to say about details, I wish to say that the debate on this motion presents the first proper occasion on which to record publicly our concern about the operation of the committees of this House. We are debating a motion to re-establish a committee and I am entitled to say at this time that we have some very serious reservations, which we expressed to Your Honour during the last session. Your Honour was good enough to indicate that this is a matter which the procedure committee might well examine. It has now been clearly established that this government with its tractable backbenchers has shown a determination to relegate Parliament, certainly this House, to a position of futility and impotence. Our experience of the last two sessions has made it crystal clear that the new committee system, which was intended to help to prop up the House of Commons as a forum for free men in a free society so that legislation passed would in fact be laws devised and adopted by the people through their representatives, has failed to achieve this purpose. These committees have now become in certain respects a means whereby the Prime Minister, the cabinet and their colleagues and lesser luminaries are de-emphasizing and undercutting the value of the House of Commons. The records of the committees themselves and the complaints made in the House during the last session bristle with illustrations of this fact.

Just two days ago the Prime Minister, in a confrontation with the press about the supremacy of the elected representatives of the people, had something to say on this score. Just whom did he think he was fooling? His scorn of the House and the parliamentary system is too obvious and well documented to need elaboration here, and the government's abuse of the parliamentary committee system is just another example.

Today there is fear, anger, despair and anxiety in this country. Violence stalks this land, as it does the United States of America—so much so that the United States Congress is now in the process of passing an extremely severe measure dealing with law and order. There are indications, if I may be permitted to say so, that the government is contemplating acting under the War Measures Act or bringing in some substitute for it. I am all for order and would support reasonable proposals, Mr. Speaker, but order under the law and not above it. And we must have law or laws passed by this House and Parliament and not produced at the whim of any one man or group of men, no matter how eminent they may be.

Surely one of the contributing factors to some of our troubles has been the fact that many, and this applies

particularly to minority groups in North America and elsewhere, have lost or are losing confidence in the democratic process. Many feel that they no longer can have their day in court. I do not altogether agree with this assessment, but there is absolutely no doubt about the steady and planned erosion of the rights of this House and the substitution of authoritarian rule by the executive which is involved all too often with the personality cult. Parliamentary systems must not only work; they must be very visible and be seen to be working.

Let the government be made aware right at the beginning of the present session that we will not facilitate the operation of committees involving the continuation of practices about which we complained during the last session. Reforms and improvements must be brought about. My colleague who spoke yesterday, the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath), dealt with this matter to some extent and spoke in detail about many of the things which I might have spoken about now. With respect to such things as travel, the holding of meetings and the co-ordination of meetings of committees, I say it is obvious that, unless there is some better measure of control than was the case last year, the proceedings of this House might just as well be scrapped, because slowly and surely the emphasis is being placed on the committees and taken away from this House. Since we are dealing with this particular area of controversy, we think it must be made abundantly clear that committees exist to clarify, to investigate, to examine and to help to facilitate the proceedings of the House; and they must at all times be subordinate to the sittings of the House of Commons, the operations of the House of Commons and the decisions which are made in this place.

For example, there is a need for some bills and some estimates to be considered in Committee of the Whole and in Committee of Supply. There must be an assurance of greater objectivity and freedom from government supervision in respect of committee chairmen. There must be more opportunities to test the views of members by dividing the House on some committee reports or by permitting amendments so that minorities on those committees can put forward their positions in the House on specific issues. These are very reasonable suggestions, Mr. Speaker. I ask the minister now if he will not, before this debate is concluded, give an undertaking that within a limited period of time terms of reference will be proposed which will direct the Committee on Procedure and Organization to deal specifically and immediately with this problem so that we on this side of the House, as well as members on the government side, may have some assurance that committees will function well and accept their proper role in the House, as must be the case at all times.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I say that many of the rule changes which were brought in have been effective but many of them have been shown to be not effective. They need to be examined. This examination ought to include an examination of the committee system and the new structure which was established.

My party will always go along with reasonable changes in the rules provided it is made crystal clear that the function of the House of Commons remains the principal object of our meetings in the House. I therefore hope that before this debate is concluded the minister will direct his attention to the issue and, hopefully, indicate that the very serious problems we have brought up, which have also concerned the members of his party for some time, will be met and dealt with. We hope this assurance will be given before further requests are made to establish other committees, standing or special, of this House.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I realize that the discussion which the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) has opened up during the course of our dealing with this motion is an important one. I hope it is not unkind for me to say that he has ranged a bit from the wording of the motion. I do not see anything wrong with that. In fact I think it is a good idea. I support his position that we should take a new look and certainly that we should maintain a continuing look at our committee system. He has pointed out some of the improvements that are needed. He said that the changes that we made were not all negative, that some of the changes with respect to the committee system have worked out well. I wish to emphasize that fact.

• (12:10 p.m.)

I am not happy about all the rule changes that we made in the last two or three years, but I believe it was a tremendous improvement to send practically all bills, after second reading, to standing committees. I think the work that standing committees have done on bills which have been referred to them is good.

I believe it was a forward step to abolish the duplication of debate that we used to have when on occasion we would send a bill to a standing committee where it would be dealt with at length and then we would have the same debate in the Committee of Whole House. By the report stage we have preserved the right of members of the House who are not members of a particular committee to make their contribution to the details of any bill.

I am almost prepared to say without qualification that I think that the changes in the rules which had to do with the legislative process are good. I referred to the fact that after second reading bills go to committee where they are thoroughly studied. We then have the report stage. Members who wish can then deal with details. We can have recorded votes on contentious issues followed by final or third reading.

In any criticisms that we make of our new rules, or of our committee system in particular, it is appropriate to record that in this area we have done well. It is also my impression that committees are doing a good job when studying white papers. There are times when the argument gets quite intense, as it ought to, and this is an innovation that has worked out well, namely, that white papers are referred to committees and the public is permitted to appear before those committees. I happen to be a member of a committee that is doing this right now with respect to the subject of unemployment insurance. I

believe it is a very worth-while exercise in which we are engaged. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. member for Peace River that the whole question should be studied.

The area where we have not solved the problem is with respect to estimates or the granting of money. I am not going to urge that we return to the old system under which every last estimate was dealt with in Committee of Supply. I think it became rather meaningless. That is the reason we agreed to send all estimates to the various separate standing committees. But I do not think anyone in this House can claim that in the standing committees the estimates are examined in any detail or that any parliamentary scrutiny is practised. I do not pretend to have the answer, but I would say that in our attempt to make improvements we have not gone very far with respect to the handling of estimates. Possibly the whole matter of estimates has become so huge in terms of the amounts of money that we have to deal with compared with what it was 100 years ago that we have to take a new look at this situation. Maybe we have to rely on the fact that we have a Treasury Board and a Treasury Board secretariat which does this type of scrutinizing before we ever see the estimates. Maybe we also have to rely on the fact that we have an Auditor General and his staff as well as a Public Accounts Committee to do the job afterwards and that in this whole picture there is not the need for what was thought to be necessary 100 years ago. Maybe Parliament has more important things to do. These thoughts are not put forward as anything final. Although we have succeeded in what we have done with respect to the legislative process in relation to committees, we have not solved the problem with respect to estimates and the granting of money.

There are other matters regarding committees that we should study. In my view the most serious problem that faces committees is that of time. Sometimes there is also the problem of space and other facilities. I would like to see more practice of the idea of committees sitting when the House is not in session. We did enough of this in September, some committees even earlier than that, to prove that it is worth while.

This very day the House is sitting morning, afternoon and night. I am a member of an important standing committee that is also meeting morning, afternoon and night. It just does not make sense, especially when one realizes that other meetings and obligations have to be crowded into the same day. When this is the case, committees suffer. Committees could do better work if we arranged for this kind of provision. It is not necessary to do this only by having committees meet during our summer recess. I think the idea of the House adjourning for a week every four, five or six weeks, whatever period might be worked out, so that committees can carry out their work is good.

In this general vein I agree with the position of the hon. member for Peace River that we should study the work of our committees. I think we should be encouraged by the useful steps we have taken and by the progress we have made to believe that we can go on to make it an even more effective part of the parliamentary process.

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

I hope the motion now before us will be agreed to. I am not sure whether the member for Peace River said it today, but he certainly said it last Friday, that when committees want to travel they should make a case for it. There should not be a series of blank cheques to permit committees to travel any time the chairman or members of that committee get the notion. I believe all parties are agreed that we should not go high, wide and handsome in the matter of committee travel. Surely in the case of this particular committee it is something that is desirable.

I also have my question about the state of the federal-provincial conferences and whether they have been useful in the last two or three years but surely the constitution is still a major problem in this country. It is still a valid proposition that the people of this country ought to get involved in that consideration as much as possible.

• (12:20 p.m.)

Ideally, we should call a constituent assembly, but this is a complicated matter and when we would have the time for it I do not know. Is it not a step in that direction to have a committee of Parliament meet the people of this country? The committee has made a start in the travels it has undertaken already and I think it should be encouraged to continue rather than discouraged from making further trips. As a matter of fact, it seems to me that if the committee simply sat here in Ottawa and rehashed its various prejudices concerning the constitution it would be rendering no greater service than the federal-provincial conferences have done in the last two or three years. To my mind, its usefulness lies in the fact that it gets around the country and meets the people, and I believe it would be unfortunate if it were not permitted to carry through the program it has outlined. In my opinion refusal of this permission would be an act of unfairness, an act of discrimination against those parts of the country which have not yet been visited.

One of my hon. friends says the committee has made only one trip. Even so, it was an important one. It went all over Manitoba. I submit that the experience of the committee in Manitoba and the Yukon demonstrated the usefulness of journeys of this kind. Granted the importance of Manitoba, the rest of the country is important too, and in my view the committee should be encouraged to go on with its program as requested in the report it made at the end of last session. I speak today with less sense of disagreement with the hon. member for Peace River than I did last Friday, because I believe he has become more reasonable; he has softened his approach. He is that kind of a man.

Mr. Baldwin: I read my own speech. It made me a lot more reasonable.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): He is a man with whom it is a pleasure to negotiate the activities and business of this House, and having stated the feelings he has about the rules and about our committee system he will not, I hope, stand in the way of the committee being given the authority which it seeks. Certainly we do not

object. We think it should possess this authority and that the motion as it appears on the order paper should be supported by the House.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on the particularly significant motion now before us. We have agreed to hold this debate today because committees are becoming ever more important.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize the usefulness of committees for the study of bills referred to them by the House. We also admit that it is necessary for committees, particularly for the one that will be entrusted with the study of the constitution, to travel across Canada in order to better understand the problems and find more suitable solutions.

We agree that travelling across the country is necessary to meet the people who have briefs to submit or suggestions to make regarding the programs brought forward by the government.

However, I am wondering what the members of what we call 'the other place" have to do with the establishment of the committee with which we are concerned at the present time. I do not see very well how the honourable senators can make a worthwhile contribution to committees established by the House of Commons, since they are not the representatives of the people but were appointed by the governments in office.

Some may disagree with me, but I believe that the House members on the various standing or special House committees are well qualified to gather all the information required from the experts appearing before such committees.

Committees are important due to the fact that, in the course of their proceedings, either in Ottawa or elsewhere, the members are able to question experts on the matters of concern to them. The establishment of the Committee on the Constitution of Canada is justified since in the last few years federal-provincial conferences have been dealing with the problem of the Canadian Constitution.

The last one brought us back to the starting point by suggesting that there should not be a new constitution but that the present one be amended instead, and the Committee is asked to study the report containing those recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to endorse the proposals of my hon. friend, the member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), in connection with the simultaneous sittings of the committees and of the House.

In view of the fact that the Committee on the Constitution will have to leave the House about one week every month from now until the end of June, the fact that it will often be away is going to deprive the House of the contributions of a number of members.

It must also be kept in mind that several other committees will have to travel. For instance, another special committee, the Committee on Pollution and Environment, will require its members to travel across the country in order to see for themselves the problems caused by pollution.

Moreover, the members of parliamentary associations have to travel during the year. As a matter of fact, the NATO Parliamentary Association for instance is to meet in Europe in November. On that occasion, several members will be away from the House.

In view of the proliferation of all those committees and associations, I am wondering whether the role of the House is not being suppressed progressively and turned over to the committees. What is more important, the House or the committees? That is the question.

As for me, I maintain that the business of the House should come first and that the business of the committees should never interfere with or duplicate the business of the House.

Furthermore, we should consider more seriously the work performed in the committees. In fact, the task of a committee was to study the housing problem in Canada. A report was presented by its members and a minister had to resign because the recommendations of that committee did not receive sufficient implementation.

I am a member of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence. I remember that, on two occasions at least, we were sent to Europe to visit the members of the armed forces, especially in Germany and, to our great surprise, upon our arrival there and before the committee study was completed and a report published, we learned that the government had decided to curtail its military establishments in Europe.

Later on, in September 1969, the committee visited Halifax and the Maritimes to study the problem of the naval forces stationed there. Once again, to our great surprise, while visiting the navy buildings, we learned that the government had decided to scrap the airplane carrier *Bonaventure*. Then we start asking oruselves questions and wondering about the usefulness of the committees if the government does not even take into account the reports which they submit.

I hope that the travelling which the committee on the constitution might wish to do throughout Canada, will be useful and that the government will have at least enough sense not to take a decision before the committee report has been presented to the House.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding my remarks, I should like to echo the very suggestion made earlier by my hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) to the effect that it would be advisable for the House not to sit for one week every month, so as to enable every committee to sit and so that the members of Parliament may not have to run from one committee room to the other or from a committee sitting to the House of Commons.

At the present time, the government may perhaps turn this situation to its advantage because of its heavier

representation. However, political parties such as the Ralliement Créditiste and the New Democratic Party cannot sometimes send more than one delegate to each committee, and their members find it quite difficult to follow the proceedings of the committees and of the House. You cannot be at two or three places at the same time. This situation is quite annoying. We are put to task sometimes for not attending committee sittings and this is precisely because we cannot be everywhere at the same time.

I suggest that the government House leader should look into the possibility of adjourning the House from time to time so that the committees may work at full blast and be more efficient.

• (12:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Mark MacGuigan (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Special Joint Committee on the Constitution of Canada in the last session, perhaps I may be permitted to add a few words of clarification on this subject. I understand the considerations that the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) has advanced in the House both last Friday and today and those put forward by the other speakers who preceded me. I sympathize with the concern which has been expressed in regard to regulating in some over-all way the travelling done by various parliamentary committees. If I may say so, it would seem to me that this consideration is especially applicable to the standing committees of the House, for which travel is a rather incidental part of their function and their interests. On the other hand, I would submit that the Special Joint Committee on the Constitution is a special kind of committee, not only in the sense that it is a special committee but also because it is one which, by the very nature and essence of its work, must travel across the country to hear the views of the people of this country.

Although I do not understand the hon. member for Peace River to disagree with this, in order to underline the point I should like to refer to the debate which took place in the House on January 26 and 27 of this year, which was followed by the vote setting up the committee. One of the speakers in the debate said:

> —I hope this committee will give a voice to the views and the actions of the Canadian people. I hope the committee itself will provide opportunities to Canadians everywhere to make their views heard and have them considered and publicized rather than filed away and forgotten.

A little farther on he said:

> This means the committee must hear groups and individuals from all across the country. The committee evidently has this power...these public hearings and consultations are necessary to the process of building a real understanding of the problems.

Those were the words of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), as reported at pages 2818 and 2819 of *Hansard*.

[Mr. Laprise.]

If I may I should also like briefly to quote the words of the hon. member for Peace River in the debate:

> I should like to see the committee composed of members of this House and members of the other place who will travel from place to place in Canada.

Those words are to be found at page 2839 of *Hansard*.

I mention those statements not because I believe that this is a matter that is controversial but to indicate the general agreement that existed in the House at that time, which was manifested by speakers from all parties, that this committee should be one that travels extensively across the country.

In the report presented to the House on October 7 by the committee, a report, I might add, unanimously adopted by the committee, the request was made that the committee be re-established as early as possible in this session and with the same powers it enjoyed previously, including, therefore, the power to adjourn from place to place.

If I may say so, the committee has been proceeding rather amicably in deciding where it should travel across the country. The committee has already held hearings in Winnipeg, Brandon, St. Boniface, Thompson and Churchill in Manitoba, and in Whitehorse, Dawson City and Watson Lake in the Yukon. We propose in the near future to visit other parts of the country. As one of the previous speakers mentioned, the committee unanimously agreed at one of its early meetings that it would travel one week a month during this parliamentary session.

If the committee is re-established by the House and it should again fall to my lot to be chairman, I should like to say that I would be happy to make periodic reports to the House in advance of the committee's travel, informing the House where the committee intends to go. This would provide an opportunity for comment by any member of the House. I would not, however, like to see taken from the committee, either in form or in substance, the power to adjourn from place to place, a power that the House has already unanimously recognized.

I conclude by saying, in sentiments that I am sure are felt by members of all parties in the House and especially by members of the committee, that this is a matter of great importance to the people of Canada and to us as Members of Parliament. It is a matter that is too important to the country to be left to the unguided decision of Members of Parliament, politicians, and lawyers. It is a matter that ought to be brought to the people; and it is a matter that this House in the past authorized the committee to bring to all people across the country. I hope that once again the House will extend this power to the committee.

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to say a few words on the motion that is now before the House. I do not propose to take the time of the House to give my views as to how the new committee system is working. May I simply say that I do not think it will ever work until governments wait for

committees to make reports before making their own decisions. In addition, the committee system will never work satisfactorily until committee reports are studied and acted upon by the government.

• (12:40 p.m.)

I should like to address my remarks more particularly to two parts of the motion before the House. The Special Joint Committee on the Constitution is asking for the power to adjourn from place to place within Canada and that it be permitted to retain the services of three specialists. I think it is time that responsible elected representatives consider this business of committees travelling across this country. In my opinion, travel by committees from one end of the country to the other has become excessive and out of all reasonable proportions. The cost incurred on these trips is fantastic.

I only need to mention the fact that this special committee studying the constitution made one trip last session, as the former chairman has just pointed out, to Winnipeg, Brandon, St. Boniface, Yukon, Whitehorse and Churchill. On that trip there were 16 Members of Parliament and 14 staff officials. They took with them all the necessary equipment and paraphernalia required at the meetings. That trip cost the taxpayers of this country a minimum of $33,628 because to this must be added the cost of printing and the salaries of the staff that went along, the interpreters and clerks, as well as the advertising and other incidental expenses. These costs are not included in this $33,628 figure.

Somebody might say the staff is paid anyway and their salaries go on whether or not they make a trip. The salaried staff must be paid if they are going to travel all over the country, but we will then require greater staff here in Ottawa to take their places while they are on the road. Therefore we must add the costs I have mentioned to this figure.

If one takes that cost and divides it by 30, it works out to an approximate cost of $1,200 for each person who went on the trip. We in this House represent the people of this country who are now being taxed to death. People will tell us, as they have told me, that they cannot afford to pay any more taxes, they are now paying the limit.

It is time this House took a look at the cost of these committees flitting all over the country. It is quite right that this is a special committee but that is no reason why it should have special privileges to spend money in this way. The former chairman advised the House that the committee proposes to make other trips and I understand there are 42 places they expect to visit during 12 trips across the country. If the cost of each trip amounts to roughly the cost of the one that has been taken, and there is no reason to expect that they will cost less, this committee's expenses for travelling will be over $500,000—a half a million dollars. I will wait to see just how close my estimate is. I do not think we as responsible representatives should issue a blank cheque to this or any other committee to travel round this country, with permission to adjourn from place to place. I for one do not propose to issue a blank cheque for this purpose.

Let me deal with the alternatives which would cut down this exorbitant cost. This committee will have to give the public an opportunity to voice their opinions on the Constitution of Canada. It would be well within the relevance of necessity that the committee needs to travel only to the capital of each province. If the committee feels it is not going to get enough briefs and reports as a result of travelling to the capitals of each province, then it could save the taxpayers a lot of money by saying to the people who wish to come to a capital that it will pay their expenses to make an appearance before the committee in that capital. There is no reason the committee should have to journey from Whitehorse to Dawson City or from Winnipeg to Brandon, a distance of approximately 60 miles.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): It is 120 miles.

Mr. Hales: The hon. member says it is 120 miles from Winnipeg to Brandon. If a group of people from Brandon wanted to appear before the committee they could travel to Winnipeg to present their briefs at the expense of the committee and we would be money in pocket.

Let us give a little thought to what these things are costing. There seems to be an opinion around here that all we have to do is ask the public for money and the public will give it to us. I tell you that we have done this for so long we are reaching the point where the taxpayer is going to say he has had it and is not going to pay any more.

The committee is also asking for permission to retain the services of three specialists. As a chairman of a committee I realize that committees need staff and special assistants. I do not know why this committee could not obtain help from the Department of Justice. There are people on the staff of that department now on the government payroll who could work with this special committee. If the committee needs extra clerks I am sure there are clerks in various departments of government, now on the payroll, who could also work for this committee.

We know from past experience that committees have hired specialists and we know what they charge. A lawyer will charge at a minimum $250 per day. If you require an accountant he will charge you a minimum of $200 a day for his services. If you add these costs you will have some idea of the expenses incurred to maintain these committees, and what it costs to have these committees travelling across the country.

Let me give you the four highest costs incurred by committees during the last session. The committee on the constitution spent $33,628. The finance committee made three trips which cost the taxpayers $23,837. The regional development committee spent $7,154. The transportation committee made three trips at a cost of $23,432. I have not broken down the costs that other committees incurred last session, but the total was $96,966 excluding

the costs I referred to earlier which must be added on. Last year roughly $100,000 was spent by committees on travel. I bring these facts to the attention of the House because I sincerely believe that travelling by committees is getting out of hand. It is costing altogether too much.

• (12:50 p.m.)

I am sure that you, Mr. Speaker, are very interested in this because I believe the money comes out of your budget. I am sure you must have felt that it is getting out of hand, is costing altogether too much and that some curtailment will have to be made sooner or later.

I am glad this motion came before the House at the earliest possible time in this session so that we as responsible representatives of the people can give serious thought to the matter before we issue this kind of a blank cheque for this committee. I find I shall not be able to support the motion in its present form. If the committee could say that trips would only be made to the capital of each province and would also set out some sort of a reasonable budget, I would consider agreeing to it, but in its present form of a far-ranging open-ended blank cheque I would find difficulty in supporting the motion.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak in favour of the motion before the House. Before I finish I should also like to make some comments concerning the remarks we have just heard from the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Hales). Before dealing with his remarks I wish to remind the House that this particular special committee was appointed after urging over many years by various members of the opposition parties including the party represented by myself and the party represented by the hon. member for Wellington. In my view this committee may be able to make—indeed it is probable—a vitally important contribution to the remaking or renewing of our Constitution. In the event that anyone should think this is an impractical proposition, I suggest that the unity of this country may very well depend on it. If anyone suggests that the making or remaking of a constitution is something of an academic exercise without practical value, I should like to say that subjects such as pollution, urban development and so on which were not considered at the time of the making of our original Constitution are the type of practical subjects which require being dealt with in the constitution. Such subjects which intimately affect the government and the welfare of this country are the type of subjects which this committee is asked to consider.

I believe that however disillusioned the people of Canada may be about the process of constitutional amendment to date it is possible—I do not say it will certainly happen because it may not—that if this committee, which represents all parties and all regions of Canada, can arrive at a consensus it may be able to make a vital contribution by renewing the fabric of unity of this country. I suggest it is important that this be done, and in the carrying out of this function and in doing what is essential to the carrying out of this function the people of Canada must be consulted. I suggest that the committee cannot consult the people effectively by remaining in Ottawa or by merely visiting the capital cities of the various provinces. I suggest it is necessary to go to the people in order to hear what they have to say.

As a member of the committee I would find it very informative and interesting to hear the points of view of those in the different sections and regions of our country. Travel is, of course, an inconvenience. It is an inconvenience to the people who travel. It involves some degree of expense. It has the effect of depopulating an already depopulated House of Commons when members serve on committees that travel. This is all very true. It is also perfectly true that travel can be expensive. I believe we can rely upon the committee itself to use restraint in respect of the degree of travel. I do not believe the committee would travel for the sake of travel but rather for the sake of consultation with the people of Canada.

I must say I found the attitude of the hon. member for Wellington to be that of a penny-pincher. If this committee does not do a job any money spent on it will be wasted. The committee may try very hard and not achieve anything. This is a possibility. But as long as there is a real possibility that through the process of consultation this committee may arrive at conclusions that are valuable in respect of the future of this country and the remaking of our Constitution, then I suggest the expenses which are being discussed are picayune and trifling in relation to the benefits which could result from the functioning of the committee.

With regard to the suggestion that the committee should confine its travel to the capitals, may I say I happen to represent an area which is the capital of the largest province but I want to say that Toronto is not Ontario.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brewin: I wish to say that if the committee should just visit Toronto and listen to the organizations represented there the members of the committee would not hear the full viewpoint of the people of Ontario. I believe Toronto is a very important place to visit and I presume the committee will go there and hear some very valuable briefs. I think, however, the committee should visit northern Ontario and spend some time in Ottawa. I believe there are various parts of the province I represent which ought to be heard from.

I find, Mr. Speaker, that it is close to one o'clock and I shall conclude by saying I hope this House will not place limitations on the motion before the House but will pass it and encourage the committee to do the important job that is being entrusted to it.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I found the arguments of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) somewhat superfluous in that no one has contested the purpose of the committee. The fundamental point is the control of

committees by this House. I have been a member of the finance committee and other committees and I suggest that the carte blanche demands made by certain committees at the beginning of a session are made without any justification whatsoever. The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan) might have presented within his report the scheme in respect of these proposals.

An hon. Member: That was done weeks ago.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): It was not done to the House. It was possibly done to committee members, but not to the House. I suggest that in a report in which a committee seeks authority to travel it should outline what it intends to do. It is not only a question of the cost involved. I remember an occasion last year when the former government House Leader complained bitterly to me about the travels of some of the committees and the fact that three committees were away simultaneously for some legitimate but uncontrolled purpose.

The point is that there is no co-ordination. Committees simply ask for authority at the beginning of a session, obtain it and spin off like independent satellites. But that is not the way the committees should operate nor is it the way this committee should operate. I suggest that the members of the committee consider dividing the committee into two or even three subcommittees in order to accomplish its purpose. Last summer the finance committee was split into subcommittees and this resulted in much less strain on the committee. Because the number of members was less numerous they were able to participate better in the discussions and considerations than would have been the case had the committee as a whole visited the places which were visited. If this were the suggestion in this case it might eliminate half the objection. May I call it one o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It being one o'clock I do now leave the Chair until two o'clock.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

• (2:00 p.m.)

AFTER RECESS

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, before the recess I had been talking about the necessity of the House maintaining control of the committees. My particular objections were to blanket authorization to travel at the beginning of the term. It seems to me that the committee certainly has reason to travel. Many of the committees have very legitimate reasons, and some more so than others. But it must be remembered that the House has control over committees, not the committees over the House. Therefore, if a committee wishes to travel to accomplish its purpose, it should come to the House and explain the purpose of travelling. A committee that has a legitimate purpose will find the House quite receptive to the idea.

It must be remembered that information in the hands of committee members is not information in the possession of the House. The minutes of proceedings and evidence of the committees and their reports reach us three or four weeks later, hopefully in the future much sooner. Therefore I say that I believe in this case this embroglio would not have occurred if more information had been disclosed and had been properly laid out.

I have suggested—and I think this may be possible—that the committee divide itself into subcommittees. This will eliminate a great deal of the logistics and of the expense. I would say that it would also improve the performance of committee members who will then be able to participate in the meetings. It is obvious to me from my experience last year and this year, more particularly the meetings last summer of the Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs which heard briefs in various provincial capitals, that if you have 30 members in a committee and these members want to question the witnesses, they will have to be severely restricted with regard to their questioning. This is the case even when there are only 10 members in a sub-committee. If there were 30 members of the House it would be terribly frustrating in Parliament and as I said in Committee. Also, I suggest that some of the centres which the committee might wish to visit may have difficulty in accommodating 45 or 50 people, as would be proposed. In one case, for example, this logistics train that went out with the committee on its one excursion was almost equivalent to the number of members participating. For this reason, I feel we must rethink the whole matter of committee activities.

My colleagues and I are not opposed to the idea of this committee travelling. I want to disabuse the mind of any hon. member who may suggest that this is so. But we are objecting to the procedure that was followed. This has also given us an opportunity to make some other observations with regard to the conduct and structure of committees.

Last year I heard complaints from the Government House Leader that many times he was not able to schedule the work before the House because the people who were primarily concerned with a particular bill were members of a committee that was off somewhere. At one time we had the ludicrous situation of three committees being away on tours. Of course, this makes work here and in other committees absolutely impossible. There has to be much better scheduling of the activities of the committees. It is not so bad at the beginning of the session, but I must plead for better planning than we had last year when 15, and sometimes 17, committees were sitting on the same day. How can we then be expected to carry on our duties in the House? It is just not possible.

I would also lay down a further caveat, that it should not be permissible for a committee to hold sittings while the House is sitting if the committee is hearing evidence from government officials. If we are dealing with witnesses from the outside, from the public, this can be done for their convenience and as a courtesy which we extend to them. However, in so far as the other hearings are concerned, our duties are here.

Some committee chairmen feel that all this is their responsibility and they have become so possessive with regard to committees that they refer to them as "my committee". What utter nonsense! They have merely been elected chairmen of committees and not the leader of—but this is not a senatorial or House subcommittee funded with a great deal of money, as happens in the American Congress. In Canada these committees belong to this House. Each committee has a chairman, and if a chairman feels he must become that possessive then he should certainly be replaced very quickly. In any event, these committees should sit for the benefit of the members and not for the benefit of the chairmen.

• (2:10 p.m.)

As much as possible, committees must avoid sitting whilst the House is sitting. We have grave staff limitations, and three committee sittings a day pile up the work and the costs. One has merely to look at how the costs of the legislative processes have escalated within the last year or two, and at the demands made on space and on personnel. What is the use of considering legislation in committee if it takes three weeks for the blessed committee reports to come back into this House?

Members of the House do not get the committee reports on time, but all too often the government House Leader has called for legislation to be considered the day after the final committee report appears at a time when no one has yet had a chance to examine the report. Legislation is being railroaded through the House because of these administrative roadblocks.

I agree with some of my colleagues who say that the platooning of replacement members of committees is wrong. We have seen roving squads of members whose chief ability is to sit in on committees, read newspapers, sign letters and at the same time raise their right hands in approval of matters on which they have had no previous experience. These members have not participated in the committee discussions, and are merely present to fill a seat or fill out a quorum. This is quite wrong. Let all members of committees be placed thereon following a resolution of this House so to do and not in the casual slip-shod way now prevailing.

The last point I wish to make with regard to committee chairmen is to acknowledge that there are some very notable exceptions. Chairmen of committees are not supposed to act as chief government hatchet men. They are not the chief proponents of legislation. They are not the chief defenders of government legislation. When they act in that way, they are acting completely contrary to the rules. The rules state that the chairman shall preside over the meetings of a committee and apply the rules in the same way as the Speaker does in this House. The Speaker is not an active, partisan participant in the deliberations of this House, and committee chairmen should not be partisan either. The sooner some of the chairmen learn this lesson the more peaceful and the better meetings we will have.

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

I have reservations about this particular motion in the terms in which it has been drawn. I think this was done perhaps as the result of a misunderstanding. I am not going to vote against it but I have entered very serious caveats. If we had an undertaking from the chairman of the committee that future plans for travelling by the committee will be explained to the House we would eliminate any possibility of further misunderstanding. Certainly other committees should be wiser, and take heed of what has transpired on this occasion.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, if I rise on this motion, it is not to criticize the principles colleagues of mine have put forward on the structure and efficiency of the committees. I agree with the principles mentioned today to the effect that the House must always remain master of the committees. My colleague from Wellington (Mr. Hales) has pointed out, with great eloquence, how much the trips taken by committee members cost. We must congratulate him, as representatives of the people, for wanting to save the taxpayers' money by seeing to it that those trips cost as little as possible.

My colleague from Wellington gave eloquent figures on the expenditures of certain committees.

I do not believe that even one of my colleagues is against the establishment of the committee on the constitution. Insofar as I am concerned, I have been asking for this since 1965, and I am pleased to see that the government has decided to set up such a committee.

I would have liked it better if the discussion on the fundamental principles, the structure, the operation and the deficiencies of the committees had not taken place today on the occasion of the establishment of the committee on the constitution.

Some committee members travel, when they should not do so, and on that score, I agree with the statement made by my colleague from Wellington to the effect that we should, as much as possible, save the taxpayers' money by reducing these trips to the minimum.

Some hon. members suggested that today's discussions showed that our party is opposed to the establishment of the committee on the constitution. If they believe that, they are mistaken and I rise simply to put the record straight. No member of my party is against it, and the less so now that we are going through such a difficult period, now that the federal-provincial conferences have failed to find some machinery to amend the constitution or repatriate it.

During the last federal-provincial conference, the premiers of the provinces and the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau) discussed some means that could possibly lead to amending the constitution. Unfortunately, nothing has been achieved in this respect.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Personally, I expect a great deal from the work of the Special Committee on the Constitution. In fact, if we can

prove to the Canadian people that the committee is as serious as it is believed to be, the committee will perhaps save the Canadian Confederation. The purpose of the committee is to go to the people; I am all for it because I believe in democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to visit Manitoba with members of the committee. We went to various places in the province and I was surprised to find out how much social and public organizations were interested in the Committee on the Constitution.

I was told that among the people we met during the trip, close to 1,000 expressed the hope that the Committee on the Constitution would work seriously to achieve a new Constitution, so that Canadians could live in a more united Canada.

I repeat, the survival of Confederation will depend on the activities and findings of this committee, as there is much thought given at the present time to the structure of a new constitution for Canada not only in Quebec but also in the English-speaking provinces. In fact, when we were in Manitoba, social organizations and young people came before us and expressed an opinion as to what tomorrow's Canada should be. It is the reason why I say that this committee is of paramount importance.

I fully agree with my colleagues who attempted to show that certain House committees travel too much during the sittings of the House. I would perhaps approve the idea put forward by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) that it might be desirable to have the committees sit one week every month and the House during the other three weeks. That is a realistic proposal, Mr. Speaker.

Obviously, the business of the House must first of all be carried out here, and it is only here that hon. members must make decisions. Out of this debate, the following principle will, I think, emerge: the committees must not have precedence over the House of Commons. Insofar and as long as the House of Commons remains the place where important decisions are made with regard to the country's business, our parliamentary institution will, I believe, be preserved.

I agree with my colleagues that meetings should be held in the provincial capitals. It is obviously impossible to visit all the important localities of each province.

We went to places in Manitoba with a population of approximately 800. Were the purposes of the committee served in this way? Perhaps not directly. Indirectly, however, we did establish contacts with these municipalities and towns.

I agree with the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) who favours visits to large centres. He suggests that a committee team should be allowed to go first in order to inquire and invite people from rural regions to meet the committee members and to submit briefs.

I think it is impossible—and the chairman of the committee probably agrees—to visit the most remote areas of each province. In Quebec, for instance, we could sit in Montreal, go to Quebec City and perhaps Chicoutimi.

There are, however, important towns where we should send in advance a team that would meet people, organizations as well as members of various associations and boards of trade in order to urge them to call on us.

My colleague from Peace River said something very important when he asked the House to adopt this procedure. Moreover, according to the hon. member for Wellington, it would save money.

Mr. Speaker, the former chairman of the Committee, the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan), gave the House the assurance that, from now on, he would submit to the House the schedule of travels planned by the Committee. This sets my mind at rest and if the activity of the committees is supervised by the House of Commons, I am not against the motion. I hope that it will not be necessary to vote on the subject.

I hope that the Committee on the Constitution will be reappointed this session and that newspapermen will understand this clearly. This debate does not mean that our party is against the work of the Committee on the Constitution. I would be very disappointed tonight to hear some newsmen say that the purpose of this debate was to demonstrate that the Progressive Conservatives do not support a Committee on the Constitution. The hon. member for Peace River in good faith has called the attention of the House on the mechanisms of the committees of the House, pointing out that we must think of revamping them to make them more efficient. He also asked those responsible for the committees to cut down their travelling expenses whenever possible.

Mr. Ricard: We are the ones who requested the appointment of a Committee on the Constitution.

Mr. Asselin: Yes, I said that before. As my colleague, the member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Ricard) mentioned, it is our party that called for the setting up of a Parliamentary Committee on the Constitution. Therefore we are not here to kill our baby, Mr. Speaker.

Committee chairmen should take into consideration the comments made this morning by the hon. member for Peace River in order to do a good job, while husbanding the taxpayers' money, and report on their activities to the Commons.

If this is the assurance given to us by the former chairman of the Committee, the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville, I am prepared to support the motion.

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

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I will be as brief as possible since several members, including the honourable member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise), have already expressed quite valuable views.

We are certainly in favour of a study aimed at amending our constitution. We were not the last, when we arrived here in 1962, to ask that the constitution be amended.

Today, we are asked to establish a committee to study our constitutional problems. I feel that before considering constitutional reform we should first find out how the constitution should have been applied.

The federal and provincial governments failed to respect our constitution in the past, and before thinking of amending it, it is important to bear this in mind.

If history proves that we have often neglected to apply our constitution, how can we hope that a new constitution will fare better?

In my opinion, we should first give the people of this country and our legislative bodies the moral assurance that the present constitution has been brought into operation. Unfortunately, past experience tends to prove otherwise. Furthermore, how is it that in the troubled days that we are now living, we can't interrupt our regular activities to discuss the constitution as a matter of urgency while all across Canada, people are making use of radical means of protest?

The committee members are travelling to the Maritimes next week and from what I know, their hotel accommodations and their transportation have already been arranged and witnesses have been requested to appear before committee. Oddly enough, the House has not yet approved their trip.

In my opinion we proceeded too quickly. We are acting according to a plan whose consequence is that instead of pouring water on the very hot constitutional issue we are throwing oil on it. In view of the political situation in Canada, at a time when the Committee on the Constitution is about to leave for the Maritimes and other provinces in order to hear evidence and given above all the critical climate in Quebec, it surely will be a good opportunity for the separatists, the members of the FLQ and other radicals to exploit the situation in order to stage representations and demonstrations, which will be in direct contradiction with the aims behind the setting up of the Committee on the Constitution: to make a logical, serious and objective study. Perhaps the Committee will have to meet in localities where demonstrations with a lamentable outcome will take place.

• (2:30 p.m.)

I do not wish to be a prophet of doom but in the present circumstances I would suggest postponing the Committee's travels for a few weeks to allow the temporary situation in Quebec and elsewhere in Canada to improve, as I hope it will.

I quite fail to see any urgency for the motion, although personally I approve of it but feel that because of present circumstances adopting it would be giving revolutionaries and radicals an opportunity to mislead the people as to its purpose.

[Mr. Rondeau.]

Mr. Gilles Marceau (Lapointe): Mr. Speaker, I would like in the next few minutes to make a modest contribution to the present proceedings on the establishment of a joint committee of the House of Commons and the Senate for the purpose of considering the constitution.

Last year it was my privilege to attend the meetings of this committee which were conducted with remarkable ability by the hon. member for Windsor-Wakerville (Mr. MacGuigan and the hon. Senator Lamontagne.

We must bear in mind that the activities of the Committee on the Constitution will not necessarily lead to a complete revamping. The purpose of this committee is mainly to facilitate fruitful dialogue not only with hon. members but with the entire population.

I do not agree with those who claim that any study of the constitution must bring about a new or amended constitution. Above all, what is most essential, is not to impose a constitution on the people, but to become aware of what the people want. Canadians, whatever their origin, must be made to agree to live together in the same country. As for those who expect this committee to give them a new or an amended constitution, they are not helping the people.

The hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) said earlier that he did not approve of the members of the Committee on the Constitution going to the Maritimes. All I will say to him is that, not being a member of this committee, he cannot grasp its importance or its value.

When we had the opportunity, not so long ago, to go to the Yukon and Manitoba, I was the first to realize that I did not really know my huge country nor its problems that are often the same as those of Quebec which is very often held to be different but is not in some respects.

I think that such trips allow us to get in touch with the people themselves and not only with the agencies which represent an important part of the population. What is most important, Mr. Speaker, it is to meet people, to talk with them and to determine what they want and how they want to live in our great country.

I think that this committee is essential, that proceedings should go on just as in the last session. Again, I do not expect in the near future a new constitution or important amendments to it, but I hope that all hon. members are aware that regardless of political parties, we have received a mandate to represent not a party but the people and to try to meet their real needs.

As the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Asselin) said, I also feel quite optimistic and I am convinced that despite the momentary difficulties we are having there will arise a spirit of understanding among all Canadians.

Events now taking place in Quebec are most important and will perhaps make more Canadians realize that we are now living a critical period of our history. Instead of being disheartened, of losing hope, of refusing to face facts, it is important that we, English-speaking or French-speaking Canadians, should join forces to give Canada a suitable structure.

In closing I wish to say that I am sure this committee will know how to serve the best interests of the whole population. We must maintain this committee while trying to improve it, because in some respects it does not seem to be equal to the task. I find that too much restraint—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I must remind the hon. member that the matter before us is to decide whether the members of the Committee on the Constitution should be granted the public funds they need to travel across Canada.

I do not think it is appropriate at the present time to reconsider whether the committee should exist, whether we should have a new constitution and how it should be adopted. It seems to me those matters extend far beyond the limited motion now before the House. If the Chair allows hon. members to engage in a substantial debate on amendments to the constitution, we will not get through the debate today.

• (2:40 p.m.)

I therefore suggest to the hon. member for Lapointe, who now has the floor, and to other hon. members who will perhaps want to participate in this debate that, for the efficiency of our proceedings, we should keep to the motion now under study.

Mr. Marceau: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I think this warning is quite appropriate and I will merely close my remarks by saying that I wholly favour granting the funds required for the members of this committee to travel throughout the province but such funds should obviously be limited and controlled. Of course, when I said throughout the province I meant—

An hon. Member: Throughout Canada.

Mr. Marceau: —of course, throughout our wide country since, in my opinion, we should be aware of the problems facing the province of Quebec as well as those in other parts of Canada.

Therefore I approve the whole resolution while I admit that we cannot allow that unduly large sums be affected for that purpose. Although I believe the appropriation is justified, control should be kept over those funds in order to ensure that they be really used for the purpose we are proposing: a better constitution for Canadians.

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, being very interested in the make-up of this committee and conscious of its importance, I cannot help but add a few observations on the funds that must be allotted to this committee for a lot of reasons.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of discussing, as you said a while ago. It is not a question of any hon. member doubting the importance of this committee. It is rather a question of establishing its responsibilities. It seems clear to us that Parliament must be able to initiate any decision. I think that this is why some of my colleagues have expressed certain opinions.

I acknowledge, as has been done by many other members, that Parliament must necessarily dictate to committees, rather than be satisfied with the committee's report following its visits.

It seems quite clear to me that some kind of itinerary should be submitted here. Furthermore, this House should allow the committee to hold sittings in the major communities of Canada where representations might be made by local citizens to the benefit of the committee. This committee assuredly needs the support of public funds if it is to collect the best information available all over Canada. Its reports will then be based on information obtained from direct sources.

I am somewhat concerned by the opinion of the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau) that the time is not ripe for the House to invite the committee to tour Canada. I believe that the deep dissatisfaction that exists in certain regions justifies the urgent government allocation of the funds the committee needs to start work as soon as possible.

• (2:50 p.m.)

According to that hon. member, that would amount to giving a chance to revolutionaries. The time has come for us to do something. We have shown enough tolerance with respect to certain freedoms. The government, in the present context, has not only the power, but the duty to take categorical decisions.

It is not by keeping silent, by holding this silence kept for too long, that the dangers facing us will be checked. To the contrary, all hon. members must support the establishment of that committee, in order that it may be given the necessary funds and that it may quickly report to Parliament. Then the latter will have to act as rapidly and introduce either amendments to the constitution or a new constitution altogether. It needs badly to be brought up to date.

With the appropriations available to the committee, it will be possible to come up with a constitution which will take into consideration the particularities found everywhere in Canada and not only in Quebec. Due to the serious efforts which will be made, this constitution will allow Quebec to anticipate the future within a federal system, with the necessary guarantees.

There is no need to mention that the committee has only to look up the documents submitted during the federal-provincial conferences for the past ten years to know exactly what Quebec's needs are. Such visits everywhere in Canada will make it possible for this committee to become fully aware of existing differences. The committee must get the funds it needs to study problems in the field and, having secured all the necessary information, I hope that in a year from now they will propose a constitution through which the freedoms of each individual are respected, and the needs of every province are recognized. We can then build something lasting, that will enable us, to face the future with much more hope and satisfaction than we can today.

Mr. Speaker: If the minister speaks now, he will close the debate.

[*English*]

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, my remarks on this motion will be very brief indeed. I want to thank hon. members for their participation in this short debate and for raising quite a number of important questions in connection with the operation of the standing and special committees. It is true that in the general opinion of members of the House the changes that have taken place in the rules have meant that the operation of standing committees has become more extensive, both legislatively and in examination of the estimates. It is also obvious that the new role of the standing and special committees has to some extent altered the atmosphere in the House of Commons itself. The general wish, of course, was to give this additional responsibility to standing committees; but it is now clear to all of us who are observing the House of Commons itself that the additional responsibility that has been given to the standing committees and to special committees has had an effect on the House itself.

Whether that effect has on the whole been totally beneficial is certainly something on which opinions will develop as time goes on. It is obvious that as standing committees multiply in importance and in the burdens they carry, the prospects for members attending debates in the House will decrease. It is a matter of regret to me that many important speeches are made in the Commons to a very small attendance.

Mr. Dinsdale: We are all at committees.

Mr. MacEachen: Members are elsewhere, hopefully doing their jobs in the committees. I for one, speaking personally, attach the highest importance to maintaining the House of Commons as the central forum in this country and as the central forum in our parliamentary system.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McGrath: It is about time somebody said that.

Mr. MacEachen: When we enthusiastically gave this new and important role to the standing and special committees, it was with the clear expectation that the role would be developed within the context of our parliamentary system. Certainly, no decision has been taken by this House or by any other authority of which I am aware that would lead to the conclusion that, because of the added importance of standing committees, we have adopted a congressional form of committee system.

It may be—indeed, I am sure this is the case—that the committee system is evolving, that things are happening within the committee system which affect the House and which have not been clearly foreseen or clearly intended, or indeed, may not have been fully thought out at the beginning. There is nothing wrong at all with that. We do want to maintain the importance of the committee system. But at the same time we want to know where we are going, just where this new system will lead us and what effect it is going to have on the House.

[Mr. Speaker.]

A lot of practical questions have been raised about the operation of the committee system, the cost, the logistics, about sub-committees, staffing, sittings of committees while the House is sitting and travel—new questions that have not been fully dealt with. Having myself expressed the opinion that the committee system is expected to operate within the parliamentary system, all I can say is that the House of Commons must maintain its mastery over the committees.

Having said that, I do not for a moment suggest that we turn the clock back. But I do suggest that we move forward in the direction of giving new importance to the committees. We must look at their role in the total context of the parliamentary system. Looking at it in that way, if changes ought to be made in our present system, then they ought to be made clearly and with full insight as to their effect.

I listened with great interest to the speech of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) and to all other hon. members who have spoken in the debate, and I will certainly undertake to consider with my colleagues the question whether further study should be given by the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization to the operation of the committee system and where it is going. I want to say, speaking personally as government House Leader, that I intend to attempt to conduct my own examination of the effects of the committee system on our total operations and on the role of the member of parliament in order to obtain some clear idea, at least for my own guidance, as to the direction we should take in the future.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I recommend that this resolution be adopted, with the assurance that the suggestions that have been made will be carefully considered.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion proposed by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen). Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: On division.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

• (3:00 p.m.)

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The House resumed, from Wednesday, October 14, consideration of the motion of Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the amendment thereto of Mr. Stanfield (p. 29), and the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Fortin (p. 136).

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words this afternoon about the establishment of a new department of environmental affairs, and I should like to say at the outset that shaping our

Canadian environment is the biggest challenge we face in the 1970's. It is a bigger challenge than unemployment. It is a bigger challenge than inflation. It is a bigger issue than pensions or skyjacking or the FLQ. To many Canadians it is a bigger challenge than all of our financial and social problems put together.

There is real urgency here. We have to act on the environmental front quickly and with determination. We have to move ahead of events, rather than from crisis to crisis. Our critical path, in other words, must be laid out ahead of time. We must have a plan to preserve the quality of our environment. We must preserve our wildlife and our fish and our trees. We must renew our renewable resources as quickly and as effectively as we know how.

Economic growth is essential. Social progress must also continue in the 1970's. But their spin-offs must not result in a deterioration of our surroundings. Economic growth and social progress, in other words, must be paced in relation to our environment. They must be managed in such a way as to improve the quality of life in this country.

From now on our emphasis must be on the wise management of our living resources and the elements that support them. Renewability of our living resources—fish, forests, birds, wildlife—and the renewed quality of our water, our soil and our air are the keys to a better future.

Industry, therefore, must keep its poisons to itself. Canada's cities and towns must do likewise. By recycling their wastes and renewing their inventories they can help us to progress on all fronts—social, economic and ecological in the 70's.

Industry's hard-nosed scientific approach has served us well in the past. But it has never been able to solve all our problems. It has had to bend to economic imperatives. Now it will have to bend, increasingly, to environmental considerations. Life in all its forms is too precious and our Canadian ecology is too fragile for us to ignore these environmental considerations any longer.

I do not want to give the wrong impression, Mr. Speaker. I am not talking about a change in direction; merely a change in emphasis. I am not turning my back on economic growth. But I am saying that industry must be more respectful of its surroundings. I am saying that our city planners must be concerned about renewability when they uproot trees and divert streams to make way for streets and modern buildings.

We must be careful for, if we break the chain of living things, entire structures come tumbling down. Wipe out a single species and you undermine an entire life pyramid. You undermine a system which would have gone on reproducing and renewing itself forever.

This is why our modern technologists have to tread carefully in the future. This is why our engineers must insulate many of our new processes from Canada's living environment. This is why we in government must make many of our human activities as neutral as possible—neutral in the biological sense of the word—and antiseptic in so far as our fish, our wildlife and our trees are concerned.

Some people, of course, would set the clock back. They would have us go back to the Middle Ages. They would even have us go back to "monkey hill" because they are afraid of modern science, they are afraid of modern technology, they are afraid of the side effects of industrial growth. Progress, in the materialistic sense of the word, is suspect. Apprehension, and occasionally fear, has taken its place in the hearts of many Canadians.

I disagree with those people who fearfully take what I regard as a static approach to these things. I disagree with those who look on our earthly biosphere as a timeless realm in which animals and plants jostle each other in humble harmony. They say that man must fit in, accept nature's limits, reduce his consumption, limit his reproduction, join the Society for Zero Population Growth.

On the contrary, I believe that man can better his lot, improve his standard of living, and still make the most of his environment. I believe that man can improve on nature. I believe that he can renew and replenish our living resources.

I believe that Canadians can build up their fisheries and increase the cut which they take from our forest lands. We can expand our resource base and operate on a sustained yield basis. In other words, we can use our human intelligence to plan and, with intelligent planning, we can have economic growth and a healthy environment as well.

Still, a word of caution as we enter the 1970's. Let us not lose sight of our ecological time scale. Let us not think that ecological changes can be made overnight. Often they take generations. Centuries may pass before a new life species will develop to its full potential.

This is why sudden changes in our environment are to be deplored. This is why industry must recycle its effluents and whole communities find other uses for their wastes. This is why the effects of modern physics and modern chemistry must be cushioned in various ways. This is why we must turn thumbs down on those who would tax the "assimilative capacity" of our local waters and our air. No lake, however large, and no atmosphere however vast is capable of absorbing man's harmful effluents forever.

Take the liquid metal mercury, for example. In its elemental form it is unknown in nature. But man has stripped it of its sulphur. He has released the metallic mercury and shipped it out to industry to use as it wishes.

Industry in turn, has used elemental mercury in an indiscriminate manner. It has been using mercury as if it were going out of style. It has been using it up as if it were a modern raw material. It has been letting metallic mercury loose on our environment without thinking about its effects on our forest on our wildlife, fish and worse still—at the top end of nature's food chain—man himself.

Mercury as everyone knows, is a heavy metal. It was supposed to sink to the bottom of our rivers and stay there. But minute bacteria went to work on it. They generated a soluble compound known as methyl mercury, a compound which dissolves in water, a compound which is flushed out into lakes and out into the sea.

Mercury in this poisonous form has also been moving up the food chain. It has moved from plants to fish in the Great Lakes and whales in Hudson Bay. It has shown up in even higher concentrations in the flesh of bird life as well. It threatens the life of human beings who eat fish.

Drifting backward and forward across our man made boundary lines, it has created problems which are not only inter-provincial but also international in character. The danger of poisoning to people has called for various interventions on our part here in Ottawa. We have had to close lakes to commercial fishing and make loans to commercial fishermen. We have had to destroy large quantities of fish and we have had to call upon industry to make amends.

As Minister of Fisheries, last spring I called for a meeting with the top executives in the chlor-alkali industry. I asked them to change their ways. I asked them to recycle all of their mercury bearing effluents within the factory fence. This the industry did, and promptly. Ninety per cent of its mercury losses have now been eliminated. Soon the figure will be 99 per cent! That is not bad going when you realize that we first ran into this mercury thing in the fall of 1969, less than a year ago.

Some of you will remember the famous Trail smelter case in the 1920's which involved air. Fumes from the big lead-zinc refinery in southeastern British Columbia drifted over into the State of Idaho. American citizens there sued the Consolidated Mining and Smelting Company Limited in Canada. They forced Cominco to strip the sulphur out of these fumes. And stripping out the sulphur led to the creation of a fertilizer industry. It created an industry which has flourished in western Canada ever since.

This is only one example of an industry which has benefited, in the long run, from a pollution abatement program. Ammonium sulfate is now a major by-product of many of our mining operations in Canada. Not only does it make money for those companies but it also encourages things to grow. It gives impetus to a thousand life cycles and it helps to renew our environment in a dozen different ways.

Look at our big pulp and paper industry. This industry alone is responsible for half of the bulk of the pollution which enters our rivers and streams at the present time. Look what it has done under pressure from our Fisheries Act. New kraft mills have installed settling basins and built biological treatment ponds. Half a dozen of them are said to be among the cleanest mills in the world. They are clean enough for salmon and they are clean enough for the tourist industry. This is a big change from half a dozen years ago when pulp and paper, inevitably, meant pollution and pollution meant a loss of business to the motel owners and the fishing lodges in the areas where these mills were located.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Again, there have been welcome by-products. Canadian engineering firms have shown us how to design these treatment facilities. They have been so successful that other countries have been asking for their services. Sandwell and Company and H.A. Simmons in Vancouver now have contracts in Sweden and the U.S.S.R. They are helping those countries to clean up their rivers and streams. Think of it! They would never have got this work if we in the Fisheries Department had not insisted that our pulp mills must not kill salmon on the Fraser River and that the waters downstream must be fit for any one of us to use for swimming.

Here again, we have shown that our environmental problems are solvable. We have shown that they can be solved so long as government continues to insist that industry tighten up on its housekeeping, that each plant recycle its effluents within the factory fence, and that anything that leaves its property does not unduly burden the assimilative capacity of the water or the air in its local surroundings.

One thing which hon. members should bear in mind is that we have a special competence at the federal level. We have a special competence here in Ottawa. We have a special competence in federal offices and federal research establishments across the country. This competence—this unique competence—is on the biological front. We have Canada's cadre of biologists, engineers with a background in biology, planners with a sensitivity for living things, fish, wildlife, trees, tundra, parklands and so on.

Proof of what I am saying is to be found, not only in the high regard with which our top fish and wildlife biologists are held the world over, but also in the actions of the provinces themselves. Out in my home province of British Columbia, the minister in charge of pollution, the Hon. Ray Williston, deals directly with our regional fisheries offices asking for advice, our forestry pathologists asking for advice and our wildlife people asking for advice. Our regional experts on the biological front are his experts, and let's keep it this way.

The mercury problem in Ontario demonstrates what I am saying in another way. The Hon. George Kerr and Ontario's Water Resources Commission naturally look to us to be the experts on fish and other aquatic plant life like algae. They have all sorts of engineers, economists and administrators. They have a lot of very competent people and they have already done a lot to protect our environment. But the fact remains; they look to us for advice on the biological side, on the living side, on the renewable resource side. It makes sense and I hope they continue to do this in future.

Clearly smaller provinces do not have this competence. Quebec does not have anything resembling a biological research board; Alberta does not; Manitoba does not. Nor are they likely to. Environmental research on the biological side is an all-embracing matter. It cannot be provincialized. It should not be provincialized because our environment is essentially global. Like life itself it is bigger than all of us.

Our fisheries and forestry staff is now being supplemented by other competent people. They are being joined by scientists, engineers, resource economists and technicians from the Wildlife Service and from the water resources section of the Mines Department. Add in survey crews which our forestry service sends out every summer and other teams from the Meteorological Service and from National Health and Welfare, and you can see that we in this department are already plugged in to our natural environment. We are already keeping a keen eye on things, locally and regionally from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the high Arctic to the International Boundary Line.

This manpower, backed up by regional laboratories is extremely helpful. But we still need a system of continuous monitoring—monitoring of our water, our air and our soil. We need to know what is happening, hour by hour, to our fish and our trees, to our wildlife and our birds, and to the health of man himself. We should be in a position to publish local environmental indices such as the air pollution index which is being reported, regularly, in Toronto these days.

Like our consumer price index these environmental indices will help Canadians to know how fast things are improving and what effects new industries are having on the communities in which they locate. At the beginning of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I stressed the need for action. I talked about a critical path. I talked about a timetable and I talked about getting things done. Here are a few of the highlights which I see us hitting over the next few months. Here are a few of the things which we can do before our new Department of Environmental Affairs is formally set up by Parliament.

First, we can transfer the relevant branches, divisions and sections of other departments to Fisheries and Forestry and begin to operate as a federal unit next week.

Second, I can, privately, name a dozen key advisers across the country. These authorities in the twin fields of renewable resource development and environmental control will meet with me periodically. We will begin to hammer out our guidelines. We will begin the task of mapping our future and roughing out our critical path for the early 70's. Here, then, is our National Environmental Council in embryo. These men and women will form the nucleus around which the government might later build a formally constituted council for the future.

Third, I personally intend to meet all of the provincial ministers who are concerned with pollution and the quality of life. I will go to them; they will not have to come to me. I will visit the provincial capitals asking for advice and talking about co-operation. I will ask our provincial people how they think we should word a new national clean air act. I will be pushing all of them to name water quality management areas—areas for joint federal-provincial management in which our new Canada Water Act can apply and soon.

Fourth, we will shortly be releasing our first nationwide standards under the Fisheries Act. These regulations will be brought in industry by industry. Starting with elemental mercury and phosphorous we will move quickly into pulp and paper. Already our regulations dealing with effluents from the pulp and paper industry have been drafted. Next week we will begin discussions of them in all their detail with the provinces and with the industry itself. Some further editing may be required because we want these regulations to work. But they will be proclaimed before the end of the year and they will then provide national norms which new mills must surpass and to which old ones must move during the 70's.

Fifth, we can do more, much more, under the Canada Shipping Act. We can get a lot tougher with tanker owners and the oil companies. We must set up revolving funds to look after those who, through no cause of their own, are hurt by oil spills and the like. And we must have task forces standing by in case of future crises like the *Arrow* and the *Irving Whale*.

Sixth, we can launch more high priority, government-industry sponsored research projects similar to the one I recently announced for the pulp and paper industry aimed at the development of new processes for treating their effluents in a satisfactory way.

Seventh, we can encourage and provide as much information as possible to local societies whose aim it is to clean up their surroundings and make proposals for action to the government.

Finally, a word about perspectives. Our tiny earth is rocketing through space like a capsule. Clearly it is self-contained and self-sustaining. Biologically speaking it can also be self-regulating. A million life cycles are pulsating within well defined limits—limits set by the earth's own eco-system. These life cycles are linked and interact with each other in a million different ways.

In the past things seemed to work reasonably well. Now, however, some sand appears to be getting into our gears. Like moondust, this sand is barren. It is inorganic. It is inanimate. It is non-living. It is non-renewable. Worse still, this sand is sometimes anti-biological in nature. It can destroy life. It can wipe out entire species. It can strip our gears. It can mess up our food chains and it can even poison man himself.

• (3:20 p.m.)

This sand is the product of man's own inventiveness. It is being created by our chemists and our physicists. It includes radioactive waste, chlorinated hydrocarbons and metallic substances like mercury. It is being turned loose in our sensitive biosphere.

This sort of thing has to stop. It has to stop immediately. This is why industries will have to clear their new products in the future, and this is why industry must recycle its effluent. This is why old factories and our existing cities and towns must become as antiseptic as possible. This is why we need to co-operate at all levels of government in Canada. This is why we also need a new department of environmental affairs to work at home and to work with other countries in our crusade to save man from himself.

I hope I have convinced you, Mr. Speaker, that shaping our Canadian environment is the biggest challenge we face in the 70's. We need economic growth but we need a clean environment as well. We need social progress and quality of life. We need to renew and revitalize. We need to put the accent on the living rather than the dead.

This is why I urge all hon. members to support us in our initiatives to pass a new clean air act and put more teeth into the Canada Shipping Act during the current session, also to support us in setting up a new department of environmental affairs in Canada, the first national department of its kind anywhere in the world.

Mr. Lundrigan: Would the minister permit a question?

Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lundrigan: Perhaps I may not be permitted to say that what we have heard is the biggest contribution to pollution in Canada of which I am aware in the last couple of years.

May I ask the minister a question? In view of the fact that both the west and the east coasts of Canada, with six provinces directly affected and all of Canada indirectly affected by the possibility of fisheries having only about a five year life span left in the event that we do not get very active and aggressive conservational measures from the federal government—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Would the hon. member put his question.

Mr. Lundrigan: My question is coming and it is very simple. Can the minister having given us that gobbledygook, get around to indicating to the Canadian people, to the House of Commons and to his parliamentary secretary who was just recently appointed, what initiatives the new department of environmental control which will be part of the Department of Fisheries and Forestry, is planning to take to protect the Canadian people from the depletion of our major fishery resource which constitutes 10 per cent of the industry producing aspect of our economy?

Mr. Davis: The hon. member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Lundrigan) is very knowledgeable in fishery matters and he knows—and he knew before he began to ask his question—what our initiatives are. They are several. First, we have, through the North Atlantic Fisheries Commission which involves 12 countries, argued for a sustained yield operation in the North Atlantic. We are trying also by taking the lead at the next Law of the Sea Conference, to make this policy effective, to put fishing on a sustained yield basis and to put the countries which own the shelf areas, and this includes Canadian control over the Grand Banks, in a special position where we will not only have a sustained yield operation out there but where our own fishermen will be on the inside track. It will be the first time in the world's history that we will have had a major fishery with a predictable resource to exploit, and certainly the first time in the history of Canada when our own fishermen will have some sort of guarantee for the future.

Mr. Lundrigan: In view of the fact that the North Atlantic Fisheries Commission to which the minister referred has been recommending for five years that initiatives need to be taken and of the fact this commission has proven to be ineffective because it is not at a sufficiently high level to take initiatives, can the minister indicate whether there are any new initiatives to be taken. It has already been proven that the recommendations of this Commission have not been accepted and are not effective. Can he indicate as well—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The Chair has to bring the hon. member to order. His question is quite argumentative and he will have the opportunity to make a speech in due course. So if he has a question to put to the minister he should put it as plainly and as briefly as possible.

Mr. Lundrigan: I do not have further questions to put to the minister but I would like to say that it looks as though the FLQ—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please.

Mr. McGrath: Would the minister permit one short question? Can he assure the House and the country, and especially the fishing industry of the country, that fishery problems will not be neglected when he assumes his new responsibilities as the minister responsible for pollution. I ask that question quite sincerely.

Mr. Davis: I think the hon. member has asked me a very good question. The fisheries service has to remain an integral service in our new department. It has to be regarded by the fishermen, as their service. It will remain intact in so far as I am concerned. It will also have the first call on my time.

Mr. Lundrigan: Why did the minister not refer to it then?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): I thought the applause was for me but I guess it was for my colleague, the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Lundrigan).

I was fortunate indeed to find myself following the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) in his remarks to the House concerning his new duties as minister in charge of environmental affairs. I propose to direct my remarks to the same subject.

First, I want to wish the minister well in carrying out the additional responsibilities which the government proposes to give him. Our party agrees with many of the proposals that the minister has made since it was indicated that he would be appointed to this position, and also with many of the actions that he has taken over the last six or eight months in connection with pollution control. We believe that he is concerned, as we all are, with the environment, and he has made an effort to show it.

But this afternoon I want to make a critical examination of the situation in which the minister finds himself and of some of the problems which he is facing in assuming these new responsibilities. I will be pointing out that the minister has been hobbled and hamstrung by the votes and actions of his own colleagues and of the government itself. He is going to have great difficulties in carrying out his objectives. It is with this in mind that I will point out to the minister some of the problems that I see before him and that I hope he can overcome.

First, I should express my congratulations to the mover (Mr. Trudel) and seconder (Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia)) of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne and to say it is always a privilege to be nominated to make these addresses.

The government has made three proposals in the Speech from the Throne and in the Prime Minister's (Mr. Trudeau) comments which followed: first, to re-organize the government structure to create a ministry concerned with the environment and to bring into the Department of Fisheries and Forestry several sections from other departments; second, to bring in a clean air act or some similar legislation described in the list of legislation as "air pollution legislation"; third, to propose amendments to the Canada Shipping Act with relation to pollution.

I must say at first that I agree with the necessity for such legislation. With regard to the creation of a department through which to consolidate pollution control efforts, we on this side have been pressing for this for some time now without too much response from the government or the Prime Minister until pressure from all sources began to build up. For example, on April 29 of this year, as recorded at page 6411 of *Hansard* I asked the Prime Minister the following question:

• (3:30 p.m.)

May I ask the Prime Minister if he intends to designate a minister to co-ordinate pollution control activities?

The reply was:

—we do assure co-ordination of pollution activities in a variety of ways, cabinet committees being one of them.

Immediately following that, the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate asked the Prime Minister if consideration would be given to having the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry "co-ordinate all activities relating to pollution control, which is now under four or five different ministers." I quote *Hansard:*

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member very much for the suggestion which I must say is not very helpful.

There was a very definite answer, that he did not really intend doing anything about the consolidation of pollution control efforts.

Early this year, it became obvious that there were two views within the government on how to approach the question of water pollution. One was proposed by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) who was tied to the Canada Water Act, and who rejected absolutely the principles of adopting national water quality standards, of requiring internal pollution control inside the factory fence, and of placing parliamentary restraint upon the export of water. I will deal with these aspects of the problem later in detail.

At the same time, the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry was making speeches around the country, in which he seemed to be of the opposite view. He seemed to be accepting those views which the Opposition was then presenting, and I must say that the public was indeed confused. I would hope that some of the confusion has been reduced, but I doubt it and I intend to show why.

On April 13 of this year, I asked the Prime Minister if he could clear up some of the problems within his government, and which appeared to be coming out to the public, by asking him, as recorded in *Hansard* of that date:

In view of the provisions of Bill C-204 which was given first reading on Friday and which effectively passes control over to the Department of Fisheries and Forestry, has a policy decision been made that administration of water pollution control in Canada should be given to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry?

The Prime Minister replied:

No, Mr. Speaker. Control is divided between the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, who is responsible for the application of the provisions of the water act and the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry.

I then asked:

Might I ask the Prime Minister which of these ministers is responsible in the case of a conflict between inspectors under the two acts?

The Prime Minister replied:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will give us an example of a conflict I will answer his question.

Of course at that time I could not engage in an argument, but I am doing it now. At that time the Prime Minister did not seem to know that there was a conflict, and apparently he did not intend to do anything about settling the conflict. Now, apparently, the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry has won the struggle, and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources will have the administration of the Canada Water Act taken away from him. I do not say this is basically bad because I do not really think the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry will be inheriting anything very helpful when he gets it. However, that is the situation now.

Following the Speech from the Throne and the Prime Minister's statement, the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry wasted no time in repudiating the policies adopted by the government and, I may say, Parliament as well by virtue of a majority of votes in the last session. As I have already said, I have a great deal of respect for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry and I incline more to his views than to those of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources on some of these basic issues.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask, where does the government stand as a government responsible for making policy decisions on these issues? It is not good enough that the Prime Minister supports one view today and another tomorrow, or that he supports one minister today

and another tomorrow. How can the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry hope to proceed expeditiously in water pollution control with some of these major decisions already made, voted upon and recorded, opposite to the views he now expresses?

The first thing is money. The Canada Water Act and the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources both foundered because the government would allot no money for pollution control efforts. That minister had to back and fill in an effort to make it appear that the government was doing something. He was sacrificed on the altar of expediency. Is the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry any better off today? There certainly was no indication that he is, either in the Speech from the Throne or in the Prime Minister's remarks.

There is a second difficulty related to the export of water. This issue was placed squarely before Parliament on June 3, 1970. Two members of the opposition, the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) and the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding), each had motions before the House asking that no water be exported from Canada without the approval of Parliament. Surely, that was not an untenable view, but their motions were voted down by the government majority, as recorded at pages 7689 and 7690 of *Hansard*. It is interesting to note that voting against those motions were the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and the Prime Minister, all of which seemed to indicate the government was taking an attitude that it would not concern itself with Parliament in respect of this matter, and that the issue of the export of water was one on which it could exercise some flexibility. We now find that the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry is taking a definite view on this issue, and I may say that I agree with him in principle.

As recorded in the *Globe and Mail* of October 10, 1970 the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry laid down four basic rules regarding water resources. The first was:

> Don't export water to the United States because it will never be possible to cut off the flow.

We agree with this. This was the suggestion we made last May and June when we tried to sell it to the government, but by its vote in this House the government rejected that idea. Where does this leave the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry? There has been a parliamentary decision on the issue, which is going to be very difficult to overcome.

There is another problem here, and again a decision was made by a vote of the House. Time and again during the debate on the Canada Water Act in the committee, in the House and outside it, the opposition pressed for the adoption of a set of water quality standards which would be applicable across Canada. The government just as stubbornly resisted.

In this connection, I wish to quote two comments made by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources during the committee proceedings on February 2. The first is to be found at page 1:14, as follows:

> A national standard would be a licence, and a free licence, to pollute.

[Mr. Aiken.]

Again at page 1:15 he was recorded as saying, speaking as a Minister of the Crown:

> In our opinion uniform standards would not be in the best interest of achieving the highest quality of water all across Canada.

• (3:40 p.m.)

That is what the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources said just a few months ago on behalf of the government. On June 3, 1970, as recorded at page 7691 of *Hansard*, there was a recorded vote in the House on a motion moved by the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) which read in part as follows:

> Forthwith upon the coming into force of this Act, the Governor in Council, upon the recommendation of the Minister, shall establish water quality standards for all clases of water in Canada.

That is a clear statement of policy and of intent to establish water quality standards. The government, including the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and the Prime Minister voted against this motion to set up water quality standards.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That was two-faced.

Mr. Aiken: That position was established and adopted by the government and, even worse, by Parliament by a majority of votes. This is the position. We can reverse it. Nevertheless, we shall certainly wonder if the government today is against establishing water quality standards all across Canada and is in favour of such a course. I want to go farther and quote what the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry said on September 23 in Toronto. I shall read from his own press release:

> So there is a great deal to be said for national standards. There is a great deal to be said for standards which apply to Canadian industries from coast to coast. Each new plant will have to meet the same set of criteria. They will not be able to seek out 'pollution havens' in some of our weaker provinces. There will be no local cesspools and the game will be the same regardless of where a firm is operating, in Newfoundland or B.C.

I agree with this position. This is exactly what we spent the whole of the last session trying to promote, in connection with legislation then before the House. It is almost exactly, word for word, our position.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

An hon. Member: But they got rid of Whelan.

Mr. Aiken: We voted on this in the House, and national standards were turned down.

The minister also said this in another speech, in Courtenay, B.C. His speech, I think, was similar to the one he made in Toronto.

> Why should we buck national standards which will force other parts of the country to clean up as well? Pollution havens in the East won't help our economic growth in the West. Nor will any lessening of standards, locally, in one part of B.C. help the rest of the province to develop as it should.

Again, we agree. Yes, we agree. Pollution havens were what we feared during the debate on the Canada Water Act. Pollution havens were what we feared when we moved our amendment to establish national water quality standards. Those amendments were turned down in committee, voted down during the report stage and again voted down on third reading. Now, the minister has come along and said, "But I agree."

I am not trying to make the government look ridiculous—which it is. I am trying to point out that it is faced with a technical and difficult problem. It adopted a policy, as did Parliament, in connection with this matter. How are we to get out from under and reverse ourselves? We could reverse ourselves; the House, of course, could do that. It is the gentlemen who are in the majority who must reverse themselves, because they have already cast their votes and voted down our amendments. I say that not only is this ridiculous, but it makes the job of the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry extremely difficult.

Before sitting down, I should like to twist his arm a little more, and rub his nose a little in what has happened. I sympathize with the minister. He has said what we, sitting here, have tried to encourage the government to say. We are glad that the minister has now said the proper thing. But where does that leave him in the light of the views he has expressed and the way he has voted?

I want to talk now about what is called the factory fence rule. I am glad the minister mentioned it today, because I do not think I need go any farther than I am about to go in my explanations. This is one of the things we pressed for throughout the hearings connected with the Canada Water Act. Although the act is foggy in general, one of its provisions permits an industry to dump pollutants into water, upon the payment of an effluent fee. The degree of effluent discharged may be open to argument; nevertheless, the principle is there. We, on this side, were trying to establish the principle that polluters should clean up pollution within their own boundaries, within their own factory fences, and that they should not be allowed to pollute by paying a fee for polluting.

Here, again, the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry has been promoting exactly what we have been promoting, the factory fence rule. However, it did not tie in with the principles of the Canada Water Act. I pressed, as did my party, for the recognition of this principle: that factories, and particularly new factories, should be required to contain within their boundaries their own pollution. We recognize that there are problems with some existing plants but see no reason why new plants should not be required to contain within their own boundaries their own pollution. I moved an amendment to the relevant section which would have prohibited new plants coming into operation, after the Canada Water Act became effective in any area from dumping pollutants. It would have required them to maintain the pollutants within the factory fence. Again, the government rejected our amendment, using its majority both in the committee and in the House. Here I must say this for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry: although he was present for the first three votes, he was not present for the last one on this matter. It is fortunate that he was called out of the House, because this point is the one that he himself has been pressing so strongly.

On September 26, 1970, which is not very long ago, after having had his colleagues vote against this particular rule, the minister said:

> Perhaps I should make my own position clear at the outset. It is in favour of recycling within the factory fence. It is on the side of treatment before discharge.
>
> ...I believe that modern industry wants to clean up. I know that our pulp and paper industry, for example, is prepared to build new plants which incorporate the best anti-pollution devices known to mankind. These should be a requirement in any new plant. They should be a requirement regardless of location.

The minister again today repeated this position, which we support. He mentioned it in several other speeches of which he has been kind enough to send me copies. So, this is the position: most of the amendments that the opposition moved in the first part of the last session were justified and correct. We wanted to consolidate the department and make sure somebody was in charge of pollution control. The Prime Minister, while resisting this for a time, has now accepted it, and for that I give him credit. Secondly, the minister has adopted most of the major program that our party put forward in its proposals on the Canada Water Act last year. I suppose we should not object to that. We are certainly glad that the proposals we have made are now being accepted.

• (3:50 p.m.)

I raise the question, where does this leave the minister? This is my main point. Where is he going to get the necessary money? It is all right to say the polluter must pay. We agree in principle with this, but it is not realistic to say that the federal government does not have to spend any money. This is the position the government has taken for the past year. The government says it will spend no money, the polluter must pay.

I hope the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry is able to pry a little money from his colleagues the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) and the Prime Minister because he is going to need it. If the minister wants support from our side of the House, we undertake to give it because we think he needs some funds. There must be a new approach by the government to pollution control. I hope the minister has been successful in persuading his colleague to accept the point of view he has been expressing for the past two weeks. If he has, it is a good start because it is a complete adoption of the policies that we have been proposing.

In conclusion I wish to point out that pollution control will not be achieved, and I am sure the minister realizes this, by shuffling offices around in Ottawa for the next six months, as necessary as that may be. I know that he will be hamstrung for some period of time until he can get his new organization completed.

The minister, after reorganization, unless the government moves to pull him out of the situation in which he

is now, will be strangled by inconsistent policies, restricted by adverse parliamentary votes, and deserted from lack of funds. He can look to this side of the House, as in the past, for support of good efforts toward pollution control. I hope his colleagues will at least do the same in a meaningful way.

Mr. E. B. Osler (Winnipeg South Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say how very fitting it was that the member representing Bourassa (Mr. Trudel) and the member representing Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) were asked to move and second the Speech from the Throne that started this debate. I cannot think of anything more fitting, both from the point of view of the character and abilities of the men involved and from the historical note that one senses when one says "Bourassa" and "Assiniboia".

These two names cannot help but make every member conscious of the great heritage that has come from French Canada and spread across the rest of Canada. The area of Assiniboia, the country of the Assiniboian, was opened up by people who could not have been born very far from the constituency of Bourassa. Assiniboia is the name that commemorates that country of the Assiniboian which was opened up by these men. I just wanted to remind hon. members of the very fitting nature of the selection that was made.

In these days of crises that we seem to be going through, that may or may not be very serious and which may last for a long time or a short time, it is fitting to remind hon. members that we in Canada are very lucky. We have every reason to be proud. Regardless of the ups and downs of the financial situation and the ups and downs of the popularity of the people involved, our Canadian armed forces can be relied upon always to do their job at a moment's notice. We have seen that just this week. There is not the slightest doubt in anyone's mind that they are capable of carrying out the rather touchy assignment that requires cool heads and tough minds.

The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) spoke very well and contributed greatly to the debate. However, the underlying thrust of his thought seemed to be the allegation that changes had taken place, but the taking place of change and the ability to change policy in itself seemed to be bad. I am not debating whether these changes have taken place or whether there has been a change in policy. I certainly do not think that if policies are changed they should be labelled as expediencies because, thank God, policies have changed ever since the first man developed the first policy.

There have even been changes in the Conservative party. One hundred years ago they had giants like Macdonald, Cartier, Galt and McGee.

Mr. Whelan: Now they have midgets.

Mr. Osler: Changes do take place, Mr. Speaker. They take place all over Canada. Canada is a federal state, as we all know, with ten provinces. It is a state with six regions, a fact we sometimes forget. We seem to be getting mesmerized by this federal-provincial business that seems to go on all the time. I do not want to decry the provinces in any way, but I do not think they are pre-ordained instruments for representing a particular region's point of view. Indeed, in some cases they have been, up to now, often negative toward Canada as a whole to such a degree that they could be labelled by a disinterested observer as parochial.

The people of a large metropolitan area, burdened down by very heavy property taxes, yet unable to find adequate financing for the urban improvements that must be made, derive little comfort from watching men on television advancing esoteric arguments as to whether the federal or provincial authorities are responsible for their problems. A Maritimer, bogged down by an unacceptably low level of employment opportunity, fails to see the merit of a tight money policy designed to cure inflation in Toronto or Vancouver.

In my own Prairie region we have many problems that I would like to speak about, but I will confine myself to one example. It is not particularly inspiring for us to know that according to DBS figures the city of Toronto alone can offer job opportunities in the civil service equal to 85 per cent of the opportunities available for the entire Prairie region. Our population in the three Prairie provinces is approximately 18 per cent of the total population of Canada, yet we have about 12 per cent of the civil service jobs. Without descending to the level of parochialism, I suggest we would not be realistic if we were to suggest that those on the Prairies who wish to serve in the civil service have equality of opportunity with those in some other parts of the country who wish to do the same.

Another situation I want to decry, and this cannot be laid directly at the feet of provincial governments, is the phenomenon called economic separatism. It is practiced by various provinces which allow between 5 per cent and 10 per cent "protection" to local industries in connection with tenders over which they have control. This practice could almost be said to constitute economic suicide on a national scale for it encourages artificially the spread of a product's production geographically regardless of efficiency. This, in turn, means that production as a whole, especially in similar units of secondary industry tends to be uneconomic, that prices tend to be unnecessarily high. This, again, penalizes both the consumer at home and the manufacturer who is trying to compete on the export markets of the world.

• (4:00 p.m.)

In addition, it militates against the less populated provinces because it becomes almost mandatory for a small, expanding company to locate in a rich, highly populated provinces so that it may get a chance to bid on that province's "controlled" business. Thus, the central provinces, and possibly British Columbia in some cases, get new secondary industries which should perhaps, from a national point of view, be established elsewhere. Moreover, a great deal of the good which the federal government is seeking to do through its Department of Regional Economic Expansion is negated.

Economic separatism is parochialism of the worst sort. Some way must be found to stamp it out. I bring forward

this point of view, Mr. Speaker, only to show that we shall not get equality of opportunity by dickering on television with ten provincial premiers, no matter how long the process continues. It may accomplish other things, but I do not think it will accomplish that.

There are other situations which give rise to despondency if one happens to live outside the magic central circle. Our banking system, for example, originates in this House, as I understand it, but we in the west feel that the branch bank system which has been set up in Canada militates against us, though it is efficient and good in many ways. I would say that it militates against the Maritimes and the Northwest Territories in the same way. All the savings of the people of this country are siphoned into the two central provinces where the head offices of the various banks are located. To be sure, some of the funds are re-invested in the outer provinces but nowhere near the percentage one would hope.

Then there is the whole question of transportation. It is amazing to me that the Transport Commission, a federal agency, should seriously be considering an application by the Canadian Pacific Railway to eliminate or cut down the service provided by its one remaining transcontinental train. From the point of view of executives of the company, secure in their headquarters in Montreal, I suppose this seems a good idea because, they say, passenger train service no longer pays. But if we look at the statistical summary of the affairs of this company provided by the *Financial Post* we find it had total assets, back in 1885, of $158 million. Two years ago they had increased to almost $3.35 billion, an apparent increase of more than 2,100 per cent. The real increase is far greater, of course, because there are all sorts of spin-off investments which do not show up to their full value in the balance sheet. And in the same period, shareholders have received dividends amounting to more than $1,455 million.

Now, I am not one of those who think profits are a sin. I do not believe Canadian Pacific has done a bad job for Canada. By the same token, Canada has not done a bad job for the CPR. As a minor shareholder in the company I can rejoice in a personal way at its success but I cannot help wondering what is going on when they have the nerve to appear before the Transport board in an effort to get rid of their one remaining transcontinental train. Indeed, the Canadian Pacific seems to be trying to get rid of all its trains. Freight trains can be eliminated by educating customers into a realization that almost any other method of shipping goods is speedier and more reliable. Passengers can be eliminated by insisting that they are irrelevant. One way of doing this is to computerize the reservation system and then rig the computers to show that no space is available for sale. If you do it right, it is easy to prove that there are no passengers and thus no requirement for trains. I am not suggesting that this is, in fact, what is being done. I am simply suggesting that there are a number of ways in which the demand for trains can be eliminated.

Once a railway company embarks on such a program, if it keeps up its courage and insists on following it through, it ends up in an ideal situation. The company retains its real estate without the inconvenience of actually having to run trains. In the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway—and I am not suggesting I am familiar with the long term aims of this company—we now have a very effective corporate entity which insists it can no longer afford to run its one remaining cross-country passenger train. As an alternative to outright abandonment it suggests the federal government should help it run the train three days a week. I do not think this is a very good idea. It sounds very efficient, but both the travelling public and the wellbeing of the work force involved are supposed to be the scale against which we value things in this country. I venture to suggest that neither Canada nor the CPR will go broke if by some mutually acceptable formula The Canadian is kept running on the same basis as it is today.

I mention this matter, Mr. Speaker, because it is a peculiarly western problem. You see, after all, it was 25 million acres of western land which was given to this company in the first place, a generous gesture by the federal government of the day when there were only three or four western members who might have queried the arrangement in Parliament. At that time the federal power still had jurisdiction over the natural resources of the west. In the 'thirties control over those resources was turned back to the western regions. But we got back our natural resources less 25 million acres, whereas the $25 million cash subsidies which the east advanced were ultimately repaid. It also happens to be provable statistically that more western Canadians use the CPR facilities on a passenger mile basis than do people in other parts of the country. So, the deal which was made with our land is being reneged on and I am appalled to find that a federal agency should be considering such a proposal as is now before it.

There is another feature of this matter which interests me. If we are going to wheel and deal in real estate, why should the CPR, a soulless corporation though perhaps a fine one, be allowed to reconsider the terms of a land deal made some 85 years ago? We ought not to forget that the Indians and the Metis, the original Canadians of this country, also made land deals at about the same time, yet no one has thought of allowing them to renegotiate, even though their deals turned out to be at least as unprofitable to them as have passenger trains to the CPR.

To change the subject, we are all happy to note the dramatic improvement in the wheat situation, thanks especially to Lift and the exigencies of nature in faraway places.

An hon. Member: What has Lift to do with it?

• (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Osler: You have been talking to different farmers from the ones to whom I talked. Anyhow, my point is that for the first time in years there has been a federal initiative taken to do something more than just tell people to cut their own throats by growing everything

that they can. Whether this is an absolutely ideal program or a program that is somewhat less than perfect, it is at least a program that has been partially successful.

I hope the members of the opposition will agree with me completely when I say that since we have Ottawa and the bureaucracy thinking constructively for once about the problems of the wheat farmers in the west, then let us keep it that way. These are problems that Canadians as a whole should be concerned with, just as much as Canadians as a whole were concerned with the problems of the textile industry, an industry that Parliament has been asked to bail out on a temporary basis until it finds its feet again. I contend that the Prairie farmers have to rationalize their operations, and trying to be funny about it is not going to help.

Once long ago one of the Fathers of Confederation called D'Arcy McGee prophesied that the hodge-podge of small colonies and vast territories comprising British North America would one day become a great northern nation. "For such it must become", he said, "if all of us do our duty to the last".

At the time he made that statement some people felt that we were outgrowing the Constitution, and they were trying to put together a new one. Whether or not we should be trying to do the same thing now is difficult to say, but it is a question that we should examine and that we are examining. As I said before, perhaps we should carry it on at the federal-provincial level, though so far the progress made has to my mind been very minimal. I suggest that the most promising level is that touched on earlier today by, I believe it was, the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Asselin). I refer to the level that examines the relationship of individuals with their federal institutions. From the little I have seen as a member of the constitutional committee, this is a very promising avenue for our attention.

It is abundantly clear that a major source of the so-called alienation we are always hearing about is to be found in this relationship between the federal government, the central government, and the people of the country. Here I am not talking politically, speaking as a member of one party to another. This relationship has nothing to do with the other dialogue that is going on between the provinces and the central government, nor has it ever been adequately articulated by the provincial premiers during the three years they have been involved in constitutional review.

As I read the message of the people which I have heard so far, it seems self-evident that there is a viable Canadian community and Canadian personality manifest in our diverse cultural heritages and in our concern for the well-being of other Canadians. But our common institutions have, at least until recently, in their opinion appeared to be letting us down.

The federal position stated in "Federalism for the Future" is that the constitutional debate should review the rights of individuals before embarking upon a review of the rights of governments. From this, it is argued that we need a constitutional charter of human rights, and so on and so forth.

[Mr. Osler.]

In my opinion there is nothing wrong with this argument; it is a good concept. But with or without such a bill, many people today feel profoundly that as inhabitants of a particular region they are not being adequately heard in the centre, Ottawa. If this feeling has justification, then it shows that we must not only be concerned with human rights; we must also be concerned with federal institutions, which should be reformed regardless of what may happen as a result of the other dialogue between the premiers and the Prime Minister.

I am not talking about the merits or demerits of any particular federal party at this point. I am saying that in Canada we have a unique situation: we have a federal state that was set up about 103 years ago which positively guaranteed that there would be a preponderence of political power in the hands of the most populated regions.

The provinces of Ontario and Quebec dominate the federal-provincial scene. The sitting members from Ontario and Quebec, most of whom are very worthy members—I am not talking of personalities now—dominate the federal House of Commons. Indeed, these two provinces elect some 60 per cent of the sitting members. Therefore, I think it is little wonder that people are asking whether their message is getting through. They are not talking necessarily in the personal sense; rather they are talking of the fact that they have not greater muscle in this federal House that is theirs.

I think this was anticipated. In the days leading up to confederation both D'Arcy McGee and Alexander Galt recognized that "rep by pop" would not by itself be enough to cement Canada into a strong federal state. They suggested that there should be a Senate which represented Canada regionally on an equal basis. The Senate has perhaps not fulfilled the expectations that were originally invested in it, and I would say that this is because it is neither elected nor anything but a servant of its master, which is the House of Commons. Thus, how can it represent regions effectively? Personally, I think we should look very carefully into Senate reform. I do not feel that those who simply say we should abolish the Senate are advancing a very worthy or telling argument. I think we have to take a very hard look at Senate reform, because we have to have better and stronger representation on a regional basis.

If members of the House of Commons do not like the idea of Senate reform—and I can see all sorts of reasons why they would not like an elected Senate, which I think is the only way the Senate would be given muscle or credibility in the country—then it is incumbent upon them to put forward a better idea. This is an area that must be looked at and examined very closely.

One point that was made over and over again as the constitutional committee travelled across the country was that the Canadian people need some form of regional representation; and with the exception possibly of the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, which have natural boundaries of their own, the other provinces are not getting it. In this I include the province of Newfoundland. Until we find some way of letting the people in the

under-represented areas lose their feeling of alienation, I suggest we will not have the kind of Canadianism that we want and for which we all hope. The future of Canada will be found by developing our north and our west, not by multiplying the pollution of lower Ontario and upper Quebec. Since I see here a member from the region, I add that the same argument applies to Newfoundland and Labrador, all along the undeveloped northeast as well as the northwest.

At the same time it is highly unlikely that these areas would ever have populations exceeding the populations of Ontario and Quebec. Thus, the north and the west, if they are to be developed and the people who live there are to feel that they are part of the ball game, must be given effective muscle at the federal level regardless of the pressures created by "rep by pop". The alternative is to keep them permanently in the state of colonialism that they suspect they are in now. There is no need for Canada to play this colonial game for, as Canadians, all of us have the right to equality of opportunity regardless of where we live.

As the Prime Minister declared only last week in the Speech from the Throne, we can change Canada if only we have the qualities and the will. Let us start here at the centre and get on with the job. No one but ourselves can stop us.

• (4:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, it is already the 3rd session of the 28th Parliament. Some people are still under the spell of the great show of 1968 when there appeared to lead the Liberal party and, later, the government, the youngest old Prime Minister Canada has ever had. A nervous, swinging bachelor who a few years before had been denouncing the Liberal herd being led to the slaughterhouse, became Number One, the saviour, the long-expected messiah. "Get ready, everybody, the just society is on its way!"

The extollers are still ecstatic but the people are still waiting. They are waiting for something to be done. They certainly want the "just society", but most of all, they would like it to become a reality.

The great fight against inflation of which the government is so proud leaves the population cold. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) may rejoyce and claim that he has won the day, but the man on the street wonders if he will still have a job tomorrow, if social welfare will look after his family better, if his dairy products will sell or if there is really any future in our immense country chock-full of resources.

He also wonders where the great battle of bilingualism and biculturalism will lead. In spite of what he is told about the advantages of democracy, he realizes to what extent it is mocked. Vanity, the excessive remoteness the government enjoys so much make it absolutely indifferent to the opinions, suggestions and action of the opposition. Yet, each hon. member has the same right, if not the same power. More than half the population is against the party which now runs the country. Our parliamentary traditions are anti-democratic. It is disguised dictatorship! Particularly when the chief will not stand any criticism and will accept and follow only what suits him.

Mr. Speaker, needless to point out that an active and objective opposition is necessary. But long and serious consideration must be given to its co-operation. By systematically rejecting all solutions suggested by other parties for the false motive that they do not originate from the Liberal party, the government is making fun of the people themselves.

An actual return to democratic processes will be required to prevent other dictatorships from taking over. Obviously, adopting the establishment of a just society as a slogan implies recognition of the existence of poverty, disparities, injustices, things that must be made to disappear from our society. It is not enough to make use of an election campaign slogan. All previous governments wanted the same thing. The importance given to the slogan will not help solve the problem of poverty, social disparities and individual injustices of which our population is victim.

The attitude of the present government, which is first and foremost that of the Prime Minister, moves further and further away from the objective. An out-and-out socialist, having taken pleasure in following on labour platforms his former friend Michel Chartrand in order to stir up the workers against the Duplessis regime, editor of a so-called advanced magazine, *Cité libre,* where he worked with Pierre Vallières, the author of *Nègres blancs d'Amérique,* finally, an inveterate globe-trotter who liked especially Russia and China, the right hon. Prime Minister does his own thing at all costs, and the recent recognition of Communist China is but a pale reflection of all the leftist and communistic projects he had in mind.

This spoiled child, unable to stand any remark, blaming Tom, Dick and Harry, the press and members of the Opposition, of whom he says they are worth nothing at 50 feet from the Parliament buildings, may not be the cause of all our frustrations, but he is one of the main factors. His adamant and off-hand manner will soon exasperate all the right-minded people in this country. It may seem cruel to utter such words but they reflect pretty well the feelings of a lot of people who are fed up with the fine words, the social antics and the childish and rambling outbursts of our Prime Minister.

People look down on us. They say: "These little Creditists with their financial obsession". But truth is not the monopoly of the great! We are conscious of reflecting the opinion of the small people. More and more, all classes of society look upon our proposals more objectively. The false and dishonest propaganda that has been conducted against us has prevented certain groups of people to consider seriously our theories. We are making great strides in overcoming this handicap. We are confident that soon the majority will agree, at least, to give a serious test to our economic system.

We want concrete suggestions. We do not have reserved rights on our doctrine. We would be more than happy to see the government steal our best ideas. All we want

is to bring to the population the full freedom of the human person. "Make financially possible what is physically workable" is not an election slogan and much less a meaningless propaganda, but a concrete solution to the basic problems of our society.

With unemployment at a record high, who can claim there is a shortage of manpower? With all our natural resources, raw materials and everything we need as a base for production, who can question the unparalleled wealth of the country? Finally, with all the talent required for planning, programming and implementing, who could dare claim that our colleges and universities are empty?

With all these assets it is simply ridiculous to sit and wait for capital. What better security to issue our own credit than all these priceless assets around us? By what right do bankers and other high finance figures hold us at their mercy? Only the right we are willing to grant them. Unfortunately, to date all governments have been swapping their birthright against a mess of pottage.

It is pitiful to see all our public institutions creep and crawl before capital and capitalists. That is the problem, Mr. Speaker. Bloated interest rates, spiralling prices, in short inflation, result from the stupid lack of judgment jealously nurtured by the Establishment which, in order not to stray from the established order continues to rush in the blind alley of the present financial system.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out to the House the specific points of greater concern to the people of the Champlain constituency which I have the great honour of representing. Needless to say that all I have said until now is a reflection of the feelings expressed by the people of my constituency. Dissatisfaction is almost general. Farmers realize that everything is going to pot. The leadership given by this government with regard to dairy production is an open war against small producers who are being wiped out. The average producers are hard-set to keep going. If they exceed their quotas, they will be denied subsidies; if they increase their output, they are punished. What is left for them to do? As for the big producers, they are overworked. Because they have to hire employees, their income is reduced accordingly. What is left for them to do also? This befuddling situation is far from improving, especially when the Prime Minister, on one of his many trips, promises that New Zealand cows will soon be supplying butter to Canada.

The condition of the workers is hardly better. Industries are getting scarce in the Champlain constituency, and all the municipal authorities are quite astonished to find that, with the exception of Sainte-Marthe-du-Cap, no other municipality is recognized as a designated area. Resolutions on that subject submitted by the cities of La Tuque, Saint-Tite, Sainte-Thècle and several others had no result. Fortunately the tourist industry is developing. The swimming race called "les 24 heures de la Tuque" was once again a big hit this year. But to organize it, it is still necessary to overcome big financial difficulties. The tremendous initiative of the population should be encouraged by a substantial grant. The same situation exists in Saint-Tite where the greatest "western" festival of eastern Canada is held at the end of the summer.

Mr. Speaker, this brings me to mention the national park of the St. Maurice Valley. I was very pleased to hear that the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) had signed last summer an agreement with the Quebec government for the development of that park.

The whole thing was done very quickly and took us nearly unawares, at least as far as I am concerned, as I received the kind invitation to attend the signature of the agreement only the day before the event, when I was in Edmonton at the Social Credit convention to celebrate the 35th anniversary of the Social Credit government of Alberta.

I suspect that the minister acted very quickly in order to quell the mounting pressure brought to bear by the committee that wanted the park located on the east bank of the Saint-Maurice River at Great Mekinac Lake.

The choice of site No. 1 is quite questionable considering the following factors: First, this site is not so much to the advantage of the St. Maurice Valley residents; it is a sort of dead end as it is not on a specific scenic drive; second, development costs may prove exorbitant because of land expropriation, access roads and a bridge needed to link the area with the upper St. Maurice Valley; third, it is doubtful whether or not that park will become profitable because tourists stay in such parks only when located along a scenic drive. For instance, while touring the Gaspé peninsula, they will stop over in the Forillon park. While touring the Lac Saint-Jean area, they will stay for a while in the Laurentian provincial park. They will get to the Abitibi area by going through the La Verendrye park. That is why it would have been logical to include that park in the scenic triangle formed by Trois-Rivières, Shawinigan, Grand'Mère, La Tuque, Roberval and Quebec.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that I am not insisting on a site in my own riding, for the limits of that park lie for the greater part within the Champlain riding. It is a question of chosing a site that is really advantageous for the whole population of the St. Maurice Valley area. I feel that no really serious study has been made about the possibility of another site. The explanations given to date by the minister are not satisfactory and I should like him to enlighten us in this regard.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues in this House, I should like to voice my bewilderment over the recent distressing events in our country and, in particular, in the province of Quebec. However, this does not surprise me much. For many years too many leaders have been hiding their heads in the sand and have turned themselves into a challenge before the eyes of an impatient youth. Loose living in our society whose ideals and morals are declining, is too often encourager by the government itself. Very bad examples are set for our young people. The life of two hostages is at stake. Everyone at this time realizes what a precious asset life

is. However, quite cheerfully, two years ago we voted for the massacre of thousands of human beings by agreeing in principle to the abortion legislation. And to think that we are not satisfied yet and that now we want abortion on request! What an example, Mr. Chairman.

Recognition of homosexuality between consenting adults is not edifying either. The dream of the right hon. Prime Minister to legalize marijuana is another very sad prospect. The Quebec movie industry jumped, just like that, without warning, directly from "La Petite Aurore" to Danielle Ouimet's buttocks, with the support of the Canada Council.

Pop Festivals are authorized and degenerate into bad taste affairs. And I skip a few, Mr. Speaker.

Such decadence is revolting. Therefore, many young people no longer believe in our society. This is extremely unfortunate, but we are all somewhat responsible, particularly those now in office. Let us berth the boat which is on the verge of running adrift.

Authority will no longer be flouted once it has regained its integrity, its unselfishness, its fairness in brief, when real strides have been taken towards implementation of the just society.

• (4:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. D. R. Tolmie (Welland): Mr. Speaker, first I should like to congratulate the hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel) and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) for their excellent speeches.

As a former member of the Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on Penitentiaries I, of course, have a very intense interest in penal reform. Perhaps this may not be a very appropriate subject to bring up at this time, but I shall speak on it in any event. I feel that a disproportionate amount of the time of the House is consumed on more glamorous and popular issues of the day with the consequence that the public is not made fully aware of the government's policies and the progress that has been made in this most important humanitarian field. The whole question of penal reform has been plagued not by a positive opposition but by a tradition of apathy and indifference. In any democracy where powerful segments of society compete for the public eye and purse, it is most difficult for a very small chorus clamouring for prison reform to be heard and answered. Therefore, at every chance it is of the utmost importance to articulate forcibly the need for reform and thereby gain public support for the implementation of same.

• (4:40 p.m.)

For those in our society still clinging to the philosophy that a prisoner is incarcerated as punishment or for the protection of society and is beyond redemption, the cold economic argument that penal reform whereby more prisoners can be released more quickly with a consequential saving to the taxpayer, has much appeal. Let us explore this argument.

We are spending over $70 million to improve the quality of our federal penitentiaries. In addition, there is the enormous operating cost of our present facilities. It costs this country approximately $3,500 a year to maintain one prisoner, and when you add the cost of keeping his dependants as well as the loss of his productivity while in prison, it is estimated that it costs this nation about $6,000 a year per prisoner. We have about 7,200 inmates in federal prisons alone. Thus it is clearly evident that if correctional reform reduces this prison population, a tremendous saving will accrue to the Canadian taxpayer.

In my opinion, transcending this monetary consideration as a reason for penal reform is the humanitarian concept that society as a whole has a moral responsibility for a minority of its members who, in many cases, for reasons of heritage, fate and environment beyond their control, have become outcasts and a menace to their fellows. As a nation with a social conscience we must endeavour to restore their self respect and lift them from their degradation. As the concern for this small helpless group matures and flowers a most beneficial result can be achieved. In penal reform, this stirring in man's conscience of the realization that the more fortunate must help the less can grow in wider human relations until man acknowledges that the strong and successful elements in our society have a duty and responsibility to the weak and unfortunate. Thus, on humanitarian grounds alone correctional reform is a most worthwhile objective.

The relatively recently recognized concept in Canada of a rehabilitative approach as opposed to an exclusively custodial system is now the cornerstone of the federal correctional policy. Thus, the entire philosophy of the federal government is directed to achieving the optimum degree of treatment, and the basic objective of the correctional system is the attempt to reform the offender and return him to society as a reclaimed, productive, integrated and law abiding citizen. My further remarks will show how this and former governments have had a systematic comprehensive program to effect these results by wielding the weapons, among others, of new physical facilities, increased training programs, research commissions and aftercare services such as probation and parole.

The new Penitentiary Act brought into force on April 1, 1962, represented a complete revision that was intended to be consistent with the enlightened rehabilitative approach to the problem of penitentiary operations. It completely re-organized the administration and set up the three main regions of Quebec, Ontario, and the western region. The Atlantic provinces were organized as sub-regions.

It was soon recognized that present facilities were not adequate to carry out a comprehensive program, and the government is now involved in an extensive program of institutional construction. A ten year program was started in 1963 and it is proposed to furnish each regional penitentiary district with the following basic facilites: one, a reception centre; two, a special detention unit; three, a maximum security unit; four, medium and minimum facilities; five, a psychiatric unit; six, prerelease hostels to help those inmates who are nearing the end of

their sentences and who require assistance in re-establishing themselves in the community; seven, a staff training college; eight, institutional facilities for narcotic drug addicts both male and female.

In every institution there will be a program of activities which will comprise the following elements of the corrective process: one, employment at a purposeful occupation during working hours; two, leisure time—a program for physical education and recreation; three, religious facilities; four, contact with families and social agencies; five, education—library services, vocational training, elementary and higher education. Programs are being developed with the aid of medical and other agencies, such as the Narcotic Drug Foundation.

The question may be properly asked: the government has this new concept and grandiose plans, but what has been accomplished since 1963, the starting date of this ten year program? First, two special correctional units have been completed. Two maximum security institutions have been completed. No further maximum security institutions will be constructed until the operation of the present ones has been thoroughly studied. Four medium security institutions have been completed and are now in operation. The reception and the psychiatric centres are in the detailed planning stage. The Drug Addicts Institution in British Columbia is operating with almost 100 inmates under treatment. Four prerelease centres are now in operation in our larger cities. The Mountain Prison addition is complete. A new staff college has been built for the Quebec region, and temporary accommodation for one in western Canada has been arranged.

In addition to the facilities planned, a vast program of officer training has been operating for some two years and is rapidly expanding. No correctional officer goes on duty in a penitentiary with less than three months training, and courses for officers already in the service are available at the staff colleges.

Thus, this brief resume of physical and training facilities indicates that the government has made marked progress in attaining its avowed goal of humanitarian correctional reform. Of course, the construction of physical facilities is only one aspect of reform in the correctional process, and in order to make reform meaningful the whole broad subject of criminology must be constantly researched and reviewed.

The subject of probation and parole is an integral part of correctional reform. The basic question is, following the conviction of an offender does his and society's best interest require that he be incarcerated or can the process of reform be better achieved on probation within the community?

• (4:50 p.m.)

Statistical evidence shows that the proportion of offenders sentenced to prison in Canada is much higher than that of any other civilized country. For example, in 1953—I do not have later statistics—England and Wales sent 34,000 people to prison and in the same year Canada sent 98,000, or nearly three times as many as a country with twice our population. This is something we should really consider more seriously.

Slowly but surely the importance of probation is becoming recognized as a well tested method of accomplishing the objectives of criminal law without sending the accused to prison. Plain economic considerations should dictate support for expanded probation when it is known that the annual per capita cost of keeping a prisoner in a penitentiary or in a provincial reformatory is about $3,000, compared with approximately $250 for an offender placed on probation.

Much greater latitude must be shown by the federal and provincial governments in regard to probation. A step forward could be taken by the federal government by amending Section 638 of the Criminal Code to broaden the grounds for probation. This would have the effect of changing the present law governing probation which restricts it in the main to the first offender and excludes recidivists from its operation. This is an amendment which should be forthcoming very shortly.

On the question of parole, it should be noted that the National Parole Board has granted parole to more than 16,000 inmates in its first eight years of life. Of this number only about 1,800 had to be returned to prison for violation of parole. The board's average of about 90 per cent is very impressive indeed. Although the Parole Board, within its legislative limits, is doing an excellent job I contend that as yet we are not realizing the full economic and social benefits to be derived from a more liberal program of parole. I believe that the government is considering amending the Parole Act to extend parole or a form of conditional liberation to all inmates leaving prison. I urge the government to take immediate action to implement this most desirable innovation.

Thus it can be seen that the government, to implement its rehabilitative concept of correctional reform, has constructed new modern facilities, appointed investigation committees into criminology, and has tackled the problems of probation and parole. This, of course, is a most commendable record, but as in every area of governmental endeavour errors have been made. Inertia overcomes action, and change is always difficult and painstakingly slow.

Much has been done but much more needs to be done. What about the future? As a member and as a citizen I would like to see a proportion of the money being spent, close to $70 million on the penitentiary service, diverted to preventive measures such as a more vigorous attack, in conjunction with the provinces, on the causes and remedies for juvenile delinquency.

As a member, and as a citizen, I would like to see more money spent on criminal research. Millions of dollars are spent by companies and governments on a whole array of research projects such as drug research, food research, automobile research, and much scientific research. But very little is spent on criminal research. Less than one-tenth of the vast sums of public funds spent by both federal and provincial governments on crime and prisons is used for research.

As a member and again as a citizen I would like to see—recognizing the principle that the goal of rehabilitation cannot by its very nature be fulfilled within prison walls by psychiatric treatment, education or vocational training—a concerted effort to prepare the prisoner for return to society. The penitentiary service, as indicated, is establishing community release centres, but I visualize in Canada's future penal system a wide range of hostels outside of prison. From these bases in the community the parolee, probationer, or the prisoner serving an ordinary sentence would go out to work during the day, or to obtain training or education and would return to the controlled conditions of the hostel at night and on the weekends.

Coupled with this approach is the chance for a prisoner to contribute from his earnings to the support of his family, and to demonstrate his ability and trustworthiness as a prerequisite to his being accepted by potential employers and by his future neighbours in ordinary communal life. This radical and exciting approach to our penal system is not new, and as Canada proceeds with its enlightened ten year penal program it should vigorously embrace this half way house or hostel concept.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I say that the recent visit by the Justice Committee to the penal system in the western provinces was most beneficial indeed. It was not a sightseeing tour. We could see conditions personally. We examined the whole administration according to the time allocated, and we found out how the inmates felt. We found out how they felt with regard to their treatment, to their training programs, and to the parole system. I only hope that we will be able to continue these visitations.

Mr. Cliff Downey (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say how pleased I am to participate in this debate on the Speech from the Throne, and I join with hon. members who preceded me in congratulating the mover (Mr. Trudel) and the seconder (Mr. Douglas, Assiniboia) of the Address in Reply. I think they were well chosen.

When I came to Ottawa as a Member of Parliament some two and a half years ago, while I was not a representative on the government side, I had the fond hope that the government, with its Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) who was certainly a very popular choice of the people at that time would do much to bring prosperity and unity to Canada. That was two and a half years ago. When he campaigned across the nation, the Prime Minister spoke of one Canada. He spoke of the just society. He spoke of bilingualism and biculturalism, and of how they would draw the country together. But at the end of these two and a half years, Mr. Speaker, we have come to the point where the capital city of Canada, Ottawa, is little more than an armed camp.

Montreal, which has the greatest mayor it has ever had, is in a situation where the cost of protective services has risen to something in the neighbourhood of $85,000 per day. Something is wrong. We have riots and bombings and treason. These are everyday occurrences, everyday words in Canada. Articles in the newspapers today and yesterday mentioned that attacks were threatened against our national railways and airlines. We have reached the situation in which a person with a somewhat unsavoury or doubtful background, in any event, is in charge of Information Canada. That is one of the most important positions in the country. It has been alleged that FLQ connections may go right into the ranks of government. This is the Canada we have today, two and a half years after all these glorious promises.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. McGrath: What a mess.

Mr. Downey: This degeneration has been aided to some extent by our legal system and its permissiveness throughout the years. There is a permissive interpretation of the law. Yesterday I sought to move a motion regarding the reinstatement of capital punishment. Acts of terrorism were encompassed in the wording of the motion. The progressively permissive interpretation of the law during the past six or eight years has made necessary a reaffirmation of our stand on matters of this kind.

I believe that capital punishment was last carried out in 1962. Since then 35 or 36 policemen and prison guards have paid the ultimate price for their service. There have been over 2,100 murders since 1962 and almost as many attempted murders. God knows how many policemen have actually been shot at; and when you are shot at, that comes very close to what could be called murder. At times our Prime Minister talks in a very tough way. He says what he is going to do, but from the other side of his mouth he often says, "Every man should do his thing." That is just what many who cause trouble are doing—they are doing their thing. We have had strikes. Some of those strikes have caused our economy grave harm and have harmed our image around the world. When one looks at the combination of all those things I have mentioned and considers some things I have not mentioned, one can safely say that Canada is like an apple rotting from the inside.

A few minutes ago the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Osler) talked about the Lift program. I imagine that the Lift program is one of the greatest sources of embarrassment with which this government has to live. One year ago the pessimistic minister who is in charge of the Wheat Board introduced the Lift program in this House and portrayed a dismal future facing the grain trade and agriculture in general. Now, less than one year later, we have made so many grain sales that it is doubtful whether our carriers will be able to carry the grain to delivery points. One wonders about the type of information to which certain people have access. What information leads them to make a choice like this, for example? I have some figures before me. The Canadian Wheat Board made a survey in connection with 4,000 elevator agents in the west and found that 161 million bushels less of cereal grains were stored on farms than had been estimated for that period by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. The DBS report showed that there were 115 million bushels of barley on farms. The Wheat Board's estimate was 72 million bushels. For oats, the

DBS figure was 106 million bushels and the Wheat Board figure was 64.3 million bushels. How could decisions be made on these kinds of figures?

We have now reached a situation in which there could well be a shortage of feed grain. If anticipated deliveries are made and if certain figures are in any way correct, we shall reach the situation in which there will not be enough grain to feed the cattle and livestock of western Canada. This is happening less than one year after the government said it would pay the farmers to cut back on wheat production. Actually, in nearly all cases the payments have not been completed. This, Mr. Speaker, is something that cannot be forgiven easily. Although some money was pumped into the western economy as a result of the summerfallow program, the net result of our not growing grain is that there is a disaster, because what has happened is like a crop failure for the farmers of the west. We desperately need an optimistic and far-sighted minister to look after our agricultural affairs.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Downey: We do not have such a minister.

An hon. Member: But we certainly need one.

Mr. Downey: I can imagine what would have happened if legislation such as the Canada Grain Act amendments and Bill C-197 had been passed by the previous Parliament. That legislation would have been held up by the government as the saviour of Canadian agriculture. Government members would have stood up and told the people that these bills were responsible for the sales we have made. The truth is that it took only a little change in nature to turn the situation around completely.

I believe the Speech from the Throne mentions that the marketing board legislation will be reintroduced during the present session. I think there is a place for this measure. I desperately hope that the minister has listened to the representations made to him and that he will come forward with a bill that will permit producer representation on marketing boards. We do not want them to be controlled by what is strictly a government agency. If that were to become the case, I say that with all the pessimism and inaccuracy which has been evident in connection with the administration of the Lift program we shall be in dire straits indeed.

• (5:10 p.m.)

In my area there has been talk of removing some railway services. At present there is a question as to whether several passenger train runs in Alberta will be removed. The bulk of Alberta is not included in the designated area program for regional development. This is difficult to understand because there is no industry there. The people of these areas cannot understand why they have not been designated, when so many other areas in Canada with much more industry and many more attributes have been. The riding of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson), which has a great deal of industry, is designated. It is hard to understand why through equalization payments these people must help pay for the liquor strike that occurred in the province of Quebec three years ago. Very few people in that area realize that equalization payments to the tune of $80 million are being made to the province of Quebec to make up the deficit in that government's revenue caused by the liquor strike of three years ago. Until there is better equalization and greater understanding on the part of the government, unity in Canada will be an impossibility.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, I wish to join other hon. members in congratulating the hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel) and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas), the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. Although the hon. member for Assiniboia and I are from the same province, I cannot find quite as much optimism on the Prairies as he does. In this Speech from the Throne there are many similarities with the first two Speeches from the Throne by this government. It is very long on rhetoric but very short on substance and any specific action the government intends to take. I for one, am very tired of the old clichés, platitudes and rhetoric.

In my remarks today I wish to cover a number of issues that I think are important. I shall deal with matters of vital importance to people in my constituency, the agricultural industry and the whole western economy. I want to deal with over-all conditions in Canada and try to determine why we are faced with so many problems. I shall talk a bit about foreign ownership, unemployment, the rights of women—a subject we are hearing very much about—poverty and violence, something that is now a reality in Canada. During the past summer I had an opportunity to spend several weeks in my constituency. I travelled around from farm to farm. I visited farmers on small and mixed farms, people who are not well-off economically. I discovered something that I had not experienced before, a feeling of depression, not only financially but spiritually.

I welcome the fact that the government is anticipating larger grain sales. I think all the people of western Canada welcome this. I hope the government is right in saying that we have some of the largest potential markets this year. The people of western Canada would like to know what portion of the 700 million bushels of grain sold is wheat and what portion is other grains. The farmers have a right to know. They also have a right to know how much of these sales constitute firm commitments, so they can plan for next year. I think the hon. member for Assiniboia will agree with me when I say that the farmer does not know what is going to happen next year or the year after. There does not seem to be any type of long-range planning. This is apparent from the past record. When speaking to the farmers in Winnipeg in June of 1968, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said, "Grow all the wheat you want and we will sell it." The farmers listened. They are efficient; they have grown a lot of wheat. In November, 1968, the Prime Minister said, "Why should I sell your grain?" In 1970 the government introduced the Lift program which pretty well forced the farmers to take wheatland out of production.

There has been a big change in a year and a half. Now the government is saying Canada has some of the largest markets it has ever had for grain. I ask the government once again to be considerate and to tell the farmers what is really happening. Earlier this afternoon the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. Osler) stated that Lift is the instrument which obtained all the extra grain sales for us, if in fact we have made many extra sales. I suggest that Lift did not have anything to do with it. There will be larger grain sales because of international circumstances, crop failures, drought and things of that sort.

I think the government overestimated the inventory of wheat in this country. They should realize that now. The government is in a very fortunate position because the farmers did not co-operate to the full extent and 50 per cent of the wheat acreage was planted this year. Also, the crops were good. Therefore we have enough grain to meet the increased sales and for domestic use. In a patronizing and ironic way through the use of operation Lift, the government has been very fortunate. I do not think, however that the farmers of western Canada can really forgive the government for the attitude it has taken on this question.

Many members from both sides of this House have underestimated the real economic value of the western farmer. Not only is the western farmer suffering, but in a province such as Saskatchewan the whole economy is suffering. When driving around the province it can be seen that a whole way of life is being threatened. The small villages, towns and cities are affected. It is a natural phenomenon because farm income has dropped by over 50 per cent in the last couple of years. People are not buying as much as they used to, construction is pretty well at a standstill and people are moving out of the province.

Places like Yorkton, with a population of some 14,000 in the 10 or 12-year period prior to 1968 almost doubled their population. In the last year people have been leaving and the population has probably dropped by 400 or 500. This is the story of many communities of that size in Saskatchewan. It is basically the young people who are leaving in search of better opportunities. They are found in almost every walk of life, young workers, professional people, teachers and people hoping to get into business. Left behind are the people who are trying to struggle on the farm.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Someone said the other day that the average age of a Saskatchewan farmer is 57. This is perhaps the oldest average age of a worker in any industry. Those older farmers who do remain on the land are often left behind on farms which are small and uneconomic. What we need in Saskatchewan is planning. Farmers on the Prairies need a guarantee that when they plant a crop they will get a market for it and a decent price. There are many efficient farmers with the reserves needed to carry out an effective operation. There are many others who have the desire and the courage to make a success of agriculture. But they need planning from the government and some extra help.

The other day I asked the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) one or two questions about the fate of the report of the Barber commission on farm machinery prices. Action along the lines recommended by that commission as a means of lowering the price of farm machinery is urgently needed. In the past few years, while the price of grain has gone down the price of farm machinery and the cost of living generally as it affects farmers have steadily increased. This is the reason for the unrest in western Canada, for the expressions of western alienation. The difficulties which the west continues to encounter cannot be ignored by the government simply because it has been able to announce extra grain sales for the balance of the year. A lot more than that is needed.

Mr. Speaker, a debate on the Speech from the Throne gives hon. members an opportunity to discuss Canadian affairs generally and to consider what direction we are taking. A couple of years ago during the election campaign, the Prime Minister was talking about building a just society, reducing regional economic disparities, wiping out poverty and, above all, building a society in which there would be participatory democracy. It seems to me that 2½ years later there is greater dissent and more uneasiness than ever before. We see this among young people who are dropping out of society, joining various youth cultures and ceasing to care any more. One senses this spirit of dissent among ordinary people when visiting door to door or farm to farm. People are unhappy about the way things are going; they seem to have lost faith in the future envisaged by the Prime Minister and his friends a couple of years ago.

Among farmers, among workers and among students, dissent is being expressed in an organized manner. We find the women of Canada demanding rights which should be theirs and, of course, we are faced with an outright expression of violent dissent from members of the FLQ in the province of Quebec. The question all of us must ask is this: Why are so many people unhappy? Why are they questioning the society in which they live? Ours is a wealthy country with an advanced technology and all the resources we seem to need. We have a government which is supposed to be liberal, which is supposed to be changing things. Why should so much dissatisfaction exist in these circumstances?

Mr. Speaker, when we take a close look at our economy we find it is one which we ourselves do not really control, that essentially it is controlled by outside interests whose primary concern is not ours. We find that one out of every five Canadians lives in poverty and that one out of every five others lives near the poverty line. We see unemployment reaching a seasonally adjusted rate of 6.7 per cent, the highest for years. We find the air and water around us being pollutted at such a rate that within the lifetime of many of us in this chamber, it is said by some authorities, there may not be sufficient oxygen left for us to breathe. These are some of the reasons so many Canadians today are unhappy and demanding change.

We, as Members of Parliament, must listen to the views expressed by those who elected us. After all, it is we who have permitted these conditions to occur and to continue. Governments are supposed to look after the affairs of the nation, and responsibility must therefore rest upon us. Moreover, those of us who are Members of Parliament have accepted, over the years, the conditions I have described, many of us in a smug and complacent way. Many of us have sat here using beautiful rhetoric but doing nothing to change fundamentally the society in which we live. We talk of justice, we talk of freedom, we talk of liberty.

In the Speech from the Throne there is a passage which reads: "A society which is not inspired by love and compassion is not worthy of that name." Mr. Speaker, have you ever tried to tell the unemployed or the poor people of this country that the present government is inspired by love and compassion? A number of changes have, indeed, been made. Minor reforms have been carried out. The Criminal Code has been amended; Parliament has passed the official languages legislation which will bring equal opportunity to many more Canadians. The Speech from the Throne announces the intention to set up a department of urban affairs and housing, something which my party has been urging for a long time. I hope this new department can be given real muscle. Recognition has finally been accorded to the government in Peking as the government of China. These are all positive steps and I welcome them, but they represent only minor reforms and the people cannot be fooled into believing the government is doing all it can to meet the serious challenges of our time. It seems to me the government believes in perpetuating the status quo, that it believes in perpetuating a system under which important decisions are made in the boardrooms of corporations motivated by a desire for more and more profit.

What Canada really needs is drastic, fundamental change. We should seek to build a country in which the people not only own but control their own society. This implies a redistribution of power, a redistribution of wealth and services in order that everyone, regardless of economic background or social circumstances may have equal access to the benefits of the society in which he lives. I do not think a change of this nature will be welcomed by many of those in positions of power today in Canada.

Nevertheless, we must democratize our society and this means more than holding elections every three or four years. The people must be brought more intimately in touch with decision-making affecting their own lives. It would be easier to do this if so much of our country were not controlled by foreign interests—mainly, of course, by United States interests. Almost two-thirds of the Canadian economy is foreign-owned. Some industries such as the oil refining industries are owned and controlled up to 99 per cent by foreign interests. What does this mean to the ordinary people of Canada? It means, first of all, that Canada is basically a political satellite, that we cannot make all the decisions we want to make. Second, it means we cannot control inflation nor provide adequate employment for our people. As long as we remain a branch plant economy we cannot build up secondary industry to the extent needed to constitute a viable economy of our own. Today, Canada is an exporter of raw materials and an importer of manufactured goods. In a situation such as this, full employment is difficult to achieve. Everyone knows there are many more jobs available in manufacturing industries than in resource industries.

Our branch plant economy puts us at the mercy of multinational corporations whose decisions are made in another country. An example of this is the potash industry. This industry, which owns a mine in Saskatchewan and another in New Mexico, had to cut down on production. They cut down to 40 per cent capacity in Saskatchewan while the mine in the United States went on producing at about 90 per cent capacity. As a result of this, Canadians on the Prairies were put out of work.

• (5:30 p.m.)

I suggest, too, that the type of economy we have is not efficient. Each and every year more money goes out of the country in the form of profits and dividends than comes into the country in the form of investment. This is one reason why we must make control of our own economy one of the priority issues facing this Parliament in the next few years. We must regain control of Canada for Canadians. I do not think we can blame the Americans or United States corporations for this state of affairs; it is only natural that they should act in this manner. We have no one to blame but ourselves. We are the only country in the western world with an open-door policy toward our neighbours. We say to them, "Come in and develop our resources, take all you want, take your profits and go home."

This is a situation that we cannot tolerate, one that we will have to change immediately. We can regain control of our economy. Our party, editorials in different magazines, periodicals and newspapers have articulated several ways in which we can regain control of our economy. I am not going to go into those ways here. Members of this party commend the government for the action it has taken in the broadcasting field whereby, as the result of recent regulations, within about one year 80 per cent of Canadian broadcasting will be Canadian-owned. This can also be done with other industries. But we must do more than just talk about it; what we need is real action. I suggest that we have to repatriate the Canadian economy before we can really talk about solving regional disparity, inflation and having full employment in Canada.

There are a number of other matters I should like to touch upon before I sit down. One of them is the reference in the Throne Speech to possible legislation in the area of income and income security. I should like to press the government during this particular session to introduce a bill to implement a guaranteed annual income for Canadians. This is one of the most effective ways, perhaps the only way, to start a real fight against poverty in Canada. The type of social system we now have perpetuates poverty and does not encourage people

to better themselves. Perhaps as many as one out of three Canadians live in poverty.

The Throne Speech also made mention of the report on the status of women and announced that during this session we will have in the House a discussion of the whole question of abortion. I should like to see us as a Parliament discuss both these subjects in a very serious way, a way we have never done before. I do not think all men here would deny that there is a double standard in Canadian society when it comes to women. It is a double standard when we do not ask women to come into the decision-making process of this country, to become really involved. Proof of that is found here in the House of Commons, where we have 263 men and only one woman. I must say that the woman we do have in the House of Commons, the Member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) is a real honour to the House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nystrom: The contribution that she is making here proves to me that women can and should be making a much larger contribution in Parliament and in the political process at all levels. I should like to see 100 or more women like the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway in the House of Commons. This would give the House of Commons a much more representative base and it would reflect Canadian society much better than it does today. In order to bring women into the mainstream of the decision-making process, it is up to us to bring down some good, concrete, positive legislation.

In the White Paper on unemployment insurance the government makes mention of things such as maternal leave without financial discrimination. I suggest this is something we shall have to legislate for in Canada. Another requirement for women is day care centres. During the last war, day care centres were provided for those women in the labour force and I see no reason for not providing them today. These are just two examples of measures that we should take.

I also think that women should be given equal pay for equal work. When we turn our attention to the subject of abortion, I should like to see some concrete legislation result, not just another discussion. This legislation should provide that all reference to abortion be removed from the Criminal Code. Today there are many contradictions. For example, if a wealthy woman wants an abortion, all she has to do is fly to New York or Europe and it can be arranged. However, a poor woman or someone with a mediocre income cannot do that. In other words, you have a double standard. People are being discriminated against. This is a double standard which must be removed.

There are a number of other issues I could touch upon at this time. For example, I think we must take a look at the role that young people play in Canada. We must get our young people more involved; we must bring them into the mainstream of Canadian society. In addition, we must do more to help the senior citizens of Canada.

What we really need, then, is a whole series of social and economic changes. People in every walk of life across Canada are growing more and more cynical of the institution of Parliament, of politicians in all political parties. More and more people are asking why we do not pass some really important measures, measures that are important to them, things that are bread and butter issues. Again, we have no one to blame but ourselves. We in Canada possess all the resources that we need. We have sophisticated technology. All we need is Members of Parliament with the fortitude and desire to make real changes.

I do not want to see more and more people dropping out and giving up. I do not want to see more and more people resorting to violence and destruction as the way of telling us that they are not happy, as the way of communicating to us that something is wrong. This does not have to happen and it should not happen. I do not think that any member of this House could condone the activities that have taken place in Quebec during the last week. All of us condemn the actions of the Front de Liberation du Quebec. We have to. Once we accept violence as the way of changing society, we are also accepting the fact that the person with the biggest gun or stick shall rule. We would be saying that the person with the biggest club rules everybody else. We would also be accepting the fact that if another guy has a bigger club, he will rule. We would merely be substituting one form of tyranny for another.

In the present situation I do not think the government should give in to blackmail. However, I feel I should point out that I suspect some backlash is taking place. I sense this feeling among some members of the House and many people in the media. I see this also in newspaper headlines. For example, one headline I saw this morning declared: "FLQ activities drive politicians to the right". Another headline in the *Globe and Mail* declared: "Spiro Trudeau". What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that there must not be extreme reaction or backlash to the activities of any group such as the FLQ. We must remain cool and rational and keep our senses. The only way that we will confront any type of unrest in our society is by changing our society and showing all types of people that there are democratic methods of changing society in a persuasive manner. This is what we will have to do. I think the words of a past president of the United States, John Kennedy, are very relevant at this time. He said:

• (5:40 p.m.)

Those who make peaceful revolution impossible make violent revolution inevitable.

This is something we must remember. As we react to unrest in our society, whether it is violent or non-violent, let us remember that there are reasons for people questioning the system and institutions we live in or under, and we must make certain basic and fundamental changes. We must do this because 20 per cent of our people live in poverty and thousands of people are unemployed. Millions of people in this country do not have opportunities that are available to a small minority.

Canada will have to make some real decisions, because I think we are coming to the crossroad. We must decide in which direction we are going.

We have heard a lot of rhetoric. We have heard a lot of old clichés, platitudes and prose. I suggest that this is no longer good enough. We must get down to the real issues and build a society in Canada that people can control, participate in and reap the benefits. In Canada we must build a democratic socialist society in which everyone, regardless of economic or social background, can participate and play a part. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this be our challenge in the years to come. If all of us in this House of Commons sit down and seriously try to change things and not just talk about them, perhaps we will get a lot further.

Mr. J. E. Brown (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I intervene in this debate in order to deal with two vital matters which in my opinion are linked together and are of great importance to the constituency of Brant. I trust that hon. members will be patient with me while I deal with the first subject which I have on many occasions emphasized in this House. This subject involves a matter which will shortly, I am sure, be dealt with in discussions between our government and the government of my province of Ontario. I refer specifically to the project of the restoration of the Grand River which flows through the constituency of Brant, and especially the restoration of navigation for pleasure craft passing through one of the most scenic and historic parts of the province of Ontario.

This subject should not be laughed at or belittled by any hon. member. Of course, it is not being laughed at or belittled by anyone, but I ask all hon. members to bear with me while I plead the cause of every man, woman and young person in Brant, in the province of Ontario, which I represent in Parliament. The need for an available source of recreation is great. It is great for the large population of my area. We have the Grand River flowing majestically behind the great city of Hamilton where boating is available, the best that can be found in the province of Ontario. It extends far beyond the limits of the county which I represent, flowing as it does behind Hamilton and then past the Six Nations Indian reserve and on to Lake Erie.

The project has been mentioned by many, but I am the one who has brought the matter to the attention of the House during many sessions. The project which I recommend would involve the reconstruction of about five dams between Port Maitland at the mouth of the Grand River and Newport, Ontario, just outside the city of Brantford. Most of this area lies in the constituency which is so ably represented in this House by the hon. member for Norfolk-Haldimand (Mr. Knowles), who I am sure agrees with everything I am saying to the House this afternoon.

The recommendation calls also for a scenic highway between Brantford and the mouth of the river. This is a provincial matter, of course, but it is also federal because the Grand River from its mouth as far as Brantford has since early days been regarded as a navigable waterway in western Ontario. Therefore, that waterway without doubt comes within the jurisdiction of Parliament. The recommendation I am making calls also for a strip park along the banks of the Grand River, and perhaps the formation of a Sir Frederick Haldimand national park a little farther down the river in the neighbouring constituency. I have said this before and I say it again: my 1949 Encyclopedia Britannica lists Brantford, Ontario, as one of the chief Canadian ports of entry.

An hon. Member: You must be kidding.

Mr. Brown: What I have said is a well known fact, publicized by none other than the Encyclopedia Britannica.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Brown: Construction of these dams, the scenic highway and adjoining parkland would not cost too much money, nowhere near as much as has been spent on the upper Grand River. The lower Grand River needs development no matter what the Kitchener-biased Grand River Conservation Authority may say about this matter, or may have done up to the present time. The hon. member is not in his seat at the moment. Also, we are witnessing tremendous industrial development taking place at Nanticoke, which makes it imperative that the federal and provincial authorities arrange to purchase all the available recreational land so that it can be saved for future and present generations.

The project I am talking about is a conservational and recreational matter. It is a project of great importance to all persons living in the Brant-Haldimand, Norfolk-Hamilton-Wentworth area. It is a project that will be utilized in the days to come.

Mr. Gibson: Hear, hear!

• (5:50 p.m.)

Mr. Brown: I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for Hamiton-Wentworth (Mr. Gibson) has cheered, because it is a project that will be utilized in the future by the inhabitants of the Golden Horseshoe of Ontario lying only a stone's throw away, where people have to tow their boats hundreds of miles up north when they could simply be putting them on the Grand, that magnificent, scenic waterway which flows past and through my constituency and near Norfolk and other neighbouring areas of great importance. Millions of dollars have been spent by the federal government on the development of the Trent and Rideau waterways, yet since Confederation hardly a cent has been spent on the Grand. This is where the majority of the people live. I admit, Mr. Speaker, that I have not been a very good Member of Parliament, otherwise this and past governments would have done something about the matter.

I now come to my second point. Unfortunately, in my constituency for the past year and a half there has been heavy unemployment. I do not like this at all. I do not

think anyone would like the situation that exists in an area where there is heavy unemployment. I am not crying; I am simply stating a fact that is well known. The unemployment which exists in my area cannot be tolerated very much longer. As a matter of fact, it is one of the worst pockets of unemployment in Canada. How can the economy of Brant and the surrounding area be stimulated? It can be stimulated by granting to the area the facilities it deserves, needs and can exploit—the most extensive and beautiful recreational facilities that can be found in North America and the reconstruction and redevelopment of navigability for pleasure craft on the Grand River.

When this is done, Mr. Speaker, you can count on it that we will have all the industrial growth we can handle in my important area. This will help bring about full employment. Also, the revenue from tourism resulting from these improvements will in itself greatly stimulate the economy of my district. This whole area in the past has been loyal to Canada. Long ago it was loyal to the Imperial Crown of the United Kingdom. Today it is loyal to the Liberal tradition in Parliament through its representatives. I say, let the Liberal tradition in Parliament show its loyalty to the area which I represent, as well as to its neighbouring and adjoining counties which I love.

I have nearly finished, Mr. Speaker. Some members will be delighted to hear this. However, there was some laughter a moment ago when I said what I did about the government not having done anything to assist and stimulate employment in my area. Not too long ago a great statesman in this country said that to govern is to choose. Mr. Speaker, I cannot govern; I can only choose. This is limiting to a degree, but it is not too limiting because I can choose and have chosen. I have chosen the man who wrote the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Rodrigue: Mr. Speaker, may I point out that it is six o'clock?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Honey): It being six o'clock, I do now leave the Chair. The sitting will resume at eight o'clock p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

[*Translation*]

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Romuald Rodrigue (Beauce): Mr. Speaker, first of all may I be allowed to offer my congratulations to the hon. member for Northumberland-Durham (Mr. Honey) on his appointment as Deputy Speaker.

I would also like to join with all my colleagues in order to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the motion for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, (Mr. Trudel and Mr. Douglas) who have carried out their task in admirable fashion.

I have read and reread the Speech from the Throne as well as the list of legislative proposals mentioned in that Speech, and I would truly like to share the optimism which the mover and seconder have tried to communicate to us.

Indeed, those who have prepared this statement must have done some truly extraordinary intellectual exercises to submit to us once again some antiquated ideas in a new light. This feat has called for increased effort and, had it not been for their artistic talents, they would have failed. This is the feeling we have after reading the Speech from the Throne, the third in the reign of the just society.

Those who have presided over the drafting of this document have given interesting consideration to our society's problems and are promising us many projects whose content must be known before we can determine their real value.

They succeeded in bringing together in that speech a collection of pretentious sentences to launch again the slogan of the just society. I am astonished that they avail themselves of that opportunity to revive an old slogan which they even tried for a while to make us forget.

Two years of power under the just society urge us to show discretion before the smoke screen which the federal cabinet is trying to throw before our eyes.

The Canadian population is ready to believe that the proposed reforms will be the ultimate solution to today's problems and that they will meet every citizen's needs. But we will know if the government is fulfilling its promises only when we read the bills.

In September 1968, in the Throne Speech of the first session, the new government stated its commitment to the objectives of a just society and a prosperous economy in a peaceful world.

Then, as today, the just society could not be achieved if the government did not eliminate the injustices bearing upon the various groups forming the Canadian nation.

In its second Throne Speech, the government announced the publication, in the following months, of several White Papers on subjects such as external affairs, national defence, tax reform, citizenship, social security, information and postal services. Those White Papers were meant to be the foundation of Canada's just society.

• (8:10 p.m.)

This second Speech from the Throne indicated also that the time had come where "Canada must be prepared to face the coming challenges of the post-industrial era". In the opinion of the government therefore a systematic reassessment of Canadian society and its guidelines was necessary.

During the following months the government tabled white papers on tax reform, unemployment insurance, the metric system as well as other documents on foreign affairs.

I am ready to believe in the government's good faith in tabling these white papers outlining its policies and

making it possible for the people to discuss and evaluate programs. But I realize one thing: very often, when the bills are passed, it is already too late. Other change generated factors have nullified the benefits that legislation could have brought to the population.

Again, this year, in the Speech from the Throne, the third under the government of the just society, the introduction of several white papers is announced.

In my opinion, there is no need to recall that the Canadian people are aware of the problems of the day and that they have always offered their co-operation in the difficult moments of our history. I think that they are ready to take part in the economic expansion of the country. In fact, they have always made a valuable and complete effort in order to fulfill our aims and to grant each Canadian the means to live decently.

However, Mr. Speaker, these people are expecting results that the government wanted but did not obtain. Here is the problem at this time.

While trying to fight inflation, unemployment has been created. Indeed, the country was plunged in an extraordinary unemployment crisis when it should have been possible to fight inflation and maintain the employment level at the same time.

Unemployment statistics released at the end of June 1970 indicated that there were 539,000 unemployed in Canada, 188,000 of them in Quebec. Therefore it seems obvious, in the light of these statistics, that economic restrictions aimed at curbing the rise of the cost of living have had the direct result of increasing the unemployment rate.

It can in fact be seen that since February, when the increase in the cost of living reached its highest rate of 5 per cent, every subsequent regression of the consumer price index has been accompanied by an increase in the number of unemployed.

From May to June, the increase in prices, while still spiraling, showed a relative drop of 1.8 per cent, accompanied by a corresponding increase of 1.5 per cent of the unemployment rate.

Statistics released in July but covering the month of June reveal that, contrary to the normal seasonal trend, the number of unemployed increased by 16,000 from May to June, going from 513,000 to 529,000, and this while the number of jobs was increasing normally, i.e. by 196,000, going from 7,952,000 to 8,148,000. As compared to June 1969, the number of unemployed in Canada in June 1970 increased by 146,000, from 383,000 to 529,000.

The number of jobs, from June 1969 to June 1970, increased by 128,000, from 8,020,000 to 8,148,000.

In the light of these statistics, it is quite clear that we are far from our objectives. We are far from our goal, that is the establishment of a just society. Admitedly there is no quick solution nor a sole remedy to fight unemployment, but this is what makes me ask a question: Has the problem been considered under its true light and is the government seeking or proposing solutions to existing problems?

[Mr. Rodrigue.]

I should like to read a passage from the Throne Speech that, I think, does not reflect the government's action, and I quote:

> The Canada of the seventies must continue to be a land for people; a country in which freedom and individualism are cherished and nurtured; a society in which the Government lends its strength to withstand, rather than support the pressures for conformity.

Now, when the government proposes a tax reform as a solution to our economic problems, I say that it is holding on to conformity.

Since the elections prior to the 28th legislature, what true measures have enabled us to create the required number of jobs? Is it Bill C-232? The number of jobs created under this bill did not compensate for the number of jobs suppressed over this period, in spite of the goodwill shown in helping the new industries.

Creating new industries is not as easy as one would believe. Granting new subsidies on paper and announcing the payment of a certain amount is not enough; there are several stages before setting up an industry or ensuring its viability.

I do not question the goodwill of the minister and of all his staff, far from it. But there is a marked difference between wishing to reach a goal and reaching it.

How many jobs have we lost during this same period in footwear, textiles and electronics? In Beauce riding, which I have the honour of representing, the labour force in the footwear industry has dropped from 700 to approximately 400 workers. Similar conditions prevail in the textile industry. Furthermore, the electronics industry which has recently been dealt a heavy blow by the government contracting out satellite ANIK to a foreign manufacturer, happens to be in the same predicament.

If the purpose is to help find new jobs, I am all for setting up new industries. However, once we have them in operation, we should not leave them on their own as we did with the shoe industry, thus forsaking the fruits of 10, 20, 30 or 40 years of efforts on the part of qualified industrialists. These shoe workers have made every sacrifice during the 10 or 20 years that they toiled in order to learn a trade which was to allow them to earn a living for themselves and their families. Unfortunately, they woke up one morning to find out that they were out of a job.

In the statement he made during the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) said that the policy of the government had succeeded after a few delays in slowing down the increase in demand, after mid-year. The minister thus acknowledges the fact that with its policy the government has deliberately helped boost unemployment.

In return, is there any action the minister has suggested to offset this loss of wages resulting from the dismissal of hundreds of worker employed in the shoe factories, textile mills, electronic plants, etc., and which represented nothing less than the purchasing power of those same workers?

Mr. Speaker, the minister contends that government restraints have helped curb demand. Certainly the loss of salary or purchasing power curtails demand or slows down its growth. However, it is unfortunate that inflation has been fought at the expense of the workers.

The late President Kennedy felt very strongly about the problem of unemployment. He was a master at coining phrases. Here is one which is a genuine plea:

> The loss of a single year of personal income on account of unemployment costs us more than 12 years of education.

These words become more and more significant as our civilization becomes one of leisure.

Productivity increases and the standard of living rises with it. Retirement comes earlier, working hours decrease to be replaced by leisure. This fact has become so obvious that some corporations expect to grant their employees education leave as they do sick leave.

In view of price increases and the rise of the unemployment rate, which are the direct causes of the lack of purchasing power, we, of the Ralliement créditiste, suggest the revaluation of family allowances and old age security pensions.

An increase in family allowances and old age security pensions would be an efficient means of putting in the hands of a certain group of consumers additional purchasing power which would renew the confidence of our people while starting an economic upsurge.

Therefore, I fully support the subamendment of the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) which calls for an increase in family allowances.

Acceptance of this subamendment by the government would be a first step toward the implementation of a system insuring a guaranteed annual income and paving the way to a true just society.

• (8:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Colin D. Gibson (Hamilton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, in the spirit expressed in the Speech from the Throne, I wish first to congratulate the hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel), the mover of the Address in Reply, and the seconder, the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) for the excellent speeches which they made in the House. I am particularly pleased since both hon. members exhibited in their speeches sincerity of character, devotion to duty and absolute integrity, as well as obvious ability.

The Speech from the Throne was an inspiring one, Mr. Speaker. The words which appeal to me most in the Speech are as follows:

> With foresight and stamina and enterprise, ours may be, if we wish it . . . a society which encourages imagination and daring, ingenuity and initiative, not coldly and impersonally for the sake of efficiency, but with warmth and from the heart as between friends.

[*Translation*]

And in French, my second language:

> . . . une société qui encourage la créativité, l'audace, l'ingéniosité et l'initiative, non pas froidement et de façon impersonnelle à des fins de stricte utilité, mais avec chaleur et cordialité, comme entre amis.

Mr. Speaker, several of us are determined to learn French. Of course, we shall succeed!

[*English*]

Speaking on the current situation in Canada, I express the desire that we reform our criminal law in order to provide much more severe penalties for offences currently being committed in this nation. I refer, of course, among other things, to section 233 of the Criminal Code or the section relating to kidnapping, and to the aiding and abetting section. I am thinking now of the crime of aiding and abetting kidnapping. I suggest that the aiding and abetting section should be used by the police whenever there is sufficient evidence to warrant a charge being laid under it. I also refer to another crime with respect to which I have found, after research, that there are no reported cases in Canada, fortunately because our society has been relatively peaceful up to this time. I refer to section 51 of the Criminal Code, which relates to acts of violence in order to intimidate Parliament or the legislature of a province. The maximum sentence for that offence is 14 years imprisonment. I urge that that offence carry a maximum sentence of life imprisonment and nothing less.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gibson: I believe that our attention ought to be directed urgently to a debate on security. There should be a searching examination of statements made on radio and television by inflammatory revolutionaries who, by sympathizing with criminals, therefore encourage support for violence by criminal acts. I submit that in so far as matters relating to the safety of the realm are not regulated by statute, the powers in that regard are in common law at the prerogative of the Crown, acting upon the advice of its servants, which has unfettered control both in time of peace or war of all matters relating to the disposition and armament of the military, naval and air forces, and the manner of the exercise of such prerogative powers cannot be inquired into by the courts, whether in a civil or criminal case. The authority for this proposition is found in the case of *Regina v Chandler* (1962) 2 All England Reports, page 314. I submit the same principle applies to Crown prerogative powers in Canada today. Further, Mr. Speaker, I quote from the judgment at page 320:

> Those who are responsible for the national security must be the sole judges of what the national security requires.

I represent the riding of Hamilton-Wentworth, a riding that is partly urban, in the city of Hamilton, and also partly rural. It is a riding with a population consisting of Canadians of varied national origins and many Canadians of British origin. The constituency also contains the township of Ancaster, which includes fine farming country and a suburban community. Also, it contains the historic town of Stoney Creek. That town, I hope, will be the source of Canada Day.

The Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, dealt with labour. I believe that despite criticism expressed by some people, collective bargaining in Canada can in fact function humanely under existing labour laws. The difficulties do not lie in the system of collective bargaining but, rather, in the inability of some to make the best use of that system. The purpose of collective bargaining laws is not the settlement of disputes but, rather, to provide the mechanism whereby collective agreements can be contracted as a result of peaceful negotiations conducted in an atmosphere of genuine concern, in a spirit of good faith.

No one can deny that those who advocate the abolition of the right to strike as a general rule, rather than abolition in exceptional circumstances, overlook the fact that, with sufficient provocation the worker can lay down tools anyway and strike illegally. For example, in the recent police strike in Montreal, policemen, underpaid and ignored by society, felt compelled to strike illegally. Policemen do not have the right to strike, but when society ignored them and when humanity and justice provided them with no other choice, they went on strike. The result was an illegal strike, a bitter and violent confrontation. Why, then, is there so much turmoil today in the ranks of labour? It is partly owing to the social unrest prevalent throughout the world, as has been demonstrated by student riots at universities and similar breakdowns in social order which result in violence. Also, it is partly owing to a gang of lawless gangsters who seek power through violence and who prostitute law and order by gang terrorist tactics.

Our challenge, Mr. Speaker, is to forge a new social consciousness. It is to improve the isolation of the urban worker in a technological world. We want to remove that isolation from his life.

An hon. Member: Did the hon. member read that?

Mr. Gibson: We must provide kindness and sympathy for workers in those places where today there is autocracy and indifference toward their lives. Those engaged in labour and management must appreciate that the decisions reached in collective bargaining agreements have a profound impact upon the community at large, and sometimes the impact causes disastrous results. Abnormally large wage increases, particularly, result in lower profits and higher prices. Thus, goods become more expensive to produce and sell, and costs become greater. Prices escalate, and as a result sales become greatly reduced and finally unemployment results.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Too frequently industry greedily grabs record-breaking profit and then flatly refuses to pay labour increased wages and fringe benefits. For example, the Canadian banks have made great profits; they have been great profit-makers but they have kept some of their employees at shockingly low income levels. The government recently substantially increased the minimum wage for federal employees, including bank employees. The record of the banks with regard to labour relations is poor. Management has ignored the human factor and failed to adjust its labour policy to the fast age of impersonal technology.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we must prevent the embryo, so-called right to incite riot and revolution. We must restore law and order from coast to coast in Canada. We need vastly improved social communications between management and labour. In my view, the burden is on management to inject a new attitude of friendship and co-operation with workers. At present a team spirit is lacking. Labour needs to be treated with appreciation and respect, not treated with scorn as useless, worn-out equipment with little or nothing to contribute. A warm and kind attitude by the employer would greatly improve this sad state of affairs, which amounts to a miserable by-product of the modern industrial state. Further, at all levels of society we must enhance respect for law and order and we must be severe in punishing crimes of violence.

We must strengthen the symbols of national unity by naming July 1, Canada Day. Frequent polls throughout this nation indicate that the vast majority of Canadians want this change. Young Canadians, in particular, who have grown up with the Canadian flag demand and insist upon Parliament changing the name of the national day to Canada Day. I have faith in young Canadians. Their idealism and interest in sports and anti-pollution measures has strengthened and developed our national character. I am proud that this government lowered the voting age to 18 years. I am also proud that despite undue emphasis on the mass media, the vast majority of young Canadians are constructive in outlook and hard-working in action. They are sports minded and athletic. They have a dream of Canada which we must foster, nurture and develop. We will do this. We must continue to provide programs such as the Voyageur plan which enabled many young Canadians to travel across our land and learn to know this great country.

I hope our future plans for the armed forces reserves will give opportunity for anti-pollution training. National defence has enemies in many forms of polluters, and our young people can be used in the struggle for our defence in the war against pollution, the war to exist. However, we must not allow our armouries to become flop-houses for drop-outs and beatniks, many of whom are not Canadian and have no place in Canadian society.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gibson: Participatory democracy is not an empty phrase but is, rather, the logical and real result of planned adaptation to the needs of Canadian society today.

With respect to the Constitution, Mr. Speaker, I have served on the Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on the Constitution. This committee is in the process of meeting the public at assemblies in each province and territory of Canada. A very helpful dialogue has been and will continue to be carried on in each area of Canada. Members of all parties serve on this committee. We are working together in harmony in the interests of

our nation, despite our party following and backgrounds. There is no partisanship on this committee. It has been a joy for me, as a new member, not only to get to know my country but to get to know members opposite. This is one of the greatest assets of committee work.

Mr. Stanfield: It has been a great thing for you fellows.

Mr. Gibson: It is good for us, I agree. I smile back in genuine agreement, because we do have a proper point of view after discussing problems with Conservatives and New Democrats. If they have constructive ideas, we try to adopt the best of them for our party so the front of Liberalism will be wider and stronger. A very valuable and helpful dialogue has been and will continue to be carried on in each area of Canada. In this way the government has developed a real policy of actual participatory democracy. The members of the committee not only hear from experts in law but also the ordinary citizens, young and old, from all walks of life who contribute their suggestions and criticisms of Canada's Constitution. Women, children, Indians, Métis, unemployed, wealthy, poor, young, middle-aged and all others with their diverse problems speak to us: they are not shy about it.

The chairmen of the committee wisely organized the committee hearings by giving public notice of the meetings so the local inhabitants, members of service clubs and people with special occupations could express the particular thoughts they had in mind. Everyone was given the opportunity to speak. This has played a very real part in participatory democracy in Canada. We visited the Yukon Territory and the province of Manitoba in September. We were all impressed with the vastness of the area we visited. I was moved by the difficulties those fine Canadians experience. We were all grateful to our northern and western hosts for the wonderful help they gave us. I hope that those who reside in the more heavily populated regions of Canada will forcefully and effectively improve the interests and protect the rights and other needs of those Canadians, the Indians, Eskimos and Métis. The Métis are party Indian and partly French. Their unfortunate lot is that they do not have the advantages of being Indians who are protected by the Indian Act. They are in the terrible predicament of not being accepted by society.

In Thompson, Manitoba, I was conscious of the wonderful effort of the social workers in desperately trying to find a means of aiding and assisting the Indians and Métis not only to integrate into employment opportunities but to find a social position in the modern society of today. The people of Thompson, Manitoba, have been pioneers in attempting to help with this very important problem. As an Ontario member, I pledge to never forget the plight of the Indians, Métis and Eskimos. As long as I am a Member of Parliament their interests will be close to my heart. I hope some way can be found to make their lot more pleasant and happy.

I hope those who serve on this committee will speak on this subject in their ridings, so that all Canadians will appreciate the difficulties of these people and the difficulties of the people who live in the territories. The territories have small populations. They do not have provincial status. They desperately need human contact with Ottawa. I hope senior civil servants will realize that cold-blooded letters refusing demands are not sufficient. These people must visit the territories. They must keep in constant communication with these people so that they appreciate the issues which affect them.

The work of the committee has created a new consciousness of the magnitude and beauty of Canada, a genuine feeling of pride in the principles that unite us, and a fixed and deliberate determination to achieve national unity by constructive constitutional reform. We are strengthening the cause of national unity by gaining a warm understanding of all Canadians and by continuing to learn about our mutual problems in developing our own Canadian identity. Mr. Speaker, I agree with those who have advanced proposals to adopt a Canadian charter of human rights. I quote from the booklet "A Canadian Charter of Human Rights," page 15, as follows:

• (8:40 p.m.)

> Existing human rights measures in Canada are limited in scope. The Canadian Bill of Rights passed in 1960, emphasizes political freedoms (speech, assembly, religion, etc.) and legal rights (freedom from arbitrary deprivation of life, liberty or property, and equality before the law).
>
> Other federal legislation and most provincial legislation is confined to prohibitions against discrimination in employment, admission to trade unions or the provisions of accommodation.

It is now suggested that there be included in a constitutional bill those rights which have been legislatively protected in Canada, in addition to those linguistic rights which are recommended by the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism. In the charter of human rights it is proposed to include five categories of rights, all to be protected by the Canadian courts. The first category includes political rights such as freedom of expression, freedom of conscience and religion, and freedom of assembly and association.

The second category includes legal rights, subjects covered by the Canadian Bill of Rights of 1960 such as general security of life, liberty and property, equal protection under the law against discrimination, the right to protection from cruel punishment, the right to protection on arrest—covering such matters as bail, a speedy trial, habeas corpus, and so on—the right to counsel, the right to a fair hearing, the right to presumption of innocence and the right to an interpreter. The third category provides guarantees against government action which would tend to distinguish certain persons or groups of persons for unequal treatment on the basis of their race or national origin, for example in admission to professions, educational facilities, public accommodation or the acquiring of property, communication with government institutions and education generally.

The fourth and fifth categories deal with economic rights. It is not proposed to implement these at present because society has not developed in such a way as to enable it to be done. They are in the way of providing a right to work, and so on. But we are signatories to the United Nations Charter of Human Rights and we hope it

will be possible to develop this eventually as part of our Constitution.

I wish to say a word now about what might be done to make a charter of human rights work. I do this with humility, realizing I am dealing with a difficult subject. I do not want to be taken as having the gall to think I know all the answers. I would make two suggestions. First, a constitutional court at the level of the Supreme Court of Canada should pass on any statute which touches on subject matters bordering on or affecting civil liberties, before those statutes take effect. By this means the constitutionality of our statutes would be reviewed and sanctioned prior to their enactment, thus avoiding situations such as occurred in connection with the breathalyzer section of the Criminal Code, which was cleared by the courts for one technical reason but has since been brought before provincial appellate courts on the ground that it is a breach of the Canadian Bill of Rights of 1960.

Second, we must seek a speedier and more efficient system whereby both trial courts and appeal courts can be used by all Canadians without undue expense or delay. These are some of the reforms I suggest. Today I believe all members of the committee on the constitution would agree with the quotation, "I am a part of all that I have met". Although we Canadians differ in language, race and origin and come from different parts of our country, despite current events caused by cruel gangsters who seek to divide us, and despite dangers which lie ahead, Canada has survived two world wars and is now a strong, virile nation. Canada will not give in to the vile criminals who have attempted to divide us and who have poisoned the mass media with revolutionary talks. I urge the government to remove wild revolutionaries from the media, particularly those who incite revolution by violent means. We shall strive to live in a technological age with a fairer social conscience, and I believe the day is not too distant when our constitution will include a charter of human rights which will place certain basic human freedoms in a position of entrenched protection. In this way the dignity of man will be respected, the rule of law will be enforced and the Canadian nation will continue to develop in a just society.

With respect to the United Nations, again I speak with humility as one who has not spent his career in United Nations work. Nevertheless, I am one who is fascinated by the possibility of a peaceful world and in this light I would advocate the following:

(a) Immediate rules changes limiting debate to 10 minutes per speaker in the General Assembly.

(b) Strict rulings from Speakers of United Nations committees to avoid repetition.

(c) An observers' forum where representatives at the United Nations who are not full-scale delegates can express their views.

(d) A United Nations school for diplomacy where young students of ability can meet students from other nations. When these students graduate they will already be familiar with some of the views and attitudes of foreign states.

[Mr. Gibson.]

(e) A United Nations grand jury. This could be developed by the use of television. It should travel and its members should include representatives from each continent. It should discuss world peace and describe its experiences as it travels from nation to nation. It should be composed of people who are articulate and senior in years.

We have listened to the floundering and contradictory criticism tossed recklessly across this chamber by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield). We have also heard from the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Douglas) as he expressed his usual party propaganda line—an ill-conceived concept of waffling—and his policy of hoarding our national resources to Canada's economic misery. Fortunately, his party will never form the government. I much prefer the orderly planning of legislation as advocated by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), who has progressively improved the destiny of Canada by sound and bold leadership and kept a firm hand on the tiller while enemy waves have attempted to rock the boat. The ship of state is safe, and we shall keep it that way. Canadians will never surrender to gangsters, in a crisis or at any other time.

I hope the Leader of the Opposition will heed the advice which the Prime Minister gave in his speech on Friday last, to which I respectfully add a quotation from Piet Hein as follows:

> The road to wisdom? Well, it's plain
> And simple to express,
> Err and err and err again,
> But less and less and less.

Mr. Melvin McQuaid (Cardigan): First of all, Mr. Speaker, I join the many speakers who have preceded me in extending congratulations to the mover and to the seconder, of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I think they did an excellent job in what I consider to be difficult circumstances.

Traditionally, the Speech from the Throne is supposed to give an outline of government policy for the session. The speech we have before us is a very long one and in my view contains far less substance than usual. The Speech from the Throne is very vague and certainly has less substance than usual. As a matter of fact, very seldom have I seen a government document that in my opinion says so little in so many words. I see very little real policy announced in the Speech, and paragraph after paragraph speaks only of very vague plans and pious hopes that the government apparently has in mind. I was very much surprised to find not a word about the proposed amendments to our constitution and its repatriation. If the Speech from the Throne had been written by the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Gibson), I think it probably would have contained some very serious recommendations in regard to this very important matter.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Constitutional amendment is a matter of some concern to Canada. We are an independent country, yet we do not have the right to amend our own constitution. It seems

little short of ridiculous that Canada should be required to present an address to the British Parliament at Westminster before we can amend our own constitution. Certainly, the British Parliament is not anxious to retain its power in this regard. I suggest that a sincere and conscientious effort must be made to find a method by which, with general agreement, our constitution can be repatriated, brought home to Canada and amended by Canada.

While I support this idea, at the same time I express some reservations with respect to the amount of travelling that the committee on the constitution has lined up for itself in the coming year. I agree that some of it is essential. However, when one looks at the schedule that has been presented to the committee, one finds that in some cases a great deal of travelling could be cut out, at considerable saving to the taxpayers of this country. For example, next week the committee—and I am a member of it—is going to Nova Scotia where it will hold hearings in Halifax, Wolfville, Sydney and Antigonish. To show how unnecessary these hearings are I place on the record the fact that the travelling distance from Halifax to Wolfville is only 60 miles. Why should a committee consisting of about 30 to 35 members, along with a staff of perhaps 15 or 16, be required to travel those 60 miles thus putting the taxpayers to expense, when it would be so much easier for those in Wolfville who are interested in presenting briefs to travel to Halifax? The distance from Halifax to Antigonish is only 140 miles, and there again it would be much easier and less expensive for those who wish to present briefs to travel to Halifax from Antigonish.

When the committee visits the province of New Brunswick it proposes to travel to Fredericton, Saint John, Moncton and Bathurst. Fredericton, of course, is the capital. The distance from Fredericton to Bathurst is only 160 miles, the distance from Fredericton to Saint John is only 70 miles, and the distance from Fredericton to Moncton is only 120 miles. So why does the committee not stay in Fredericton? In all seriousness I suggest that some of these trips could very well be cut out. At the same time, those people who wished to present briefs would not be prejudiced in any way at all because they would not be inconvenienced very much by travelling to Fredericton.

Speaking in this debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, my chief concern is to try to place before this House as clearly and as forcefully as I can the economic situation in which we in the Atlantic provinces find ourselves. Canada entered the 1970s with a very definite worsening of the grim economic problems which plagued her particularly during the latter part of the 1960s. In March 1970 for example, the Canadian unemployment rate was 6.7 per cent and that rate was the highest since 1964. Turning to the Atlantic provinces, in Newfoundland the unemployment rate was 15.3 per cent—more than twice the national average—in New Brunswick it was 11.8 per cent, in my own province of Prince Edward Island it was 9.7 per cent and in Nova Scotia it was 7.7 per cent. The average unemployment rate in the Atlantic provinces was 11.1 per cent, or 4.4 per cent above the national average.

These figures, high as they are do not begin to tell the whole story. As a matter of fact, they understate the real magnitude of the unemployment problem because they do not take into consideration those who are willing and able to work but have not yet entered the labour force. Currently according to the latest figures we have, there are today in Canada over 500,000 people unemployed. This, I charge, is because of the government's anti-inflation program and is also a result of its tight fiscal and monetary policies. Further the existence of large-scale poverty in this country is an unmistakable fact. Millions of Canadians are forced to exist on incomes which deny them a proper standard of living. Many of them have the misfortune to be poorly housed and do not eat sufficient nutritious food. They suffer from every disadvantage that comes from deprivation.

In my own province, for example, the average per capita income is only $1,860 per year. That is the lowest of any province in Canada, with the possible exception of the province of Newfoundland. By comparison, in Ontario the average per capita income is $3,300. In 1967, the last year for which figures are available, 5,378 income tax returns filed in my province declared an income of less than $1,000. Remember that in considering these figures we have a total population of about 110,000 people. Some 6,367 returns were filed by people earning between $1,000 and $2,000, and 6,122 were filed by people earning between $2,000 and $3,000. Only 145 returns were filed in that province declaring an income in excess of $20,000 per year.

Those figures give the House an idea of how badly off are the people in my province so far as earning an adequate standard of living is concerned. The Charlottetown income tax district last year ranked ninety-eighth among 100 selected Canadian cities, in terms of highest average income. Basically, each Canadian should be assured of an income that would provide him with an adequate standard of living; that is the very least he should expect. As a matter of fact, this point was recognized in the Speech from the Throne, in that the Speech declares, as reported at page 2 of *Hansard:*

> With foresight and stamina and enterprise, ours may be, if we wish it . . . a society in which individual freedom and equality of opportunity remain as our most cherished possessions;

• (9:00 p.m.)

The Atlantic provinces as a whole have a very low rate of population growth. Between 1961 and 1966 the population growth was only 0.8 per cent per year, whereas the national average increase was 2 per cent per year for the same period. This low rate of population growth is due mainly to a high net out-movement of people from this region. There is a natural tendency for large numbers of people to move from the Atlantic provinces in search of better opportunities elsewhere.

The out-movement over the period 1961 to 1966 was about 104,000, or 20,000 people per year. Unfortunately, this trend is worsening. If this out-migration continues at the same level during the decade 1961 to 1971, about 207,000 people will have left the region during this period. That is more than 10 per cent of the present

population of the area. Unfortunately, our most important export is brains. Why do these brains leave? They leave in search of work for higher pay. The main factor which contributes to this out-migration is the small employment base. No one is going to stay if there are not sufficient jobs to enable them to maintain a decent standard of living. If this out-migration of the population continues at the very high level of the past few years, we may very well ask ourselves whether the region will be left with a sufficient labour force to produce the goods and services required to prevent the gap from becoming even wider.

It is impossible to reduce out-migration by force. Nor is it reasonable to expect that people will remain in the region because of a hope that the per capita income will increase. There must be a generation of employment within the region. This must be at a sufficiently high level so that rates of pay are commensurate with those received in other parts of Canada. Only in this way will we be able to make remaining in this region an attractive proposition. This calls for a programmed approach by the federal government in the development of job opportunities in the area. That is what we require, job opportunities.

There must be a narrowing of the gap in personal income as between this region and Canada as a whole. This should be accomplished through generation of income in the region and not by a transfer of income to the region. Pouring subsidies into the Atlantic provinces will not solve our problems satisfactorily. Patronage will never produce prosperity. Those are not my words, but it is a very correct quotation. We in our province unfortunately entered Confederation on a patronage basis. What is more unfortunate is that we have existed on this patronage ever since. Pouring subsidies into the area has not worked, except that it has enabled our people to subsist in the land they love but in a land which, unfortunately, is incapable of supporting them.

New assistance to this area of Canada must not bear the tag of charity; it must help us to be productive. There must be policies aimed at substantially increasing productivity, thereby leading to maximum efficiency and the utilization of our natural resources, while processing these resources to the fullest possible extent within the region. We are somewhat encouraged by the Speech from the Throne which says:

> It remains the goal of the government to be concerned with the production of wealth. It also remains the goal of the government that Canadians be given the opportunity to enjoy that wealth.

If these are more than empty words, and let us hope they are, the government must get going right away in order to help this area. There are many ways in which help could be extended. We have natural resources in the area. In my own province, for example, we have a rapidly expanding Irish moss business. Irish moss, for the information of hon. members who may not be acquainted with it, is a small marine plant which is attached to rocks very close to low-water. The most important and valuable extract from Irish moss is a product called carrageen. It is worth from $1.50 to $2 per pound. It is used as a stabilizing base in very many products. It is used, for example, in ice cream, chocolate milk, pie fillings, beer and icings. It is also used in insecticide sprays, water-base paints, inks, shampoos, ointments, tablets and cosmetics. There are hundred of uses for this product.

Last year in the province of Prince Edward Island we produced 54 million pounds of Irish moss. This represents 37 per cent of the world supply. Think of it—37 per cent of the world supply of Irish moss was produced in the small province of Prince Edward Island. About 85 million pounds of Irish moss was harvested in the Maritimes last year. That represents about 84 per cent of the world production. This is a very promising industry, but the unfortunate part is that all this moss is exported, either to Denmark or to the state of Maine, in order to extract the carrageen, which is the important part. I suggest there is no reason at all why extraction plants could not be established in the Atlantic area. This would provide employment for a great many of our people and would enable this important extract to be taken out right at home. The product would not have to be exported to foreign countries. This is an industry which I suggest could very well be helped and supported by the federal government in order to provide more employment for our people.

Fishing is another important industry in the Atlantic provinces. In 1969 the fishing industry accounted for an income in excess of $9 million. I suggest that more work will have to be done to make fish attractive and easy to prepare, and also to encourage its greater consumption. The latest figures issued by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics indicate that Canadians eat 13 pounds of meat and poultry for every pound of fish. A great deal of blame for this can be laid directly at the feet of the Department of Fisheries. There has, unfortunately been very little effort on the part of the department to find out just what the consumer wants in the line of fish, and very little effort has been made to encourage our producers to make fish more attractive and of improved quality. Quality control must be tightened, because the entire industry suffers when sloppy inspection practices permit inferior quality fish to reach the consumer's table. Again, more encouragement must be given to our people to eat fish.

In many cases, fish recipes which are published for consumers—some by the Department of Fisheries itself—are so complicated, contain so many uncommon ingredients and take so long to prepare that the average housewife, in despair, reaches into the fridge and brings out a sausage dinner. Housewives cannot be expected to find out from processing companies what to do with fish when they buy it, and if they wait to find out from the government I am afraid the fish will be spoiled. Fish cookbooks prepared by the government—there are some good ones—should not be kept here in Ottawa waiting for the consumer to write for them. The consumer just will not write. I suggest these cookbooks should be sent out. Unless the federal government takes steps along these lines to increase Canadian per capita consumption of fish, the industry is bound to suffer. More work will

definitely have to be done so that the fish may become more attractive and more marketable.

• (9:10 p.m.)

Now, of course, in our area farming is one of the main industries. Unfortunately, however, the farm population in my province has dropped by almost 50 per cent in the last 30 years. In 1930, for example, our farm population was 55,000. That represented 63 per cent of our total population. In 1966 the farm population dropped to 31,000 people, or 28 per cent of our population. A drop in farm population naturally results in a drop in the number of farms. In 1931 there were 12,865 occupied farms, but by 1966 this number had decreased to 6,357, a drop of 50 per cent in five years. In order to stop this downward trend—and I suggest it must be stopped in a province such as ours which depends so much on farming—the government must give the province some assistance in respect of marketing.

The province of Prince Edward Island grows the best potatoes in the world, but markets must be found for them. In 1969 our potato harvest was one of the best on record both in respect of quantity and quality, but unfortunately the price the farmers received for this product barely covered the cost of production. One just cannot remain in business unless he can make a profit, and one cannot make a profit in so far as farm products are concerned unless some assistance is given in the finding of adequate markets for what is produced.

The tobacco industry is a growing industry in our province. Last year 2¼ million pounds of leaf tobacco were produced. This brought a return of approximately $1.5 million to our farmers. I suggest that here is an avenue whereby the government can come to the assistance of the farmers and help them maintain a better standard of living, so that the young people would be encouraged to remain in agriculture because, as I said before, it is the most important industry in our province. If we lose it, I am afraid we will suffer very seriously economically.

These are some of the things to which this government should give attention. I know my time is rapidly expiring. I trust some of the things I have mentioned this evening will in one way or another be brought to the attention of the government, and that some effective measures will be introduced at once to improve the economy of the Atlantic area.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join in this Throne Speech debate. I wish to add my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, the hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel) and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas).

This debate has been taking place this week while we have all been preoccupied with the events in Montreal regarding the kidnapping of Mr. Cross and Mr. Laporte. Indeed, the arrival on Parliament Hill on Tuesday morning of combat troops placed an ominous note over the whole capital. One cannot help but wonder if the free and open society which we have enjoyed in Canada is coming to an end. Perhaps in the future our Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) will not be able to move freely within our country without the heavy security which United States presidents and leaders in many Latin-American countries have. Let us hope this is not the case, because this is one of the conditions which many of us cherish in this land. It is one of the conditions which we have enjoyed in the past and which is different from the United States. We have always had the happy circumstance that political differences could be settled by debate and not by a gun.

I commend the government on its handling of this situation, in not giving in to the terrorists. To give in is to invite anarchy—the rule of law would be finished in Canada. The strategy of playing for time while keeping up the police investigation is the right one. By doing this the terrorists will ultimately make a mistake and be brought to justice. The coverage by the news media is less commendable. The media speak of "political prisoners" in Quebec jails. These are not political prisoners; these prisoners are criminals convicted of a crime set down in the Criminal Code of Canada as enacted by Parliament. The media also speak of "the execution of Mr. Cross and Mr. Laporte" in the notes sent by the terrorists. Let us be sensible. Only a judge and jury acting under the law of a sovereign state can sentence a man to be executed. If Mr. Cross or Mr. Laporte should be killed by the FLQ terrorists, there would be only one word for this act, and that is "murder."

Mr. Speaker, as I moved around through my constituency of Algoma this past summer, a constituency which I am very proud to represent in the House of Commons, I detected a feeling of concern about the quality of life which we seem to be heading into in the 1970s. There is concern, first, with the use of drugs by so many in our society; second, with the pollution of our lakes and rivers to the extent that fishing is banned and, third, with the violence portrayed on television and exemplified in the recent events in Montreal. Our area is not immune to the problem of young people appearing in court because of the illegal use of marijuana and other drugs. The newspapers carry regular accounts of it. And, Mr. Speaker, there is no easy solution to the problem. Many people feel that we should not saddle young people with permanent criminal records because of convictions for using marijuana, but at the same time legalization is no solution to the problem. Undoubtedly this is a matter which we, as the elected representatives of the people of this great land, must study with all diligence in this session and in respect of which we must formulate solutions.

It seems to me, as I read the reports of the increased use of drugs in Canada and the United States, that this could well be the Achilles heel of our western civilization. Surely, a civilization that has been able to make the scientific and technical advances that ours has, that has developed an educational system which should challenge the most intelligent of our youth, must be able, through education and example, to control this drug problem in our society. A famous man once said, "The problem is not in our stars; it's in ourselves". Thus, part of the

solution perhaps is not in the stars; it is in ourselves. Young people see the adult generation using other drugs and setting a premium on false values, and are inclined to say, "Hypocrites, who are you to talk?".

Mr. Speaker, at a time when there is so much concern with our environment I was pleased to see forecast in the Speech from the Throne a department to be concerned with the preservation of the environment and our renewable resources. This new department will combine most of the activities of the federal government in the fight against pollution. Last year many of us spent several months in committee discussing the Canada Water Act. This will be a major federal statute to co-ordinate the activities of the various levels of government agencies in Canada. There were also four other bills passed last session to deal with pollution control, including action to control pollution in the Canadian Arctic, in the oil and gas-drilling rigs offshore on the continental shelf, and amendments to the Canada Fisheries Act.

I am pleased to learn that a bill respecting air pollution will be introduced this session. This is long overdue. Although some provinces have air pollution laws, not all have. I hope that the Canada clean air bill will follow the same tack as the Canada Water Act, that is, that we recognize that much of the responsibility for pollution control in our society is a provincial responsibility. The two levels of government, by acting jointly to resolve the problem, can share resources, expertise and responsibility.

• (9:20 p.m.)

However, if the province fails to act, or if it cannot afford the cost of taking action, the federal law will give the federal government power to act and the finances to carry it through. This way we have a continuity across this great land on the levels of despoilation that are permitted to our land, our water and our air. It is unacceptable to Canadians to see the interprovincial bidding for new industries that has taken place in the past because our province's pollution standards were lower than those of others. Ontario has not had a new pulp and paper mill established in it for the last 20 years. One of the reasons for this is that pollution standards here are higher than in some of the other provinces. Many people think they are none too high even in the province of Ontario.

The federal government has a responsibility to provide maximum, optimum standards throughout the land for water and air which will ensure a good-quality environment to pass on to future generations of Canadians. The combining of many federal government activities into a department charged with responsibility for our environment, as outlined in the Speech from the Throne, is a step in the right direction.

The Algoma federal riding combines many endeavours, including farming, forestry, mining and tourism. On reading this list of activities of the Algoma riding one quickly realizes that these are primary industries. No public debate concerns us more than the current one on the foreign domination of our industry and of our land.

The present uncertainty in the uranium mining industry is an example of the immense complexity of drawing up rules for Canadian ownership. Last year at this time there were some 20 diamond drills operating in the Elliot Lake area. Today there are practically none. Exploration activity is at a minimum across Canada. This represents millions of dollars of lost development. Now that the uncertainty regarding foreign ownership of uranium mines has been raised, it should be resolved as quickly as possible so that future exploration in Canada will continue.

Fortunately, the government did establish an assistance policy last July to aid uranium mines through the next three to four lean years of markets for uranium oxide. Everyone in Elliot Lake is depending on both the government and Denison Mines' representatives, who are currently negotiating assistance to keep the mine operating, to come to an agreement very soon. The value of this assistance policy will only be proven, so far as this community is concerned, if a successful conclusion is reached.

The ramifications of the current public debate on foreign ownership in Canada are far reaching. For example, we have been searching for several years now for a company to establish a pulp and paper mill in the Algoma riding to utilize our wood fibre. One U.S. company which had started a study of the area, and of the feasibility of building a mill, decided not to proceed partly due to the uncertainty as to the foreign ownership of Canadian resource industries.

I think we must approach economic nationalism in Canada with great care. Any decisions made to limit foreign investment must be well thought-out with regard to repercussions on the communities which will be affected. If rules are developed rashly and without careful study, the results could be disastrous for the resource industry areas of Canada. It happens that many of the resource industry areas are also areas of Canada which are designated for secondary industry grants by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. It would be stupid to establish foreign ownership rules which would stop development in these areas of Canada when the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is spending hundreds of millions of dollars to promote expansion and the development of secondary industry.

Nothing that this government has done since it took over in 1968 has been more fruitful in the underdeveloped areas of our country than the establishment of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. The incentive grants for new manufacturing industry have meant a great deal to the Algoma riding. So far this year we have commitments for three regional development grants to industry amounting to over half a million dollars, which will provide much needed new jobs to our area and broaden our economic base. This kind of development reassures people that the government is concerned with establishing industry in our area. I am sure that this is only the beginning. More grants and more applications are pending, and further development will take place. There is a need in the Department of Regional Economic Expansion for a larger staff to handle the

applications for grants. Many businessmen who have applied tell me that they have had to wait several months to have their applications processed. Additional competent development officers should be hired so that these applications can be handled more quickly.

The problems of foreign ownership are not limited to our mines and forest industry, but extend also to our farm and lakeshore property. United States ownership is so common on the shores of Lake Huron, Lake Superior and Manitoulin Island that local people think little of it. Many U.S. families have owned summer cottages there for two generations; they have been good summer citizens and are our friends. However, in recent years, with the opening of a four-lane interstate highway from Detroit and Chicago to Sault Ste. Marie, with the summer cottage frontier pushing farther and farther north, and with the summer riots and dissent in the U.S.A., the acquisition of Canadian land and lakeshore recreational property has gone from a trickle to a raging torrent.

Two examples will give an idea of the size of this problem. A recent transfer of property took place north of Sault Ste. Marie on Lake Superior, involving 13 miles of lakeshore property. This was a sale from a Canadian to a U.S. company. Similarly, a foreign-owned company established a subdivision on the south side of Manitoulin Island with some 2,000 lots in it. The concern is that we are selling our birthright; that future generations of Canadians will look back at the time when Canadians owned the land and then the Americans came and bought it all.

There is a need for planning to assure future generations of Canadians that land will be available to them for recreation purposes. There is a need for land to be set aside for public use as well. The federal government must stop waiting on the Ontario government for park development. There is a need for more public recreational land to be set aside now for future generations in Ontario. It is forecast, for example, that Toronto will have 6.5 million people in less than 30 years. Where will these people go for public recreational land? I can think of no better place for a national park than the Manitoulin Island area, midway between northern and southern Ontario. But now is the time to act—not after all suitable land has been purchased by our U.S. neighbours.

The chairman of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development, the hon. member for Laprairie (Mr. Watson), visited the island this past summer. He was very impressed with its beauty and its potential for a national park. One can capture something of the beauty of the area between the town of Espanola and Manitoulin Island by watching the current Sunday night TV series "Adventures in Rainbow Country," which was filmed there during the summer of 1969. So my invitation to hon. members is to see the TV program "Adventures in Rainbow Country," which shows some of the beauties of our area, and then I am sure they will agree with me that now is the time to decide to establish a national park in this area for recreation in the future.

Division

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. It being 9.30 o'clock p.m., it is my duty, pursuant to section 4 of Standing Order 38, to interrupt these proceedings and put forthwith the question on any amendment or amendments now before the House.

• (9:30 p.m.)

The House divided on the amendment to the amendment (Mr. Fortin) which was negatived on the following division:

• (9:40 p.m.)

YEAS

Messrs:

Barnett
Brewin
Caouette
Dionne
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Fortin
Gauthier
Godin
Harding
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Laprise
Lewis
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Matte
Nystrom
Peters
Rodrigue
Rondeau
Rose
Saltsman—20.

NAYS

Messrs:

Aiken
Allmand
Anderson
Asselin
Badanai
Baldwin
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Benson
Bigg
Blouin
Borrie
Brown
Buchanan
Caccia
Cafik
Chappell
Chrétien
Clermont
Coates
Cobbe
Code
Comeau
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Longueuil)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
Diefenbaker
Dinsdale
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Drury
Dubé
Duquet
Éthier
Fairweather
Faulkner
Flemming
Forrestall
Foster
Francis
Gibson
Gillespie
Givens
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Hales
Harries
Hees
Hopkins
Howe
Jerome
Kaplan
Kierans
Lachance
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt)
Langlois
Laniel
La Salle
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
MacDonald (Egmont)
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
MacLean
Macquarrie
MacRae
McBride
McCleave
McCutcheon
McGrath
McIlraith
McIntosh
McKinley
McNulty

Division

McQuaid
Mahoney
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Monteith
Morison
Munro
Nesbitt
Nielsen
Noble
Noël
O'Connell
Olson
Otto
Ouellet
Pelletier
Pepin
Perrault
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Richardson
Ritchie
Robinson
Rochon
Rock
Roy (Laval)
Ryan
Schumacher
Sharp
Smerchanski
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Southam
Stafford
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
St. Pierre
Sulatycky
Sullivan
Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Thompson (Red Deer)
Tolmie
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Valade
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting
Woolliams
Yanakis—150.

• (9:50 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment to the amendment lost. The question is now on the amendment.

The House divided on the amendment (Mr. Stanfield) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alkenbrack
Asselin
Baldwin
Barnett
Bigg
Brewin
Coates
Code
Comeau
Crouse
Diefenbaker
Dinsdale
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Fairweather
Flemming
Forrestall
Hales
Harding
Hees
Howe
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
La Salle
Lewis
MacDonald (Egmont)
MacInnis (Mrs.)
MacLean
Macquarrie
MacRae
McCleave
McCutcheon
McGrath
McIntosh
McKinley
McQuaid
Monteith
Nesbitt
Nielsen
Noble
Nystrom
Peters
Ritchie
Rose
Ryan
Saltsman
Schumacher
Southam
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Thompson (Red Deer)
Valade
Woolliams—53.

NAYS

Messrs:

Allmand
Anderson
Badanai
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Benson
Blouin
Borrie
Brown
Buchanan
Caccia
Cafik
Chappell
Chrétien
Clermont
Cobbe
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Longueuil)
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Davis
Deachman
Deakon
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Drury
Dubé
Duquet
Éthier
Faulkner
Foster
Francis
Gibson
Gillespie
Givens
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Harries
Hopkins
Jerome
Kaplan
Kierans
Lachance
Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt)
Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (La Salle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacGuigan
Mackasey
McBride
McIlraith
McNulty
Mahoney
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Morison
Munro
Noël
O'Connell
Olson
Otto
Ouellet
Pelletier
Pepin
Perrault
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Richardson
Robinson
Rochon
Rock
Roy (Laval)
Sharp
Smerchanski
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
St. Pierre
Sulatycky
Sullivan
Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Tolmie
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting
Yanakis—108.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost. It being ten o'clock, this House stands adjourned until eleven o'clock tomorrow morning, pursuant to section 2 of Standing Order 2.

At ten o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, October 16, 1970

The House met at 11 a.m.

WAR MEASURES ACT

TABLING OF PROCLAMATION THAT APPREHENDED INSURRECTION EXISTS AND PUBLIC ORDER REGULATIONS, 1970

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 41(2) I wish to table an Order in Council under the War Measures Act authorizing the issuing of a proclamation and a copy of the proclamation.

I also wish to table a second Order in Council under the War Measures Act authorizing certain regulations to provide emergency powers.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I ask the Prime Minister if copies of these regulations will be circulated to members immediately?

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I understand this is being done at the present time. The document is being circulated.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

APPREHENDED INSURRECTION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43 TO APPROVE ACTION OF GOVERNMENT IN INVOKING WAR MEASURES ACT

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 43 I request the unanimous consent of the House to move the following motion. I move:

That the House approves the action of the government in invoking the powers of the War Measures Act to meet the state of apprehended insurrection in the province of Quebec as communicated to the Prime Minister by the government of Quebec and the civic authorities of Montreal and further approves the orders and regulations tabled today by the Prime Minister on the clear understanding that the proclamation invoking the powers as contained in the regulations will be revoked on or before April 30, 1971, unless a resolution authorizing their extension beyond the date specified has been approved by the House.

Mr. Speaker: Does the right hon. Prime Minister have unanimous consent to proceed with the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, it is my grave duty to inform the House that at 4 a.m. this morning the government proclaimed the War Measures Act. This step was taken after consideration of all the facts, and particularly of letters received from the Prime Minister of Quebec and the authorities of the city of Montreal reporting a state of apprehended insurrection. The letter from the Prime Minister of the province of Quebec, which was received at 3 a.m., reads as follows:

[*Translation*]

Quebec City, October 16, 1970.

Mr. Prime Minister,

During the last few days the people of Quebec have been greatly shocked by the kidnappings of Mr. James R. Cross, representative of the British Government in Montreal, and the Hon. Pierre Laporte, Minister of Labour and Manpower and Minister of Immigration of Quebec, as well as by the threats to the security of the state and individuals expressed in communiqués issued by the Front de Libération du Québec or on its behalf, and finally all the circumstances surrounding these events.

After consultation with authorities directly responsible for the administration of justice in Quebec, the Quebec Government is convinced that the law, as it stands now, is inadequate to meet this situation satisfactorily.

Under the circumstances, on behalf of the Government of Quebec, I request that emergency powers be provided as soon as possible so that more effective steps may be taken. I request particularly that such powers encompass the authority to apprehend and keep in custody individuals who, the Attorney General of Quebec has valid reasons to believe, are determined to overthrow the government through violence and illegal means. According to the information we have and which is available to you, we are facing a concerted effort to intimidate and overthrow the government and the democratic institutions of this province through planned and systematic illegal action, including insurrection. It is obvious that those participating in this concerted effort completely reject the principle of freedom under the rule of law.

The Quebec Government is convinced that such powers are necessary to meet the present emergency. Not only are two completely innocent men threatened with death, but we are also faced with an attempt by a minority to destroy social order through criminal action; it is for those reasons that our government is making the present request.

The government is confident that, through such powers, it will be able to put an immediate stop to intimidation and terror and to ensure peace and security for all citizens.

Please accept, Mr. Prime Minister, my very best regards.

Robert Bourassa

• (11:10 a.m.)

[*English*]

I also received from the civic authorities of the city of Montreal a letter addressed to me which reads as follows:

[*Translation*]

Mr. Prime Minister,

The chief of the Montreal Police has informed us that the means available to him are proving inadequate and that the assistance of higher levels of government has become essential for the protection of society against the seditious plot and the apprehended insurrection in which the recent kidnappings were the first step.

Invoking of War Measures Act

We are forwarding as a matter of the utmost urgency the report describing the scope of the threat and the urgent need to reinforce the machinery to cope with it.

We ask for every measure of assistance the federal government may deem useful and desirable in order to carry out the task of protecting society and the life of citizens in this difficult period.

Lucien Saulnier
Chairman of the Executive Committee

Jean Drapeau
Mayor of Montreal

[*English*]

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, would the Prime Minister agree to table those two letters?

An hon. Member: They are on record now in *Hansard*.

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, Mr. Speaker, if they can be tabled; I have some copies here. I might add a longer letter which would be of interest to the House but which I shall not read at this time. It is a letter to the Mayor of Montreal and to the President of the Executive Council from the Director of the Police Department of the city of Montreal. This document might also be of interest to the House. Perhaps the three letters could be printed as an appendix to *Hansard*.

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreeable?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

(*Editor's Note: For text of letters referred to above, see Appendix.*)

Mr. Trudeau: Following the proclamation of the Act and the approval of the Governor in Council of the orders and regulations tabled at the beginning of this sitting, the several police forces in the Montreal area were instructed to increase the volume and the intensity of their activities. Commencing at approximately 4.30 a.m. this morning a number of arrests were made. As of an hour ago, the number of persons taken into custody as a result of these operations was, I believe, in the vicinity of 100. No, I am told it was approximately 154.

The letter from the government of Quebec requesting special powers followed by several hours an earlier request from that government for the deployment of armed forces personnel in some parts of the province of Quebec.

The House will know that the government of Quebec had earlier yesterday evening proposed to the FLQ kidnappers that in return for the surrender of their two hostages, Mr. James Cross and Mr. Pierre Laporte, safe conduct out of Canada would be promised them and that parole would be recommended of five FLQ members now in jail who had requested parole. That proposal brought no positive response.

It is a matter of deep regret and grave concern to me, as I am sure it is to all hon. members, that the condition of our country makes necessary this proclamation. We in this House have all felt very strongly, I know, that democracy was nowhere in a healthier state than in Canada; that nowhere was there less need for frustrated men to turn to violence to attain their political ends. I still believe firmly that this is so. Yet in recent years we have been forced to acknowledge the existence within Canada of a new and terrifying type of person—one who in earlier times would have been described as an anarchist, but who is now known as a violent revolutionary. These persons allege that they are seeking social change through novel means. In fact they are seeking the destruction of the social order through clandestine and violent means.

Faced with such persons, and confronted with authoritative assessments of the seriousness of the risk to persons and property in the Montreal area, the government had no responsible choice but to act as it did last night. Given the rapid deterioration of the situation as mentioned by Prime Minister Bourassa, and given the expiration of the time offered for the release of the hostages, it became obvious that the urgency of the situation demanded rapid action. The absence both of adequate time to take other steps or of alternative legislative authority dictated the use of the War Measures Act. After informing the leaders of the opposition parties of our intention to act in this fashion, and following receipt of the letters that I tabled a moment ago, the government proclaimed the Act.

The government recognizes that the authority contained in the Act is much broader than is required in the present situation, notwithstanding the seriousness of the events. For that reason the regulations which were adopted permit the exercise of only a limited number of the powers available under the Act. Nevertheless, I wish to make it clear today that the government regards the use of the War Measures Act as only an interim and, in the sense mentioned above, somewhat unsatisfactory measure.

Following the passage of enough time to give the government the necessary experience to assess the type of statute which may be required in these circumstances, it is my firm intention to discuss with the leaders of the opposition parties the desirability of introducing legislation of a less comprehensive nature. In this respect I earnestly solicit from the leaders and from all hon. members constructive suggestions for the amendment of the regulations. Such suggestions will be given careful consideration for possible inclusion in any new statute.

• (11:20 a.m.)

May I say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that no Canadian takes less lightly than I the seriousness of the present situation in Canada and the gravity of the measures which the government has been asked to assume in order to meet that situation. Coincidentally, the fate of the two kidnapped hostages weighs very heavily in my mind, as it does on all of us.

I recognize, as I hope do others, that this extreme position into which governments have been forced is in some respects a trap. It is a well known technique of revolutionary groups who attempt to destroy society by unjustified violence to goad the authorities into inflexible

* An offer to deal had been made

* Evid. Bourassa had asked W.M.A. be proclaimed the prev. Sunday.
** "firm intention"

attitudes. The revolutionaries then employ this evidence of alleged authoritarianism as justification for the need to use violence in their renewed attacks on the social structure. I appeal to all Canadians not to become so obsessed by what the government has done today in response to terrorism that they forget the opening play in this vicious game. That play was taken by the revolutionaries; they chose to use bombing, murder and kidnapping. *

To those who will voice concern at the extent of the powers assumed by the government under this procedure, I can only say that I sympathize with their attitude, and applaud them for speaking out. I hasten to suggest, however, that the legislative record of this Parliament in the field of individual liberties contributes unequivocally to its credibility and good faith.

I promise that the House shall be kept fully informed if any changes in the regulations are made. Furthermore, I pledge that all extraordinary powers will be withdrawn as soon as it has been demonstrated that there is a cessation of the violence and the threats of violence which made necessary their introduction. I intend to repeat that assurance and offer an explanation of government activities in this matter to the Canadian people through the public media later today.

Before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, it would be inappropriate were I not to mention to the House my gratitude for the understanding which has been offered me in the last 24 hours by the leaders of the opposition parties and by certain members of the Privy Council, including the right hon. member for Prince Albert and the Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson. For their wise counsel I say, thank you.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, we are discussing a most serious matter, a matter fraught with the most serious consequences for our country and one which I hope I can discuss in that sense and in the full recognition of the very grave issues that are involved in the measures that the government has taken. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) did inform me and the leaders of the other parties last night about the probability of this action being taken, and I appreciate that courtesy. There was also some discussion. I know the Prime Minister did not intend at all to indicate that the action the government proposed to take had been approved by the leaders of the opposition parties, but I wish to make it perfectly clear that while I was informed of the decision to be taken and while there was an opportunity for some discussion I was, of course, in no position to and did not give any approval.

I am certainly not contesting the legitimacy of the proclaiming of the War Measures Act, or the legal power of the government to issue this proclamation and these regulations. My understanding is that the finding of the government that there is real or apprehended insurrection is conclusive. The government is the only one in a position to know. The government has received the letters to which the Prime Minister referred from the government of Quebec and the civic authorities in the city of Montreal. Therefore I certainly am not questioning the legitimacy of the proclamation.

Nor, Sir, am I questioning the need for governments, including the government of Canada, to take effective action to enforce law and order at this time particularly in view of the kidnappings which have taken place, the holding of these two men for ransom and the apparent failure of the methods that were being used to bring this crisis to a conclusion. I emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that I do not question the need for effective action to be taken to enforce the laws of this country. Yet we must recognize that the measure that has been adopted, the invoking of the War Measures Act, is the most serious and drastic measure the government could have taken. It gives the government very broad powers. I wish to emphasize, of course, that it is the government that has taken this action and that it is the government which must accept the responsibility for invoking this Act, because we in the opposition are not in a position to judge whether there is real or apprehended insurrection.

I say this is a very serious measure because obviously it has broad ramifications. The War Measures Act provides for the possibility of very sweeping interference with what we ordinarily consider to be the civil rights and liberties of Canadians. It is true that the government has presented and adopted regulations which do not invoke all the powers of the War Measures Act but, the War Measures Act having been invoked, there certainly are many additional powers in reserve which the government could utilize by regulation at any time. Furthermore, the extensive powers described in the regulations are to be in effect until April 30, 1971, a very considerable length of time. These powers apply, of course, throughout the country.

The Prime Minister has touched upon something that is of great concern to me. I refer to the possibility that a measure such as this could lead to escalation and might perhaps increase the tendency of some people to be attracted to radical movements. Therefore, because I recognize the need for action and am very concerned about the sweeping measures the government has adopted, I think it is important that at this time we consider the need of restricting any extraordinary measures to the greatest possible extent and for the shortest period of time.

• (11:30 a.m.)

I do not want to be partisan and I do not propose to be partisan on this occasion, at least, but in due course questions will have to be asked about how the condition in which we now find ourselves in this country developed. But I think the Prime Minister must find himself in a most extraordinary position as a man who advocated fervently the entrenchment of civil rights in our constitution and, within a relatively short period thereafter, is in the position of invoking the War Measures Act and suspending in a substantial way the tradition of civil liberties of Canadians for a substantial period of time.

* This was not murder of hostages, which came later.

I also believe that it is not good enough for the government, when the country finds itself in a condition such as this, simply to point the finger at certain revolutionaries who, it says, have brought the country into this condition. I am trying to be fair when I say that the government in authority when this condition was developing must also be prepared to answer for the condition in which the country finds itself.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: A special danger exists, and the government has taken the measures it has taken. I believe strongly that it would certainly have been far more preferable to introduce special legislation with much more restricted powers than the powers the government now has having invoked the War Measures Act. The Prime Minister has said that it was not possible. I am not going to spend much time arguing about what was possible or what was done, but I assert that, rather than coming here this morning and seeking the approval of the House for a measure for which the government must accept the responsibility for having taken, the government should have concentrated on bringing before the House a bill which would have carefully restricted the special powers that it is seeking to deal with this condition. Such a bill would contain proper safeguards to reduce to a minimum the possibility of any partisan action. I do not see that in these regulations. We do not really know when these powers will end. The regulations are sweeping. I want to say perfectly frankly that I would not be prepared to support a bill that embraced these regulations but I would certainly be prepared to co-operate in providing, for a limited period of time, such unusual and extraordinary powers as were clearly necessary for the government to enforce the law.

Consider, for example, the provisions in these regulations. The regulations make it a crime to be a member of an unlawful association. First of all, they provide as follows:

> The group of persons or association known as Le Front de Liberation du Quebec and any successor group or successor association of the said Le Front de Liberation du Quebec or any group of persons or association that advocates the use of force or the commission of crime as a means of or as an aid in accomplishing governmental change within Canada is declared to be an unlawful association.

In other words, the government is creating a new crime, and I should point out in passing that it has now become a crime to be a member of an association which advocates the use of force or the commission of a crime. Under the emergency powers which the government now has it could, of course, create a new crime tomorrow. I simply wish to say that I certainly want to see the law enforced, I want to see those who are guilty of subversive activities prosecuted and punished. But I am not prepared to see it made a crime to be a member of an association, particularly in view of the measures relating to evidence in section 8, which reads as follows:

> In any prosecution for an offence under these Regulations, evidence that any person
>
> (a) attended any meeting of the unlawful association,
>
> (b) spoke publicly in advocacy for the unlawful association, or
>
> (c) communicated statements of the unlawful association as a representative or professed representative of the unlawful association is, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, proof that he is a member of the unlawful association.

Under that section it might very well be that someone who some time ago might have attended a meeting of some association that is defined as unlawful by these regulations could be convicted of an offence which carries a penalty of up to five years imprisonment.

Certainly we must protect our society. Certainly we must prosecute people who try to overthrow it violently or to use violence to achieve their purposes. But I am not convinced that we have reached the point where we must define as a crime membership in an association unless, of course, there is direct implication in the committing of a crime. When we consider the safeguarding of our society we have to consider not only the enforcement of the law, the direct protection of society against criminal acts but also the preservation of the strength of our society, and not weaken it by making it a crime to be a member of an association. I suggest that this could have quite widespread application throughout our country.

• (11:40 a.m.)

I apologize for not making my remarks more succinct but I did not have an opportunity to see the regulations until a short time ago. Nevertheless, I urge that the government, instead of seeking the approval of the House for the measure it has already taken, the invoking of the War Measures Act, should heed what is said in the House today and should at the earliest possible date bring in a bill with much more restricted powers, many more safeguards with regard to review, and of a much more limited duration.

I put these views forward very solemnly, Sir, because I am very concerned that in our desire to deal with this tragic situation that has developed, our desire to deal with these terrorists who are a menace to our society, our desire to do those things that are necessary, we do not weaken our social fabric by invoking powers that are far too extensive, possibly creating new crimes on the spur of the moment, and do not provide adequate safeguards for review.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, these last few days have been days of anxiety for all the people of Canada, and particularly for the members of this House who sit on the treasury benches. We have all been appalled and disgusted by the abduction of two innocent men who are being held as hostages in an attempt to blackmail the government into releasing convicted criminals and to do certain other things which, in my opinion, are completely unreasonable.

Because this situation is so delicate we in this party have carefully refrained from making any statements or

from asking any provocative questions. Because we felt that the government should be given every opportunity to deal with what was an extremely difficult situation we have gone along with the government on at least two or three matters.

We have agreed with the government's refusal to accede to the outrageous demands of the kidnappers. I can understand the feelings of those sensitive individuals whose first reaction was that the government should deal with the kidnappers and should be prepared to accede to their demands. I would not go so far as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) as to call them weak-kneed and bleeding hearts. I think they are people with a great sensitivity and a great sense of the value of human life. But I think such people overlook two important facts.

The first fact is that compliance with the demands of the abductors would not necessarily guarantee the safe return of the two men whom they have taken as hostages. The second, and even more important, is that acceding to the demands of the kidnappers would only set in motion a whole series of similar incidents, and nobody knows where the road would end.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Once it has become established that the government of this country is prepared to negotiate with kidnappers, to break the laws of the country, to release convicted criminals, to hand out huge sums of money, to publish the names of informers, then, of course, we would in all probability have more kidnappings and more blackmail. Undoubtedly the day would then come when the government would have to call a halt. The moment it called a halt it would, of course, be subject to the criticism that it had acceded to the demands in order to secure the release of some people and was now refusing to accede to the demands to secure the release of other persons. Therefore we have supported the government because we believe that to allow any group to dictate terms to the democratic, elected government of this country is to invite anarchy and chaos in Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I think that Canadians must become aware of the fact that there are revolutionary forces in the world and now, unfortunately, some in Canada who are dedicated to the use of violence to bring about social change. We in the New Democratic Party want to bring about social change, but we have always believed that the means that are used determine the ends that are attained.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Those who attain power by violence and force always have to retain power by violence and force. A government that is founded on violence and force then begins to have problems within its own ranks, and the transfer of power and the change of leadership are also settled by violence and force. When we start down that road, Mr. Speaker, we are inviting the man on horseback, and the experiences of history from the days of Napoleon to Stalin, to Hitler, have all proven the same thing, that social change predicated on violence, on sabotage, on kidnapping, on assassination, is bound to end up in a police state, with periodic purges. We do not accept the doctrine of the Maoists that "all power proceeds out of the mouth of a gun", because if we accept that concept what we are saying is that society will be dominated by those who have the most guns and the ruthless will to use them.

In a country that has not got the democratic process one can understand men who desire freedom resorting to force, but in a country which has the democratic process and has a form of parliamentary democracy we say that these are the means at hand to bring about social change.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The second point on which we have supported the government is its desire to do everything possible to secure the release of Mr. Cross and Mr. Laporte. We, of course, understood that it could not possibly negotiate on the terms of the demands that had been made. But the government has a responsibility to negotiate, if possible, the safe return of these two men to their anguished families. For that reason we have done everything we could not to make a delicate situation more difficult in order that if the government could possibly reach some agreement for the release of these men, without acceding to the demands which had been made, it should be given every opportunity to do so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we come to a point on which we cannot support the government. The government is now convinced that there is a state of civil disturbance and anticipated sabotage which requires prompt and vigorous action. The government, of course, undoubtedly has in its possession information that is not available to us. I suggest that if the government has information that civil disturbances are likely to break out on a large scale and that sabotage is anticipated in menacing proportions, then the government, of course, has the responsibility to deal with it.

I submit that, properly, the government had two options in dealing with the situation. The first was to deal with it under the powers which it now has under the laws of Canada, to utilize all the powers under the treason sections of the Criminal Code and the sections dealing with seditious intention. There are very considerable powers there. I think the government deserves some criticism because some of those sections have not been used. There have been indications of seditious intent upon which the government could have acted. There is also the offensive weapons provision, and in dealing with the matter the government could have acted under that authority. The government had the power to call in the armed forces, and did so, and there was no criticism of the government for using these extraordinary powers if they, in their opinion, on the basis of information which they and they alone had, considered the situation serious enough to warrant such action.

The second option which was open to the government was that if it came to the conclusion that the powers it now enjoys under the Criminal Code and various other statutes were not sufficient to cope with this situation, the magnitude of which the rest of us are not fully aware of, the government had the option of coming to Parliament and asking Parliament, in a democratic way, to clothe it with the authority to deal with this unusual situation.

• (11:50 a.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Certainly I can say, so far as this party is concerned, we would have been prepared to facilitate very quickly such matters coming before Parliament in order that the government might be able to indicate the areas in which it had not sufficient power and the justification for requiring greater powers and greater authority. But the government has not utilized this option. Instead, the government has taken the unusual step of invoking the War Measures Act. In my opinion the government has over-reacted to what is undoubtedly a critical situation. Does civil disturbance constitute apprehended insurrection?

An hon. Member: Yes.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): We have had civil disturbances in Canada before.

An hon. Member: Not like this.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Well, I recall as a boy the Winnipeg strike and the riot.

Mr. Sharp: But there was no kidnapping then.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Why don't you listen, Mitch, and learn?

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I recall the trek of the unemployed from Vancouver on the way to Ottawa and the riots in Regina. There have been civil disturbances before; there have been subversive organizations at work in our society before. Governments have been able to secure from Parliament the necessary power and authority to deal with these situations without invoking the War Measures Act.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): This is the first time, to my knowledge, in Canadian history that the War Measures Act has been invoked in peacetime. So far as the New Democratic Party is concerned, we have been prepared and are prepared to support enlarging the police powers if the government thinks it necessary to give the police greater authority in the matter of searching for dynamite or offensive weapons. They have the power now to search for dynamite and offensive weapons but there is one exclusion—personal dwellings. If the government required the inclusion of personal dwellings for a stated period of time, under some protection we would certainly be prepared to consider the advisability of giving those additional powers. We are prepared to support the government in taking whatever measures are necessary to safeguard life and to maintain law and order in this country. But, Mr. Speaker, we are not prepared to use the preservation of law and order as a smokescreen to destroy the liberties and the freedom of the people of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Shame!

An hon. Member: There is no shame.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I wonder if the Liberal members who are shouting "Shame" have read the regulations.

An hon. Member: Yes.

Mr. Langlois: The hon. member should go to Quebec and find out about the situation.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The government, I submit, is using a sledgehammer to crack a peanut.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): This is over-kill on a gargantuan scale.

Why has the government invoked the War Measures Act? May I point out that the FLQ have been around for some six or seven years. For several years now it is well known that they have committed and been found guilty of acts of sabotage, the placing of bombs in mail boxes and blowing up of public buildings.

An hon. Member: Is the hon. member condoning that?

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The Prime Minister was Minister of Justice for three years and has been Prime Minister of this country for over two years. Why have we not been asked to supply the government with the powers to deal with the growing menace which it now says is so tremendous that we must invoke the War Measures Act to deal with an apprehended insurrection? The fact is, and this is very clear, that the government has panicked and is now putting on a dramatic performance to cover up its own ineptitude.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Sharp: Not at all.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In the process of invoking the War Measures Act I wonder if

the hon. gentlemen opposite who are making so much noise have stopped to consider that today the Prime Minister holds more power in his hands than any prime minister in the peacetime history of Canada.

An hon. Member: Thank God.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Right now there is no constitution in this country, no Bill of Rights, no provincial constitutions. This government now has the power by Order in Council to do anything it wants—to intern any citizen, to deport any citizen, to arrest any person or to declare any organization subversive or illegal. These are tremendous powers to put into the hands of the men who sit on the treasury benches.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): If my friends will look at the regulations they will find that if the police in their judgment decide that some person is a member of a subversive organization—not just of the FLQ but of any organization that the police decide is subversive—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): —or that he contributes to such a party—

An hon. Member: Why is the hon. member scared?

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): —or that he communicates any of the ideas or doctrines of such a party—

An hon. Member: What has changed you, Tommy?

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): —that person may be arrested and detained for 90 days. At the end of 90 days, he has the power to appeal to a superior court judge to set a date for his trial and that may be postponed for some time. He may be denied bail.

• (12:00 noon)

A person in Canada may be held for 90 days or more without any opportunity to prove his innocence, to prove that he does not belong to a subversive organization or to prove that the organization to which he belongs is not subversive in spite of what may be in the minds of those who ordered the arrest. The regulations give the power to seize property and hold it for 90 days. It is a resurrection of the padlock law. These are very serious powers. If the government requires those kinds of powers, surely in a democracy they should have asked the democratically elected representatives of the people to give them those powers.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): What will be the effect of the action which the government has taken? I hope the effect will be to bring about the release of Mr. Cross and Mr. Laporte. I also hope the effect of this will be to reduce the effectiveness and activities of the FLQ, but I am not very sanguine about that because the history of our country and other countries is that revolutionary movements, when declared illegal, go underground and have an unhappy faculty of coming up from underground stronger than when they went down.

We remember when section 98 was included in the Criminal Code to deal with the communist party. It was not very effective so the Liberal party rescinded it. I was in the House at the time the Liberal party removed section 98 from the Criminal Code on the very proper Liberal ideology that you should not condemn a person for his ideas, but only for his acts of violence.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) pounds his desk. That is precisely what he is doing under these regulations. It does not have to be an act of sabotage. One does not have to commit an act of violence. He just has to belong to an organization which, in the opinion of the police, is dedicated to violence.

Some hon. Members: Tell the truth.

Mr. Woolliams: Give him a hearing.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I suggest to the House, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Cafik: Thank God the ship of state is not in your hands!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): If the ship of state were in my hands, the first thing I would do would be to get rid of some of the barnacles like the hon. member!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cafik: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please; the hon. member rises on a point of order.

Mr. Cafik: It seems odd, Mr. Speaker, that one who advocates democracy would get rid of one of the duly elected representatives if he had the power.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The hon. member knows that being Democrats, we would get rid of him by the democratic process. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the action of the government constitutes a victory for the FLQ.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): This is exactly what they want. They want a confrontation between themselves and the government of Canada. They want to be recognized as a revolutionary force with which the government of Canada must deal, and because of whom the government of Canada must mobilize all its resources to declare war. They want the government and the people of Canada to consider that we are now engaged in a civil war with the FLQ. This is exactly what they want. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) very properly said this morning that these actions fall within the established pattern which is planned by revolutionaries.

What happens? If we examine what has happened in other countries we find that revolutionary movements begin by associating themselves with the disadvantaged in the community and by espousing their cause. Then, acts of violence and sabotage follow which is responded to by police repression. That gives rise to demonstrations, maybe strikes and further police repression until, bit by bit, all the freedom and democracy is pushed aside and there are two armed camps. This is the polarization and confrontation which revolutionary movements in the world have sought to bring about.

The government has fallen right into the trap. The government has done exactly what the FLQ hoped they would do. All across this country students, workers and alienated groups will be told "See what happens when we fight on your behalf? The government immediately brings in repressive measures".

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I say to the government that we cannot protect democratic freedom by restricting, limiting and destroying democratic freedom.

The government has two tasks before it. I sympathize fully with their desire to cope with civil disturbances and with any anticipated sabotage, but the government has two tasks to do before they are going to be successful in this regard. The first is that they must use the democratic process in seeking to stop sabotage, kidnapping and acts of violence. They must work within the framework of the democratic system. If we are going to tell people that we value democracy and that democracy is the way of dealing with social change, we must use the democratic procedures and not revert on our part to the very kind of violence which we are condemning on the other side.

Mr. Sharp: Do you not condemn it?

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The second is that stringent measures by themselves, and I agree that stringent measures are necessary, taken through the democratic process will not cure this situation. We must go back to the root cause. A revolutionary movement has to have a base. Where is the base of the FLQ? The base of the FLQ lies in the disadvantaged and unfortunate people in the province of Quebec.

[Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Where is the support coming from?

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. member kindly resume his seat? I just wanted to assist. At the moment the hon. member who has the floor should be allowed to make his speech.

• (12:10 p.m.)

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would think that even with the War Measures Act proclaimed we ought still to have the right to express our views in this free Parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I am suggesting to the government that no revolutionary movement can become a menace unless it has the support of the disadvantaged and alienated groups. Who are some of these people? The Lapalme workers who were callously and shamefully thrown out of work by a callous government without any thought of what would happen to these men—

Some hon. Members: Oh.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The unemployed, many of whom have now been out of work for a long time and who plead in vain for some action by this government, yet none is forthcoming; the people who live in slums, the people who live under appalling conditions.

Mr. Trudeau: This does not excuse violence.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The Prime Minister says this does not excuse bombings. Of course, it does not. But I would point out to the Prime Minister that the best way to stop people turning to violence is to remove the root causes which make them frustrated with the democratic process.

Mr. Trudeau: And let Quebec separate? That is what they want.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): That is not so, and you know it.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): This government should know that police action alone will not prevent discontent, and will not remove the sense of grievance and injustice which is felt by people. It takes positive measures alongside firm administration of the law. The government will make a great mistake if it thinks that merely by resorting to wider police control powers the problem of the FLQ will go away. It will not go away until we deal with the discontent and the frustration in the hearts of five or six million Canadians who feel that this country is not giving them a fair chance.

I say that the government's action today is an action of panic. In the hysteria which people feel, the government

may, as the Prime Minister has said, get many letters and calls approving what is being done. But I predict that within six months, when the Canadian people have had time to reflect on what has happened today—the removal of all the protection and liberties presently on the statute books of Canada, a country placed under the War Measures Act, regulations introduced allowing persons to be detained for 90 days without a chance to prove their innocence—when that day comes, the Canadian people will look on this as a black Friday for civil liberties in Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, after the House gave its unanimous consent this morning, to the introduction of a legislative measure that nobody wanted and after hearing the Leaders of the Official Opposition and the New Democratic Party (Messrs. Stanfield and Douglas), say that perhaps we should not have accepted these measures, I feel they are simply playing politics.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Caouette: Indeed, that is what is being done in dealing with questions that are totally irrelevant to the situation now prevailing in Quebec.

I should like to point out that as far as the people of the province of Quebec are concerned, I think I know them better than the Leader of the Official Opposition or the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

Nobody is happy, this morning, to have to introduce such measures to put an end to terrorism in the province of Quebec. Neither the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), nor the other ministers, nor any other hon. member, nor anybody for that matter, feel happy that we have been forced to take such action and if it has become imperative, then I will say that it has long been overdue.

A year ago when the Chairman of Montreal's Executive Council (Mr. Saulnier) issued a warning against terrorist activities within the Company of Young Canadians, for instance, and also within other Montreal organizations, the government refused to acknowledge the truth of those statements. At that time, Mr. Saulnier had requested a Royal Inquiry which would have turned the whole situation inside out; the government decided not to move. They had to wait, before taking any action, until two eminent personalities had been abducted. You see now why over a week ago, I was already arguing that there was no alternative but to invoke the war measures legislation in view of the seriousness of the present situation.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that such events took place in the province of Quebec and that some of my fellow French-Canadians are responsible for them. It seems to me there would have been some other way to draw the whole world's attention than the methods used by the FLQ.

It has been pointed out earlier that the current situation had its roots somewhere. This is true. We have been saying so for long a time. We have called this government's attention to certain activities going on in Quebec for many years. In fact, when I stated in this House on repeated occasions, that separatists were employed by the CBC, nobody would believe that this government agency was being used as a platform by those who were spreading hatred and dissatisfaction throughout Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Caouette: I was told that I was wrong. The Secretary of State defended the CBC when he was perfectly aware that separatists, members of the FLQ were employed by this government agency which is run with the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Speaker, there is another point on which I would like to draw your attention. When Algerian teachers were allowed into Canada for instance, these were revolutionaries who came to educate our children but there was no opposition to it. Hundreds were admitted into Canada and these people were arrested this morning, including professors at the universities of Montreal, Quebec and Laval.

Mr. Speaker, why did we fail to act in time? Now we see students on the march. Moreover, in Hull this morning at 4 a.m., three or four students—including the son of a physician—were arrested for subversive activities. Those students have been roused by others, by people who told them: "Let us get together to upset the established order." I do not share at all the remarks made earlier by the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Douglas) when he said that those responsible for the abductions or the current situation in Quebec are destitute people.

In fact, most university students were born with a silver spoon in their mouth. They are primarily responsible for the situation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Caouette: There are among them unambitious, cowardly young people who do not have the guts to work and want to take advantage of the ignorance of people to try and climb the administration ladder of the country. I might give you hundreds of other examples.

What we are witnessing in Canada has already happened in other countries.

Two years ago, in Czechoslovakia, students revolted against the loss of their freedom that they wanted to recover. The students in Prague today are the sons of those who 25 or 30 years ago made the revolution in order to establish the totalitarian system they have to put up with now, and they are no longer free. Such a situation must be avoided in Canada. Those who are fighting in the name of that "famous" freedom in the FLQ are people who want to deny it to others, once they are in power.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Caouette: It is quite untrue that the FLQ is made up of disadvantaged, poor people who live in slums. As for its members, we have seen them again on the state-owned television network. Last night I heard Robert Lemieux yelling that he would overcome, priding himself on being an FLQ supporter, with Michel Chartrand in his wake. That is the story.

Now we know that the people we have seen for many years, the rebels, really exist. Michel Chartrand does not live in a slummy district in Montreal, even though he has always tried to rouse the destitute, such as the boys from Lapalme, for instance. They were mentioned a while ago and said to be members of the FLQ. This is not true. You can find among the former employees of G. Lapalme Inc. a few members of the FLQ, but they are not all members. These workers were roused by people like Michel Chartrand who blamed the government by stating: "You did not hire again the Lapalme drivers." They did not work for the government, but for a private company, G. Lapalme Inc.

If I close down my garage in Rouyn, will the government be forced to hire my former employees?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Caouette: The government offered the employees of G. Lapalme Inc. to integrate them in the public service. However, people like Chartrand told them not to accept.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Caouette: We sympathize with these former employees of the Lapalme Company, but never with the likes of Chartrand, because these are people who have no respect for anyone or for anything. In fact, he is one of those who formally declare their intention of overthrowing the present system and of taking over. I do not want rulers such as Chartrand and I do not think that members of the New Democratic Party would want him either.

Mr. Speaker, following the unanimous adoption of war measures by the House this morning, I would once again ask the Prime Minister to be careful, because some armed forces members who are now in Quebec come from parts of the country other than Quebec. Their searches should be controlled lest they meet somebody with an FLQ card and mistake him for a member of the Front de libération du Québec when he might be only a member of the Fédération libérale du Québec—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I know as everybody else does, that the situation in Quebec is serious. As far as we are concerned, we do not want to deprive citizens of their rights. However, as the Prime Minister suggested earlier, those people are the ones who asked for what is happening this morning. They are those who, by their doings, have decided of their present fate. Do we have the right to let them deprive the Canadian citizens of their freedom? Indeed, they have no right to do so. Then, they will complain that we have accepted to impose dictatorial measures. The steps taken this morning have absolutely nothing in common with dictatorship. What we want, Mr. Speaker, is to save our country and saveguard its unity.

That our administration has deficiencies, there is no doubt about it. Is any administration free of them? Some countries governments have been changed and have gone through upheavals. Have they for all that attained perfection? Not at all!

The same Castro, who pulled off his coup in Cuba, in the name of freedom and the poor, today tends his resignation saying that it resulted in a fiasco. Therefore it is certainly not in Cuba that perfection is to be found.

Is there any perfection in Russia? Not at all. No more than in Czechoslovakia. We do not have it here either but at least we enjoy freedom of expression. We have never prevented Mr. Michel Chartrand of Montreal, for instance, from expressing his opinion on radio and television or from publishing in newspapers all the nonsense he wrote in them.

Mr. Speaker, we still enjoy that freedom in spite of all the faults which are found in Canada. At least we can express ourselves. And this is, Mr. Speaker, what we believe in—and I shall say it in English,—the four basic principles capable of establishing true order which the Prime Minister has called "the just society", which should avoid situations such as the one we are facing at the moment. And I quote now these four principles which can be accepted by any political party. They are not political but social and economic principles which can be accepted in order to achieve true democracy, true freedom and true security. They are the following:

• (12:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

1. We firmly believe that the individual is the most important factor in organized society. Because he is a divinely created being, with spiritual, mental and physical needs and potentialities, he has inalienable rights which must be respected and preserved.

Because of this belief, we are unalterably opposed to communism, fascism and all forms of totalitarian government which make the individual citizen subservient to the state.

It stands opposed to political organizations whose aims are the furtherance of the sectional interests of organized labour, business, or finance.

2. Government must serve the individual. The major function of democratic government in organized society is to secure for the people the results they want from the management of their public affairs, as far as such results are physically possible and morally right.

3. The individual must be free and have economic security. The individual can only attain his full stature in a society where his ability to make moral choices is restricted as little as possible. Economic security is a necessary means for attaining this freedom not as an end to be attained by restricting it.

This is the strongest one.

4. The physically possible must be regarded as the financially possible. Whatever is physically possible, desirable, and morally right, can and should be made financially possible.

• (12:30 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Some think that is funny. Let us not forget that enforcing the War Measures Act will cost the taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars in bringing back order.

Might not a policy of prevention have kept those insurrections from happening, two, five, ten or fifteen years ago, and created a climate of confidence amongst all Canadians, regardless of tongue or creed.

Mr. Speaker, we have tolerated the existence of a system which forced us to fight amongst ourselves. That system bred hatred between French-speaking and English-speaking Canadians. The major problem in Canada is not a language problem.

We almost came to blows in this House on this matter.

In other countries, religion is the cause of strife. We see it now in Ireland, for instance.

If we can use the army, if we can find money to enforce those measures in Montreal and in the province of Quebec, in peace time, there is no reason why we cannot find the funds to achieve what is physically possible. Thus, we will contribute to better understanding amongst Canadians. We will no longer witness these sterile fights between French-speaking and English-speaking people, amongst Canadians who feel frustrated because one part of the country is better treated than their own.

We believe in those four principles. Enforcing the measures proposed this morning by the government does not appeal to us. Obviously, no one would wish to resort to those methods. But given the serious situation in Quebec and the irresponsibility of certain hotheads, we must face the music and protect the basic rights of the individual and the society in Canada. We shall then have a system enabling anyone to be himself.

Those who rebel today will be able to think the matter over, and consider the chances that Canada offers them. Then, all Canadians will take part in making Canada greater, more worthy and a striking example for the whole world.

Mr. Speaker, of course the measures we intend to approve today make poor publicity for us abroad. However, we must cope with the situation. The government can rely on our support to prevent recurrence of such acts as have been perpetrated. This does not mean that we shall support the government in all respects. I merely suggest that the government introduce economic, social and political reforms designed to guarantee true democracy and prevent a repetition of current events in the province of Quebec.

[*English*]

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, this is one of those occasions when Parliament has the opportunity of dealing with the question of freedom which, above everything else, is the mandate of Parliament and the reason that Parliament exists. I have listened to the explanations by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), and knowing his past connections with civil liberties associations and his strong advocacy of the right, whether in war or in peace, to disagree with the authorities, I can understand when he said how diffident he was to bring before Parliament a resolution that what has been produced by the bureaucracy shall be voted upon by Parliament.

Many of the members in this House have not read the regulations, of that I am sure. They are asked to give approval to a series of regulations that place the freedoms of Canada in cold storage for several months to come. The request of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) was that there should be a statute. I was impressed by his arguments as he unveiled his views in this connection. Why not an amendment to the Criminal Code; why not an act of Parliament that will put teeth in the laws now in existence? Laws that will place the wrongdoers in jeopardy but will not take away the rights of Canadians in every part of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Why should we in the province of Saskatchewan have our rights and our fundamental freedoms taken away, at the request of the government of the province of Quebec, Mayor Drapeau and Mr. Saulnier of the city of Montreal?

I am not going to get into arguments with those who have decided they are going to interrupt because they disagree with my views. Members of the government, with their great majority, should not try to deny those who are members of the opposition their right to speak. I have always been accorded in this House the right to speak, even from those who have strongly disagreed with me because Parliament is, to me, a cathedral of devotion to Canada, its future and its greatness.

The Prime Minister says the reason for doing this is that the situation in Quebec has gotten out of hand; there is an emergency he contends. I have been watching the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier), with his hand up to his face, looking out of one eye. As I watched him, I wondered what his reaction was. He doesn't need two eyes. He does not want to see. I wonder what his attitude is now, after two occasions on which he stood up in this House and said there was nothing in the argument of the leader of the Créditistes that in the province of Quebec there were several people in Radio Canada who were members of the FLQ. I say to him that he knew this at the very time he was denying it in this House. Why were proceedings not taken?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (12:40 p.m.)

Mr. Diefenbaker: Why were not proceedings taken against the wrongdoers in the Company of Young Canadians? The minister is the one responsible. I shall deal in particular with some persons, who have the accolades of the government, who actually were trying to undermine this country. What about these four men in Radio Canada in the province of Quebec? Were they not brainwashing the people of Canada; were they not from

day to day explaining that all was well? Yet, they were kept there. They were not interfered with. They enjoyed a peculiar protection. I wonder why the Secretary of State did not act, because I say again that he knew these individuals. Why did he not act? The Prime Minister says that this thing has come on suddenly. I am tremendously interested in the fact that he had both eyes shut, not just the one like the Secretary of State, and both ears shut, as the Prime Minister indicates. I am glad that he did so. Now, he puts his hand up to his nose which indicates that the stench is too strong.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The Prime Minister said today in effect "we have word from Mayor Drapeau of Montreal and from Mr. Saulnier". Well, he had that in November of 1969. I have the dossier with me. The Prime Minister had this information and the pictures of some of these individuals. He had that information and what did he do? He whitewashed it. Sir, I have made a summary of the highlights of the documents which represents a review of the evidence placed before the Committee of Parliament. This clearly establishes that there were in the Company of Young Canadians those who were advocating the end of the government by force. Let me read from this. One is entitled the "Revolutionary Strategy". Apparently, the government never read this, although it was before them. I repeat that what is happening in the province of Quebec was before the government of Canada in November and December of 1969, and the government did nothing about it.

"Revolutionary Strategy" outlines in detail the tactics, organization and methods for seizing power by force in the province of Quebec. It reads:

> There are only two strategies—electoral strategy and revolutionary strategy. Real independence is inseparable from global revolution and its conquest demands always and everywhere a war to the end against imperialism, as in Viet Nam and Guatemala—

Then:

> Let us profit by the lessons of history since the Russian revolution in 1917 to work for an authentic revolution, organizing a base whereby through revolutionary action itself we shall come to count only on our own power, ability and creativity.

And then:

> Since 1963, the explosion of the first FLQ bombs, we are in the first phase of the revolutionary struggle, which will keep up until agitation becomes general—

What did the government do about it? Nothing, except for the Prime Minister's attitude of pinching his nose. I am surprised that he took that attitude. I ask the Prime Minister whether he ever read the recommendations that were made by the city of Montreal.

Mr. Trudeau: We had them examined by justice.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What is the answer?

Mr. Woolliams: He said he had them examined by justice.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. Diefenbaker: He had somebody else do it. Surely, the Department of Justice did not conceal from the Prime Minister this evidence of revolutionary conduct.

Mr. Trudeau: Why didn't Montreal act?

Mr. Diefenbaker: I know this hurts, but I must proceed with it. I shall continue the quotation:

> Second stage of the battle...If we wish to attain the objectives...we must organize the masses in local committees, or professional liberation committees... Committees in each quarter, each ward, each factory, school, broken into cells, regrouped in regional federations... In the factories, universities, CGEP ... Organization of those who are exploited must be undertaken having in mind a popular insurrection, characterized by armed occupation—

The word "armed" is underlined.

> —of universities, schools, public services and national territory. The most difficult phase of the struggle: the armed conflict between the people and its enemies...inseparably a military and political struggle...

Then, it says about the government of the right hon. gentleman—

Mr. Woolliams: He is leaving; he can't take it.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He can't take it.

Mr. Hees: Sit down and take it, Pierre.

Mr. Diefenbaker: When I deal with facts the Prime Minister always finds it necessary to leave the House. I do not mind him following his usual course.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out to the hon. member that I was very willing to listen to him but if he intends to read nonsense in this way—

Mr. Diefenbaker: Nonsense, Mr. Speaker! He says that if I read nonsense he will not listen. Well, this came from the very people in Montreal to whom he is now listening. Isn't it a strange thing that the Prime Minister is trying to pretend that what is happening has suddenly developed. These are the instructions. Violence and illegality are absolutely normal for revolutionaries.

> Don't be afraid of being illegal...Violence and illegality are absolutely normal for revolutionaries...Like the Black Panthers all the revolutionary groups—

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is a little difficult for the Chair to follow the words of the right hon. gentleman. Perhaps we could have order.

Mr. Diefenbaker: This lack of order indicates how far Liberalism has gone along the road of a dictatorship under this government. Let me quote:

> Like the Black Panthers, all the revolutionary groups (and there are several) must prepare for armed revolution—

There is page after page dealing with such evil persons as Pierre Vallières who, I think, was picked up during the night. The President of the Treasury Board (Mr.

Drury) indicates that that is correct. There is a call for a manifestation on behalf of Vallières, a terrorist out on bail, and it reads, in part: "Vive la révolution, vive Pierre Vallières". He has been wandering around, in recent months spreading his poison everywhere. Sedition has been committed by him over and over again. Would this government touch him?

• (12:50 p.m.)

Mr. Woolliams: No.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Diefenbaker: It is difficult to understand why the government did nothing. The Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) knows something about some of these characters. Chartrand has been a close pal of his. I would not have brought that up if the hon. gentleman did not want to interrupt.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): I fired him twice.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Why did you not pick up Chartrand during the last several weeks when he has been issuing statements that were seditious and against the law?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Where is Chartrand now?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Where was he last night? Just discovered during the night? The government did not need these powers in order to arrest him. Did you not think that a man who was spreading this kind of falsehood—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to remind the right hon. gentleman that he should address the Chair.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Well, Mr. Speaker, I agree with you entirely but when the hon. gentleman seeks the limelight I want to be assured that he gets it.

The minister of Regional Expansion says that the reason they did not pick up Chartrand until four o'clock this morning was that they did not know where he was. I ask him: was there ever a warrant issued for Chartrand's arrest for sedition? He has enjoyed particularly warm feelings from some of those in the government. It was not until four o'clock this morning that like the Phoenix he rose out of his own ashes. May I remind the minister when he interrupts that, on a number of occasions, I brought before the House the danger of bringing American revolutionaries into Canada who advocated revolution from one end of the country to the other, who advocated bloodshed and revolution. For instance Rubin had advocated the killing of the parents of each of those members of his organization—kill and kill, turn out the government and spill blood. What did the hon. minister say in answer to me? He said in effect "after all, we believe in free speech".

Is the reason Chartrand was not apprehended that the government believed in free speech? No! The Prime Minister endeavoured to leave the impression today that, suddenly, there was a reason for action now and that he was deeply shocked. Certainly, the kidnappings were committed for the first time, but what about the 2,000 pounds of dynamite that were stolen recently? What about the bombings? What about the attempts on railroads, and what about the killing of innocent Canadians? The government, except in a very few cases where prosecutions took place, did nothing. They opened up Canada's doors, laid down the red carpet, and said in effect "come, believing, come to Canada". These revolutionaries went across Canada and they preached the most diabolical doctrines. The answer of the Prime Minister and of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion was "After all, we believe in free speech". Is that the reason the government did not pick up Chartrand? His so-called free speech was a crime against the sedition provisions of the Criminal Code. Why was action not taken?

There is an appeal in the dossier calling on all comrades to attend the trial of Charles Gagnon. Was Charles picked up yesterday?

An hon. Member: Yes.

Mr. Diefenbaker: What a coincidence! The government obtains the power to do something, a power which they could have exercised at any time. Charlie has been around for months and months and the government knew where he was. The minister to whom I have referred for the last few minutes knew where Gagnon was. The appeal states that adherents are urged to fill the court every Wednesday. It reads: "It seems certain that the jury is impressed by the presence of numerous supporters in the court".

I must not speak disrespectfully of Lemieux because he is in the position of being an arbitrator, a plenipotentiary. His statements in the last several months have aroused people, of the kind he endeavours to arouse, the revolution in Canada. Why was no action taken against him? The government of Canada let these people run wild. Free speech is not what two or three ministers say it is. It is a strange triumvirate in the cabinet composed of the Prime Minister, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion and, above all, their conscience, the Secretary of State.

Mr. Saulnier brought all of this evidence before the committee. He pointed out that the FLQ was organizing through the instrumentality of a government agency. What happened? Nothing. A year went by. No attention whatsoever was paid to the representations of two gentlemen, the mayor of Montreal—a tremendous power in the public life of our country—and Mr. Saulnier, both of whom dared to speak out. They were pushed aside and the government walked on the other side of the street. The government is endeavouring to leave the impression that a crisis came about suddenly.

Now, sir, I will read a few quotations from what Mr. Saulnier said. He said: "I gave these facts to the Prime Minister of Canada on several occasions". When I mentioned that to the Prime Minister today, he put up his

hands to his nose in such a way that one can fully understand the meaning of that gesture. The Secretary of State closed his eyes.

Mr. Pelletier: They shine too much.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is the first intelligent interruption.

An hon. Member: No one understands it.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I say to the minister that what he permitted in the Company of Young Canadians—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I must remind the right hon. gentleman, first, that he should address the Chair and second, that it is one o'clock and I must leave the chair.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The house resumed at 2 p.m.

Mr. Diefenbaker: At the time of adjournment, Sir, I was reviewing the representations in this very large dossier in connection with the Company of Young Canadians and subversion in the province of Quebec, transmitted by that great man, the Mayor of Montreal, and by Mr. Saulnier, his chief executive officer. These representations were placed before the government in November, 1969, and the two gentlemen I have mentioned have today been given the credit in large part for having brought about the need of action being taken now. Yet they provided a complete dossier on extraordinary crime, internationally incited, and no action was taken thereon.

The dossier clearly established the existence in the province of Quebec of active, communist oriented, revolutionary forces headed by the FLQ, and at the same time it revealed the involvement of certain members of the Company of Young Canadians in revolutionary activities including propaganda, organization of demonstrations, trips to Cuba and the like. The information contained in this dossier was but a short resume of the situation, and the Mayor and Mr. Saulnier agreed that all of the investigation of the Montreal Police would be made available to the government. In other words, what was produced represents only the tip of the iceberg regarding the activities of a revolutionary secret society.

I shall proceed to read some of the other information contained in this document. What was sought by them was a royal commission. If a royal commission had been granted, evidence would have been revealed which would have been a reasonable assurance that the terrible events of the last ten or 12 days, the kidnappings of the British diplomat and of the Hon. Pierre Laporte, might very well not have taken place. These are some of the observations of the Company of Young Canadians, paid for by the people of Canada through contributions to this organization:

> Not enough force has been displayed in attacking Ottawa colonialism...We must now attack federal institutions as we did the Murray Hill business...
>
> Violence and illegality are absolutely normal for revolutionaries...

It goes on to compare the organization with the Black Panthers. There are pictures of the wrongdoers. They stand out just like an out-building in a fog on the western prairie. They cannot be missed.

Here are a number of documents put out on equipment belonging to the Company of Young Canadians, calling on Quebeckers to arm themselves, and portraying machine guns and other paraphernalia of revolution. The march of 15,000 on McGill, organized by Stanley Gray, is included as one of the achievements of the revolution. If a press report is correct, I think he was one of those picked up this morning. There is a full agenda as to how to revolt and how to destroy. The government did not read it. The Prime Minister did not know anything about it.

Mr. Hees: He just held his nose.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am amazed because Mr. Saulnier has said he told the Prime Minister about it several times. Document 10 in this dossier tells how to deal with police, tear gas and violent demonstrations. It goes on to point out that it is important to start organizations to disturb the peace in every field in which there is any possibility of creating disorder. There are detailed instructions, with diagrams, on how to construct dynamite bombs, and an explanation of guerilla fighting in the forests of Quebec in the event that it becomes necessary. A list of equipment for fighting forces is provided. It informs its readers that it is publishing a list of material for Maquis fighters which everybody organized in Maquis teams should use. These statements would have convicted these wrongdoers of the crime of sedition, but there was no action. Vallières, one of the men arrested today, is named in the dossier. Vallières makes this statement.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Vallières makes this statement:

> Revolutionary strategy is the conscious organization of violence...of the masses oppressed under capitalism.

Then he says:

> We live in an era of violence created by the English and the Federalists. We must combat violence with violence.

There are these warnings, given not about events that have taken place in the last few days, but one year ago.

> We will take the time to prepare—and when we strike—so powerful will be the blows that the enemy will never get up.

Sir, the dossier contains the blueprint for revolution under the FLQ. There are detailed instructions in pamphlet form as to how to grow pot. There are diagrams

* Drapeau - Saulnier alarms were a yr. old.

showing how one can manufacture dynamite bombs and Molotov cocktails. There are instructions on how to organize. A pamphlet also points out that it is a very good idea to obtain instruction from Cuba. The fraternal relations existing between the revolutionaries of America are given full consideration. A pamphlet says that from now on, all members of the militant Quebec Left, that is the FLQ, may be classed as "professional revolutionaries".

Well, Sir, I have read enough to indicate that the Government of Canada, the present government, was remiss in its duties. It had the Criminal Code; it could have proceeded against these people for sedition, but no action was indeed taken. Furthermore, the press fully summarized the text of Mr. Saulnier's letter, which reads in part:

> The partial revelations to which I will limit myself today are but a small example of things I know and of which I have privately informed the Prime Minister of Canada a few times in the past year.

That statement is dated October 13, 1969. It was further pointed that in the ranks of the Company of Young Canadians there was one member who had previously been convicted for terrorist activities. I could keep reading to the House. In other words, when the Government of Canada was furnished this information by the City of Montreal, all it did was close its eyes, shut its ears and do nothing.

Mr. McIlraith: That is not right.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Is that not right? I will let the hon. gentleman explain, because I will be very glad to hear what prosecutions are taking place and why those people who were picked up this morning, who have been guilty of sedition over and over again, were not proceeded against.

Mr. Sharp: There are 23 men in jail. What about the 23 in jail?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Well now, so far as the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) is concerned, let me say this to him: his responsibility was for the safety of all diplomats in Canada.

Mr. Sharp: I hope the right hon. member supports that.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He knew that there was a danger of their being kidnapped—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: —and he did not act.

Mr. Sharp: Why did the right hon. gentleman not help us, then?

Mr. Diefenbaker: He did not act.

Le Petit Journal written by Gerard Asselin, on October 8, 1970, reads:

> At the end of last spring, Le Petit Journal announced that it is expected that a foreign diplomat would be kidnapped in Canada by the terrorists.

—the actual FLQ is the follow up of the first well structured movement, that of Pierre Paul Geoffroy.

Mr. Drury: Did the right hon. gentleman ever hear of Burgess?

Mr. Diefenbaker: What did the Government of Canada do? It played around. It refused to offer a reward. The offer of a reward of $50,000 in the spring brought this result: four of these criminals were picked up. In their list of conditions to the Government of Canada, the FLQ asks for the name of the person who revealed their identities. That is one of their requisites. The government contends that the name cannot be permitted to be revealed, and naturally so. The government ought to have offered a reward, as a result of its past experience with the FLQ. The fact that information was secured immediately after the reward was offered would indicate that when a person has no money in his pocket and no principle in his head, a reward always has a softening influence.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: And what did the Secretary of State for External Affairs do?

Mr. Gibson: He did lots of hard work.

Some hon. Members: Hoot, hoot, hoot.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I always like the interruptions of my hon. friend from Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Gibson). He reminds me of something that happened in the British House of Commons. There someone said, while talking about Mrs. Margot Asquith, that there is no finer political love match in all history, no greater love match, than that exemplified in the marriage between Margot and Asquith. The same applies to the hon. gentleman. There is no finer match than that between Gibson and Hamilton-Wentworth.

Some hon. Members: Hoot, hoot, hoot.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I have great affection for the hon. member and love his interruptions. I hope he continues them.

What did the government do? It played around and then pretended that the burden was on the government of the province of Quebec. Premier Bourassa has acted with directness. He has spoken with authority and responsibility.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: And what did the Government of Canada do? Being responsible for the safety of diplomats, it said to the province of Quebec in effect, "This is your baby." All through the statement the Prime Minister has made runs this golden thread of uncertainty. The premier of the province of Quebec asked for action. Why did the Government of Canada abdicate to the government of the province of Quebec the responsibility for ascertaining what had happened to this unfortunate diplomat. I repeat

that this government has the responsibility for the preservation and safety of diplomats from other countries.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: All over the world, Canada has a black eye. And now what is the government doing? It has recognized Communist China. Well, I can just imagine the deluge of communist spies who will come in here attached to the Chinese embassy, when it opens. They will all masquerade as diplomatic representatives. With the United States alongside us, we have not yet seen anything of what will happen when this group comes to Canada and begins its active responsibility which is to destroy Canada from within and, as well, undermine the United States.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The minister said yesterday that what Canada has done will have great influence in the United Nations. Well, and I think this expression is to be ascribed to Mao, for anyone to suggest that communism and the western world can coexist side by side is as ridiculous as endeavouring to fry an iceberg. And that is the situation. They are coming, and what we have seen happening up to now will be as nothing.

Furthermore, what has been done concerning the degree to which these criminals in Canada have been operating after graduating abroad? Indeed, a number of FLQ terrorists graduated from the El Fatah school in Jordan. I am now referring to an article in *The Canadian Jewish News* which reads:

• (2:20 p.m.)

The "students" at that school, speaking to a Canadian reporter, admitted that they had even prepared "the names of the prospective victims", who will be their first targets when they return home.

That is, return from the El Fatah Palestinian terrorists. It goes on to say what is being done to investigate these graduates from Algeria and the Middle East who have been active in the extremist, terrorist independence movement of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker: I have to interrupt the right hon. member to bring to his attention and the attention of the House that the time allocated to him under the rules has expired, unless he has the agreement of the House to pursue his remarks.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Diefenbaker: As always, I deeply appreciate that courtesy because when I speak I never wield a feather duster. That is why I have deep affection for this institution. It does not take members very long to find out if another member is sincere. If so, he can speak his mind. This is the only place in our country today, under these new regulations, where there will be freedom of speech.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

Mr. Diefenbaker: I now want to make reference to these regulations. Over the years I have heard various Liberal speakers say that section 98 was the most terrible section in the Criminal Code. I am informed on good authority that even the Solicitor General spoke in strong condemnation of section 98. In 1936, when the Right Hon. Mackenzie King came into office, section 98 was repealed.

There have been some members today who wondered how it was that in a matter of hours those responsible for drafting these regulations were able to produce them. I had never known anything to equal the celerity with which this was done. I will read only portions of section 98 of the Criminal Code, unless some member wants it all read:

Any association, organization, society or corporation, whose professed purpose or one of whose purposes is to bring about any governmental, industrial or economic change within Canada by use of force, violence or physical injury to person or property, or by threats of such injury, or which teaches, advocates, advises or defends the use of force, violence, terrorism, or physical injury to person or property, or threats of such injury, in order to accomplish such change, or for any other purpose, or which shall by any means prosecute or pursue such purpose or professed purpose, or shall so teach, advocate, advise or defend, shall be an unlawful association.

The draftsmen copied the words. It saves a lot of time. Section 98 was repealed in 1936, right after the election of that year. I continue to quote:

In any prosecution under this section, if it be proved that the person charged has

(a) attended meetings of an unlawful association; or

(b) spoken publicly in advocacy of an unlawful association; or

(c) distributed literature of an unlawful association by circulation through the Post Office mails of Canada, or otherwise;

it shall be presumed in the absence of proof to the contrary, that he is a member of such unlawful association.

The new regulations are identical except that it was decided to add a few more things. If the Prime Minister had brought in a statute, I would have done everything possible to help bring about changes in the Criminal Code to meet the changed conditions resulting from the type of illegal activities that are perpetrated against the state. If we had an opportunity to deal with this, every member of this House would do his part. It would not take very long to get it through. But no, they decided to impose an Order in Council that simply abolishes freedom in every part of this country for a period of months, if not longer.

I wish to read some of the sections. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite who are devoted libertarians whether they agree with this? I quote:

The group of persons or association known as Le Front de Libération du Québec and any successor group or successor association of the said Le Front de Libération du Québec or any group of persons or association that advocates the use of force or the commission of crime as a means of or as an aid in accomplishing governmental change within Canada is declared to be an unlawful association.

Over the years I have been a strong opponent of legislation that provides for the outlawing of any organization. I want to "inlaw" organizations and to have changes made in the Criminal Code that will cover the modern

techniques that destroy nations from within. I have taken unpopular stands. I frankly state that in 1948 my own party came out in favour of outlawing communism. I was the only one to oppose it. I received a very unusual lack of welcome. The Conservative party was going to sweep Canada with that policy. I said, "You cannot do it. You cannot deny an individual the right to think as he will. The offence is not in being wrong, the offence is in doing wrong." Wherever communism has been outlawed it has operated underground. When it has come out, it has been stronger than ever.

It is interesting to note that under this regulation the communists can do what they want in Canada without being subject to the provisions of this section as it now reads.

A person who

(a) is or professes to be a member of the unlawful association,

(b) acts or professes to act as an officer of the unlawful association,

(c) comunicates statements on behalf of or as a representative or professed representative of the unlawful association,

(d) advocates or promotes the unlawful acts, aims, principles or policies of the unlawful association,

(e) contributes anything as dues or otherwise to the unlawful association or to anyone for the benefit of the unlawful association,

(f) solicits subscriptions or contributions for the unlawful association, or

(g) advocates, promotes or engages in the use of force or the commission of criminal offences as a means of accomplishing a governmental change within Canada is guilty of an indictable offence...

Wrong should be punished. Why not amend the Criminal Code? Why bring in a great umbrella which will deny freedom elsewhere in Canada in trying to meet a situation in one province? It is as simple as that. One section of the regulation reads and I think somebody made a mistake here:

In any prosecution for an offence under these Regulations, evidence that any person

(a) attended any meeting of the unlawful association,—

It does not say when. If any member of this House ever attended one of those meetings he will, prima facie, be guilty of that offence. There ought to be some amendment. I presume it was intended the next line should also apply:

(b) spoke publicly in advocacy for the unlawful association,—

Grammatically it cannot stand up. It does not say when. All that is necessary is for someone to say, "I saw you attending a meeting of an unlawful association". You are then before the court. You can be picked up and detained without the opportunity of habeas corpus. A change should be made in that, because grammatically it is not correct. If it is read altogether, it says "attended any meeting of an unlawful association, spoke publicly in advocacy of that unlawful association." Either it does not mean what it says or it does not say what it means.

• (2:30 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: One can be arrested without warrant for committing an offence. There are sections about peace officers, sections 10, 11 and 12, all of which I support.

I ask the government even now to withdraw this resolution, bring in a bill and let members of this House give effect to bringing about changes in the Criminal Code to cover the situation rather than take away from Canadians something which is dearer than life itself—their civil rights, their right to live their lives as they will and not to be denied their constitutional freedoms without which life would cease to have any interest.

I am concerned for my country. I have known during the years the degree of fear, frustration and foreboding in the hearts of Canadians in every part of our country. Where is the pride in Canadianism today? People are fearful. Permissiveness has become a way of life and Parliament has made its contribution to that concept in abortion changes and in legalizing adult homosexuality. Everywhere groups of individuals contend that, because they have numbers behind them, they are above the law. The result is that freedom is destroyed for the rest of Canadians. I make this plea to the government. I brought in the Bill of Rights. It was ridiculed for many years. It finally became law in 1960 and from 1960 until 1969 various individuals across Canada in the universities and in the lower echelons of the courts declared that the Bill of Rights was merely a pious declaration written in grandiloquent language but having no binding effect on the courts. Indeed, I was surprised that when Joe Drybones of Dog Lake Reserve had his case heard before the Supreme Court of Canada, the Government of Canada was represented by counsel who bitterly contended that the Bill of Rights had no legal effect and was merely a declaration. The courts held otherwise and today Canadians enjoy a freedom under law which they did not have before.

Mention was made today by the Leader of the Opposition of the Bill of Rights, to the effect that the Prime Minister had hoped he could make it into a constitutional amendment. Such is not possible. As I see it, it will not be possible in the generation of any member of this House because the provinces will not give up their jurisdiction over property and civil rights. Dare any government bring before the Parliament of Canada a measure for the repeal of that act? Habeas corpus itself is only a statute. It was enacted in the 17th Century, yet no one dares abolish it except in circumstances of grave emergency.

I would like—and hon. members may think it is only a dream—to see action taken by the Parliament of Canada which will raise the hearts of men, and raise the horizons of young men and women, to give them an understanding of the greatness of our tradition, of the meaning of freedom and its record in Canada. It was in Canada that slavery was first abolished under the British Crown, 40 years before it was abolished elsewhere. I should like to see a declaration made by a committee of this Parliament setting out national goals, a declaration of our hopes, our expectations and our ideals. It would have no probative value but it would contribute to achieving the objectives I have in mind, that is, in giving Canadians principles to

be proud of. Some talk about the abolition of the monarchy. How many of them realize that as long as we have a Queen, and the Queen remains true to her oath, there can never be a dictatorship in Canada? As one travels across the country, going to schools and colleges, one finds young men and women who say: "Why should I be interested in the past? The past means nothing to me." That question was answered, for me, when I was a young graduate, by a professor who said: "Have you ever noticed what happens to a person who loses his memory?"

I should like to see a committee of this Parliament, in a spirit of give and take, produce a declaration for Canada of objectives and ideals so that there may be new horizons for Canadians.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacEachen: Sounds like the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I understand that the leader of the Creditiste party, speaking outside the House, stated that I—and I believe the leader of the New Democratic Party was included in this, too—had reached an agreement with the Prime Minister last night but had gone back upon that agreement today.

I said in the House this morning that, while there had been an opportunity for some discussion, I was not in a position to give any approval. I was not aware that the leader of the New Democratic Party gave approval either. I am surprised that the leader of the Creditistes should have made such a statement as has been attributed to him.

I wish to make it perfectly clear that I made no such agreement last night with regard to supporting the position of the government. A great deal of the discussion related to the possibility of consulting our caucuses this morning to see what the position of our parties would be. I rise in my place to say I can only assume that because the discussion took place in English, for the most part out of consideration for the leader of the New Democratic Party and myself, there must have been some misunderstanding. I repeat, there was no agreement. Neither I nor the leader of the New Democratic Party have gone back on any agreement today, and I wish this to be clearly understood.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): On the question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I wish to support entirely what has been said by the Leader of the Opposition. Speaking for myself, not only did I not agree with the course the government was taking but I endeavoured to make it perfectly clear that, in my opinion, the additional powers the government wanted should be secured by resorting to this Parliament and by placing legislation before Parliament.

• (2:40 p.m.)

Therefore I hope the leader of the Creditistes party did not make the statement that has been attributed to him.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

If he did, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that it is wrong. It may be that he was confused by the fact that we did agree we would consult our caucuses this morning, and that we did agree that we would give consent to the motion which the Prime Minister has introduced so that it could be debated today.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, we have just listened to the usual eloquent submission made by the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), and I hope he will concede that I listened to him with my usual attention. Neither the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) nor I yield to him in our devotion to civil rights in this country, despite the lifetime that he has devoted to protecting and enhancing those rights. I think he will appreciate that while his rhetoric can run a little freer in opposition, because of the responsibilities we have been given by the people of Canada, as temporary custodians of our laws we have to temper what we say within the limits of responsibility, balancing the rights of individual citizens against the rights of society as a whole. As the right hon. gentleman will appreciate, that is always a question of judgment in each individual case.

The action the government has taken is a drastic measure. I have no intention, nor has the government, of evading or attempting to minimize that fact. It is a drastic measure because it has been precipitated by persons with an utter contempt for the rights of others. It is a measure brought on by persons with an utter contempt for the democratic process, by persons who undoubtedly envisage themselves as totalitarian masters in Quebec and perhaps even further afield. They seek to mutilate and destroy our social institutions, including that of representative government.

Their chosen instrument for this purpose—and this is well indicated by the communiqués to which the right hon. gentleman referred—are not instruments of persuasion. They are not the instruments of free dialogue and discussion to attempt to convince their fellow citizens. They are the instruments of hatred, violence, turmoil and chaos. This society in Canada cannot long endure if the time comes when the right of individuals to life and personal security can be rendered meaningless by criminals—not by "political prisoners" but by criminals—through acts of terror directed at the government.

The government of Quebec and the federal government have been urged by some whose good faith I do not doubt, and in respect of whom there is no reason to believe they are sympathetic toward Le Front de Liberation du Quebec, that we should surrender to the demands of the FLQ, demands in terms of bullion, in terms of exchanging criminals now in prison for the victims of kidnapping. The House is fully aware of the full range and gross enormity of those demands.

I ask this House whether anybody really believes seriously that such surrender or such acquiescence to those demands would have solved anything. It is the view both of the federal government and of the province of Quebec that such surrender would have been nothing less than the first instalment in a program of continuing blackmail.

* and perhaps further afield.

Surrender would simply have inflated the ego and whetted the appetite of the FLQ, while at the same time enervating and eroding the will of governments and society to resist the encroachments of these criminals.

I think the House will subscribe to the proposition that no freely elected government can ever be held to ransom. We are fully conscious of the danger to the two men who are in the hands of these abductors. We have respect for them and their lives and are deeply sensitive to the responsibilities we have with regard to how to deal with this matter. But I do not believe that any release or exchange of prisoners—criminals—in return for the victims of kidnapping would have solved the problem. I do not think that any of us could be sure that it would even have saved lives.

Mr. Lewis: No one has suggested otherwise.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Many people have, Mr. Speaker, but I am not going to pick an argument with anybody at this stage. I am merely setting the ground for the atmosphere within which the action of the government has been taken.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Any exchange would merely have invited escalation: hostage for prisoner, hostage for criminal. And there would have been no stop to it.

It is rather a false logic for people to suggest that if we resist these demands we are imperilling the lives of these people and would indirectly be killing the victims. What type of false logic is that? If the victims were killed, then they would have been killed by the abductors. There is no way that that responsibility can be shifted. We have a duty not only to try to save those lives but to anticipate the danger in which other lives might be placed. So we had to act, Mr. Speaker.

It is true, as some distinguished members of the House said earlier, that there had been a developing situation, and I will deal with that later. There had been a recent and rapid escalation. I believe that the climate that had been set by an attempt to negotiate, by the vocabulary which had been adopted of "political prisoners", the use of the word "execution" of those who had been kidnapped instead of "murder", as if to imply some legitimacy, placed the government in a position of immobility whereby all the action in terms of public opinion was left to a bunch of renegades and the government was having difficulty sustaining its position.

All that has now stopped. I believe that the rules of this House ought to be waived this afternoon if this debate is not finished. I believe that the House should deal with this resolution, since it is of such importance that Parliament ought to pronounce upon it at one continuous sitting. This would let the people of Canada know the position we are taking.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): We have brought this resolution to Parliament to test the will of Parliament. There is no attempt whatsoever being made to evade parliamentary scrutiny.

Mr. Fairweather: You had to bring it here because the law so provides.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): No. Any ten members can rise and challenge a proclamation, but there is nothing within the law to force the government to bring this proclamation before Parliament. We did it because we believed the people of Canada should be involved.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (2:50 p.m.)

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this House should rise until Parliament has pronounced upon this resolution so the people of Canada, the people of Quebec and the terrorists know exactly what Parliament says.

An hon. Member: We will stay.

Mr. Baldwin: You asked for it; it is agreed.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I understand we have unanimous agreement to that proposition, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Perhaps in the light of the agreement I heard from all sides of the House I might invite you, Mr. Speaker, to make an order to the effect that this House shall sit until this resolution is dealt with.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am not too sure what the proposition is.

An hon. Member: Neither is he.

Mr. Speaker: I believe the hon. Minister of Justice has made a motion which at this point would require the unanimous consent of the House that the House pursue its sitting beyond the usual time of adjournment, for the purpose of continuing the debate on the motion now before the House, until obtaining a resolution of the House thereon.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, we might be prepared to agree to that, but surely this is not the way to deal with a matter of this sort, in the middle of an hon. member's speech. I should like to suggest that the House Leaders get together in the next hour or so, and if there is a disposition to continue the debate certainly I, for one, will raise no objection. Surely, this is the proper way to conduct the business of this House.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is apparent that there is no unanimous consent at this point. In any event, I

suggest that the Minister of Justice pursue his remarks.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I think that the House would want me now to deal with the justification for the government's action. The right hon. gentleman—

Mr. Diefenbaker: Possibly it is not appropriate at this moment, and I do not know whether he can give the information, but has the minister any information as to whether these two unfortunate men, the British diplomat and the minister of the Quebec cabinet, are still alive?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I am advised by my colleague, the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith), who is naturally closer to that particular problem because of his responsibilities, that there is no information at the moment.

The proclamation, Mr. Speaker, of course, depends on the government having appreciated a state of apprehended insurrection. I believe those are the words of the proclamation. Those words have to be interpreted in their ordinary meaning. Members are as capable as I am of referring to the dictionaries which state that "apprehend" is to anticipate with anxiety, and "insurrection", a rising up against an established authority, a revolution or a revolt. As I said earlier, this has to be a question of judgment based on the information available to members of the cabinet. Needless to say, some of that information, because of the current state of affairs, is not information that necessarily can be made public.

I think hon. members will appreciate the reasons for that. The right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) this morning tabled two letters, one from the Prime Minister of Quebec. I just want to read the appropriate words.

[*Translation*]

Under the circumstances, on behalf of the Government of Quebec, I request that emergency powers be provided as soon as possible so that more effective steps may be taken. I request particularly that such powers encompass the authority to apprehend and keep in custody individuals who, the Attorney General of Quebec has valid reasons to believe, are determined to overthrow the government through violence and illegal means. According to the information we have and which is available to you, we are facing a concerted effort to intimidate and overthrow the government and the democratic institutions of this province through planned and systematic illegal action, including insurrection. It is obvious that those participating in this concerted effort completely reject the principle of freedom under the rule of law.

In order to refresh the memory of hon. members, I shall read the relevant passage of the letter signed by both the mayor of Montreal, Mr. Jean Drapeau, and the chairman of the Executive Council of the City of Montreal, Mr. Lucien Saulnier:

The chief of the Montreal Police has informed us that the means available to him are proving inadequate and that the assistance of higher levels of government has become essential for the protection of society against the seditious plot and the apprehended insurrection in which the recent kidnappings were the first step.

[*English*]

The government of Canada has to take the final responsibility, but when the Government of the Province of Quebec and the mayor of the largest city in this country, on the information available to them and the information available to us through our own law enforcement agencies, are of the opinion that the state has been reached where we ought to, as sound and commonsense human beings, anticipate a danger to our society in the form of insurrection and are willing to use that type of vocabulary to the Prime Minister of Canada, then that is material which we cannot ignore.

I want to recite a list of events that have contributed to the rapid acceleration of this dangerous situation in Quebec. They are the kidnappings, which in themselves if they were isolated would be a purely criminal affair but, within the context of a wider conspiracy and being used for ransom against a legitimately constituted government, are something else. We have the continuous threats to life and property in the communications of the FLQ of a seditious, violent and inflammatory nature. They have been issued and members are aware of them.

We have also a series of bombings and violence, a rising increase in thefts of dynamite now available in some hidden caches in the province of Quebec. More disturbing, we have a type of erosion of the public will in the feeling among some sincere people that an exchange of prisoners for the victims of the kidnappings would somehow ease the situation.

One of the difficulties in our society or in any free society is that we are not organized, and people are ordinarily not organized, against that sort of threat. Ordinary people generally believe that such actions as kidnapping, bombings, theft and violence by organized revolutionaries will not take place. The people of this country do not easily accept this because we have had a very happy history, as the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert said. This is a novel situation in Canada and it provokes the unprecedented use of a very severe measure for the first time in peacetime. We have been singularly fortunate since Confederation and we are now dealing with an unprecedented, serious situation.

• (3:00 p.m.)

This situation has arisen in other countries. The population resents violence but the population, taken generally, is not organized to meet it but relies upon governments to do so. Governments have to exercise and fulfil their responsibilities in meeting it. I might say, too, that the recent call for a public manifestation by men like Gagnon, Vallieres and Chartrand established and escalated the whole coming together of an infiltration of FLQ doctrine in certain areas of society in Quebec—in the unions, among universities and in the media—and the growing feeling among the people of Quebec, particularly the citizens of Montreal, that they are living under a reign of terror. You do not have to ask me; ask any member from Montreal and the people they represent just what they have been undergoing last week in the city of Montreal.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I believe we had to respond today in an urgent fashion to the call of the

At least no such seditious doc. was put out by RCMP within the next yr. & no one has ever been reprimanded.

provincial government and the city of Montreal to exercise our duty in a federal state, to ensure that the necessary co-operation in a federal-provincial aspect was maintained between the government of the province of Quebec and the government of Canada. The attorney general of the province of Quebec and the premier of the province of Quebec advised us that the law as presently constituted and directed in a free society was not equipped at the moment to meet the serious situation they were facing, and that they needed additional powers of arrest, of search and of detention.

Mr. Baldwin: Why did you not come here and ask for it?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I will deal with that point in a minute. So this measure is brought before the country and the House. As the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said, it is an interim measure; it is an emergency measure. I listened very carefully to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) this morning. The suggestion in respect of a special statute is not necessarily excluded so far as we are concerned. This is a debate; we want to listen to what the opposition has to say and how they judge the situation in the country.

Mr. Forrestall: Is somebody working on such legislation now?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): If the hon. gentleman will listen to me, he will learn soon enough. The attorney general of the province of Quebec called in troops under the National Defence Act by a letter to my colleague the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald). The provincial attorney general said that he needed extra powers, extraordinary powers, to deal with the matter. I believe we had a duty as well to allow the provincial attorney general to fulfil his responsibilities in respect of the enforcement of the law in the province.

It is all very well for the right hon. gentleman to recite some facts from the past. He knows that the enforcement of the Criminal Code, including the section relating to sedition, at the present time rests with the provincial attorneys general. It may be in times gone by that if Mr. Saulnier thought he had sufficient evidence, he had control of his own police force under the law as it existed then and could have prosecuted. He chose not to do so. The responsibility for the administration of justice as presently defined in the Criminal Code of Canada lies with the provincial attorneys general.

If organized crime should become more prevalent—I hope this never happens, but it may in a violent society where crime is mobile and where through the communications media information can be transmitted much more quickly—it may be that we should consider in this House an amendment to the Criminal Code to broaden the powers of the federal attorney general in dealing with some of these matters like sedition or treason which now come under provincial jurisdiction.

Mr. Asselin: Why not now?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The hon. member is responding with some favour to the suggestion I make. But this situation does not exist now. I want to deal with the extent of the power given the government and the province of Quebec under the proclamation and regulations. Although the provisions of the War Measures Act and of the Public Order Regulations, 1970, made pursuant to that proclamation—copies of which have been received by hon. members—are in force throughout Canada, the regulations are directed primarily, and in practical terms exclusively, to the situation that prevails in the province of Quebec. Indeed, the Front de Libération du Québec is mentioned expressly in section 3 of the regulations and that organization, or any successor group or organization to it, is declared to be an unlawful association.

The right hon. gentleman asked: Why drive them underground? They are already underground. One might ask: Why make them unlawful? I suppose in strict terms they are already unlawful. Now we have a declaratory provision that makes it quite clear to prosecuting attorneys that being a member of this organization, or promoting or advocating its intent, is now a crime.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The ends and aims of those persons who comprise that group or association are well-known; they are in fact notorious. They will stop at nothing to subvert democratic government in this country. While their prime target today may be the government of Quebec, there is every reason to assume—indeed, I think there are many clear indications—that other governments and indeed the central government of this country fall within the purview of their endeavours.

In recent days these persons have demonstrated an arrogance, disrespect for law and order and a degree of inhumanity that our ordinary democratic processes cannot continue to tolerate. Intimidation of the government and of the public by means of kidnapping and murder have become their *modus operandi*. It is in this much to be regretted climate that the government of Canada felt constrained to move in this admittedly unusual manner.

It must be underlined, however, that these regulations apply only to those who have demonstrated inclinations of a seditious or treasonable nature. The Criminal Code includes in its definition of treason a person who uses force or violence for the purpose of overthrowing the government of Canada or a province. The Criminal Code defines sedition as the advocation of the use of force without the authority of law as a means of accomplishing a governmental change within Canada. I think the House should be aware that these regulations are directed only at the overt manifestation of treason and sedition. This is the thrust of the offences set forth in section 4 of the regulations. Sections 5 and 6 of the regulations are directed at those who would aid and abet or assist in the commission of seditious or treasonable offences.

In summary, then, it can be said that the Public Order Regulations, 1970, are designed to assist the law enforcement agencies in the apprehension and conviction of those who would subvert our elected governments and destroy our way of life. The Front de Libération du Québec is dedicated to that end and its ultimate goal is a totalitarian state achieved not by evolution but by revolution.

These regulations, then, will have application to a very limited number of persons in this country. They are not of broad compass and they by no means apply to crimes or criminals generally. Rather, they single out the very special crimes of treason and sedition—crimes that go to the very heart of our democratic rules and procedures—for more effective law enforcement. This step was made necessary because of the unique considerations that were found to prevail within the province of Quebec.

So except as altered by these regulations, the ordinary law applies. The proclamation is merely an empowering order. In other words, the proclamation does not bring in the full scope of the War Measures Act; it does not bring into play all the other items set forth in the act. The proclamation is limited by the terms of the regulations, and the War Measures Act is brought into force only in so far as those regulations are concerned.

Mr. Woolliams: You brought it in last night and you can bring in a new law tonight.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I think the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) can take my assurance that if we considered it important enough to bring it before Parliament now, we would not ignore Parliament in any future instance.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The proclamation is empowering only. It creates extended powers of arrest, powers of search and powers of detention in the specific area of crimes I have mentioned. Trial by the ordinary courts of the land, including jury trial, still prevails. The ordinary rules of evidence continue to prevail and the ordinary appeals open to convicted persons continue to prevail. The main effect of the regulations is the creation of a new offence of belonging to the unlawful organization known as the Front de Libération du Québec and related directly or indirectly to the violent and criminal aspects of that association which are declared to be unlawful.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Mr. Nielsen: Would the minister permit a question at this time?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Perhaps the hon. member could put his question afterwards. I know the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) well enough to know that he has the patience to wait until the end of my speech.

[Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton).]

The ultimate aim of the regulations is to restore and preserve order, and the regulations enlarge the investigative and the apprehension powers by expanding the powers of arrest, the period of detention and the powers of search. Bail, which is normally within the power of the court, is, in respect of offences listed in the regulations, vested in the attorney general of the province.

One may ask: Why these powers? Because in the opinion of the attorney general of the government of Quebec, an opinion which I share, in the present situation—and, after all, prosecution is a provincial matter—under the present law, the prosecution of this type of violent, criminal conspiracy is rendered difficult, if not impossible, and so is investigation rendered difficult, if not impossible, under the present provisions of the Code. The Criminal Code as presently constituted deals primarily with individual crimes. It is true that it mentions conspiracy, but the whole compass of the Criminal Code is that crime in its essence is an individual matter.

An hon. Member: What about conspiracy?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I mentioned conspiracy. But without the additional powers necessary to immobilize and to apprehend this organization as presently constituted, the attorney general of Quebec felt that the law was at present insufficient.

An hon. Member: Where is the proof?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) in his statement earlier today suggested that what we are doing is in some way undemocratic.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): That is the essence of it.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I want to assure him and the House that, as found within the Statutes of Canada, this procedure is contemplated under the Canadian democratic process. The procedure by way of proclamation is found within the War Measures Act. This is a completely constitutional technique. Let me point out more particularly that the regulations were issued under powers granted to the Governor in Council by Parliament; so that the constitutional source of this enactment was, and is, Parliament itself.

The power vested in the Governor in Council by Parliament is also a power of which the Governor in Council can be divested by Parliament. Indeed, the very exercise of this power by the Governor in Council is recognized in part 2 of section 6 of the Bill of Rights, itself enacted by Parliament, which requires that such proclamations be laid before Parliament forthwith—as has been done—and which declares that anything done or authorized, or any order or regulation made under the authority of the War Measures Act shall be deemed not to be an infringement

of any right or freedom recognized by the Canadian Bill of Rights.

• (3:20 p.m.)

The procedure we are adopting is recognized in the Bill of Rights. In other words, the ultimate constitutional source and the legitimacy of the proclamation by the Governor in Council under the War Measures Act is a power granted to it by Parliament to so enact. It is Parliament which confers this legitimacy, and it is Parliament which can take it away. The power of the Governor in Council flows from Parliament and it is ultimately accountable to Parliament, and thereby to the people of Canada.

I want to move on to address myself to the reason the War Measures Act was used. The question has already been asked: why was the War Measures Act resorted to and why was it brought into force in the early hours of the morning? There are two basic reasons in answer to the first question. The government of Quebec had come to the conclusion, and the government of Canada agreed, that the existing law was inadequate to deal with the crisis in Quebec. This left only two possible courses of action. The government could have sought special legislation of the type embodied in the regulations which have been brought into force under the War Measures or, alternatively, the War Measures Act could have been resorted to.

I suggest to the House that if a special piece of legislation had been resorted to, the provisions might well have been similar to the provisions now found in the regulations. But this government was assured by the government of Quebec, and by senior persons directly involved with attempting to cope with the terrorists, that a search and arrest operation of considerable magnitude directed at the FLQ was necessary and that time was of the essence.

Our initial reaction was the reaction of several members of the House, to seek the authority of Parliament first. But faced with the seriousness of the situation and with the necessity of not broadcasting what the government of Quebec and the government of Canada intended to do, faced with the urgency of anticipating any further escalation in the situation in Montreal, the government of Canada resorted to the War Measures Act. It is my hope that some day the full details of the intelligence upon which the government acted can be made public, because until that day comes the people of Canada will not able fully to appraise the course of action which has been taken by the government.

The element of surprise was essential, and members of the House will have to rely upon the judgment of the government. I am not saying that other value judgments cannot be brought into play. I am not saying that this debate is not the most legitimate exercise of the parliamentary function. But that was the value judgment we had to exercise and that is how we did it. Also, at this stage, when we are dealing with a situation which is not completely clear, when we are dealing for the first time in Canada with a type of organization which in peacetime is dedicated to violence and the terroristic overthrow of government, there is advantage in having a certain amount of flexibility, in seeing what we need to deal with this proposition.

There is advantage in having a certain amount of flexibility, particularly in the delicate relationship in the federal system as between Ottawa and Quebec, to mobilize our joint efforts so that the proper result can be obtained. So the purpose of the action was surprise, to render immobile and inefficient, as quickly as we could, the Front de Libération du Québec which menaces the health and the lives not only of individual citizens but of the polity of Canada and the polity of Quebec.

I want to say that this action was taken reluctantly. Throughout his life and throughout his career as a Member of Parliament, the Prime Minister—and, if I may say so, I have so far as I have been able—has tried to advocate those measures of law reform that are needed in an age of confrontation, this age which is dominated by a conflict between freedom and authority, which puts the law in a special delicate position because on the one hand the law is the symbol of authority and on the other hand it is the guarantee of freedom. Between the two the law is caught in the crunch. The administration of the law demands a sensitive type of judgment.

We have tried to ensure that in the administration of the law, in reforming the substance of the law, the personal options open to individuals, the ambit of individual liberty available to citizens shall be made as wide as possible, consistent with public order. We have tried, in terms of public administration of the law, to widen the rights of citizens, accused before the law, particularly the right to bail, to balance the rights of citizens against the rights of the state and to open up for citizens new avenues of appeal and recourse against the government.

The bail reform bill, the criminal law reform bill and the federal court bill, together with other legislative action, are measures based on the premise that the orbit of personal freedom must be widened and guaranteed. The rule of law is the essential condition not only for the existence of the state but for the existence of individual liberty within the state. Freedom is the precondition of liberty, and restraint is the beginning of freedom. The rule of law is the source and condition of that restraint, and through it the freedom and the liberty of the individual in society are maintained.

Insurrection and violence are not only a total denial of the constituted authority of the state but are a denial of the liberty of the individual himself who depends upon the controlled organization of the state. This type of violence defies not only the total integrity of society as a people but the individual integrity of every person in that society. In this sense, then, the concept—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the minister will not mind my interrupting at this moment to bring to his attention that his time has expired, unless he has the agreement of the House to continue.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Invoking of War Measures Act

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I thank hon. gentlemen and the hon. lady from Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) for their courtesy.

In that sense, then, the concept of absolute freedom which at times is dressed up through verbal sleight of hand such as "political prisoners" and "liberation of the people"—this sleight of hand implying that there are absolute rights and absolute liberties in any particular society—is a perversion of the rule of law. It is the replacement of the rule of law by the rule of absolutism. It denies not only the existence of the state but, ultimately, the freedom and liberty of the individuals composing the state. This type of conduct mocks society at the same time that it seeks to destroy it. We have been living through a charade that mocks, a charade that seeks to destroy.

Accordingly, no democratic process can categorically license any absolute or unfettered conduct without endangering the viability of the democratic process itself. The measure of the democratic process is the history of the rule of law. There has never been anything in any constitution of any democratic society, at any time, which sanctions the concept or practice of absolute liberty and lawlessness. Indeed, if there are any absolute rights they reside in the right, both moral and legal, of the democratically constituted authorities to protect the rights and liberties of the citizens. Society itself cannot—because no government constituted in the name of the people can—through countenancing insurrection and violence oblige its members to subject themselves to the deprivation of life, liberty, property or dignity and claim to be democratic. A government which allows that sort of thing to happen cannot claim either to be democratic or to speak on behalf of the people.

If a government is to reflect and articulate community values and community expectations, it must as a fundamental constitutional norm guarantee the basic survival of that community as a collectivity, and the freedom of that community as individuals. No democratic state can be asked to negotiate the terms of its existence or negotiate away the rights of its members.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Political morality does not begin at the barrel of a gun, and the state has both a right and an obligation to protect itself and the members of the community which compose it. The proclamation of the War Measures Act and the enactment of the Public Order Regulations, 1970, should not be interpreted as indicating any departure from the government's declared intention to proceed with its law reform and civil rights program. However, it must be underlined that human rights and fundamental freedoms can only exist within a society that respects those rights. We are experiencing today a direct attack on the very fabric of our society which is dedicated to the protection of those rights and freedoms.

A society that fails to protect itself, a society that cannot manifest the will to protect itself, is a society that does not deserve to be preserved. We believe that the rights and freedoms that all Canadians enjoy are based upon our democratic institutions and upon the principles of representative government. We believe that these elements of our society must be preserved at all cost. While it is a result I regret very much indeed, we cannot be unduly concerned about the rights and freedoms of those who act to subvert our governments by force and intimidation.

The Public Order Regulations, 1970, should therefore be looked at as an unhappy but necessary step in the ultimate preservations of the rights and freedoms of Canadians generally. I wish to assure the House that it is the intention of the government to proceed as rapidly as possible with its announced law reform program. We also intend to bring this matter now before the House to a successful conclusion. I can only express the hope that the initiative which the government has been compelled to take today will eliminate terrorism and violence in our society, that it will be of short duration and that it will produce a new and better climate for the enjoyment of our rights and freedoms.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Since the minister's time had expired, questions can be asked of him only with the consent of the House and of the minister himself.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I shall answer.

Mr. Nielsen: For the benefit of the House I wonder whether the minister could clarify the government's intentions with respect to the communist party of Canada, because under the terminology used in section 3 of the regulations it would appear that this association is an unlawful one within the definition of the regulations. If one reads the last four lines of that regulation it will be seen that any association that "advocates, promotes or engages in the use of force or the commission of criminal offences as a means of accomplishing a governmental change within Canada" is an unlawful association. Having regard to the ideology of the communist party of Canada and its adherence to the use of force if necessary to accomplish governmental change, can the minister say that the government intended making the communist party of Canada an unlawful association?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. gentleman puts his question in all seriousness, but I would point out that the text will be interpreted by the courts and that prosecutions will be instituted by the provincial attorneys general. So long as there is the separation between the executive and the courts, and between the federal and provincial attorneys general in terms of responsibility for administering justice, that interpretation is not left to me; it is left to the prosecutors and to the courts.

Mr. Nielsen: I appreciate the minister's difficulty in attempting to interpret laws that the government has passed. My question was this: Is it the intention of the government to say that the communist party of Canada shall be deemed to be an unlawful association?

• (3:30 p.m.)

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I think the hon. member will have to rely upon the wording of that particular section and draw his own conclusions.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might direct a question to the Minister of Justice. I followed his argument and agree with that part of it which asserts that the administration of justice in these matters is the responsibility of the attorneys general of the provinces. The regulations set out certain offences and crimes. Does the administration of these matters not fall under the attorneys general of the provinces?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I follow the purport of the hon. member's question.

Mr. Woolliams: I ask the question again. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) said that for crimes set out in the Criminal Code, the administration of justice falls under the jurisdiction of the provincial attorneys general. The regulations set out new crimes which are similar to those in the Code but are different from them. Will the administration of justice, so far as these crimes are concerned, come under the attorneys general of the provinces?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): That is so. I hope the attorneys general of the provinces recognize the purport and the limitation of these regulations.

Mr. Woolliams: May I ask the minister one more question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the House will allow the hon. member to ask one additional question. We really ought to go to the next speaker.

Mr. Woolliams: As I understood the minister's argument, one of the reasons the government has not brought in a special statute or amendments to the Code is that the Code is administered by the provincial attorneys general. He left the impression that this measure could be undertaken by the Minister of Justice of Canada.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): If I left that impression, I am sorry.

Mr. Forrestall: Are we to have legislation soon?

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) put forward a defence for what the government is now doing. I suggest to him that defence was as fallacious as it was eloquent.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Lewis: Just hold your horses. We have had enough of these catcalls from the Liberal backbenchers today. They should listen with some tolerance to what is said from this side of the House. This intolerance is probably reflected in the matter we are now discussing.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: I say that because I suggest to the Minister of Justice that there is not a single person in this chamber, from any part of the House, who does not feel, as he does, utter detestation for the FLQ in Quebec for abducting two innocent, unfortunate men, for the bombings which have taken place and for that organization's threats to subvert Quebec and Canadian society. There are no members in this House, indeed there are few people in this country, who do not condemn that organization and all it stands for, and the cowardly and cruel acts for which its members have been responsible. Therefore, all the minister's speech—in which he tried, by setting up a framework of panic and terror, to take unto himself and his government the condemnation of this organization—is irrelevant and surplus. We are all aware of the things he spoke about. We are all aware, moreover, that there is a very serious and critical situation in the province of Quebec. We are all anxious to assist this government and the government of Quebec in dealing with that situation in a proper and democratic way—but not in an arrogant and dictatorial way, as is now the case.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Lewis: That is the case now, Mr. Speaker. Throughout these unhappy days we in this party have not laboured the point. In fact, our members have desisted even from asking questions on this matter during the question period, because we have known of the delicacy of the situation and have felt profound sympathy for the way in which this government and the government of Quebec have been burdened with a terrible problem involving the lives of two innocent men. If we had been faced today with a request by the government for certain specific changes in the law, with evidence that those changes which this House of Commons would pass were necessary, we would have a different situation. What we are faced with at present is a thoroughly authoritarian order—which I will try to analyse in a moment—which, it seems to me, no democratic assembly such as this can possibly accept. It may be accepted by government backbenchers who are determined to support their Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the government regardless of whatever conscience they may have about democracy.

An hon. Member: That is utter nonsense.

Mr. Lewis: The Minister of Justice tells us that this step was taken with the aim of restoring and preserving order and that it will settle the whole matter. He also talked about other things in our society. I say to him, without attempting to suggest that either he or the Prime Minister is a dictator, that every dictator in the history of humanity has justified his dictatorial acts by declaring that he was preserving order in society. Every reactionary spokesman in the United States, Canada or any other country has justified his demand for reactionary and repressive measures by stating that it was for the purpose of restoring or preserving order. These words are no more progressive because they come out of the mouth of the Minister of Justice than if they had come out of the

mouth of Spiro Agnew of the United States. It was actually the same kind of statement.

Before I go any further let me say this to the Minister of Justice and, through him, to the Prime Minister. The government's excuse for taking action by Order in Council is that they have some intelligence of which we are not aware: it was required that all these steps be taken immediately, at night, in order that the government could deal with certain people and events by surprise. In all earnestness I say to the government: You have done this. I disapprove of it. I think it was wrong and unnecessary, as I will try to show, but you have done it now. You have been able to incarcerate 154, 200 or 300 people. You have been able to institute searches without warrants. If you are sincere in what you say, on Monday morning you will revoke this Order in Council. You will cancel it and you will bring before this House a bill to amend the law in order to deal with this matter.

I say this very seriously. You will have had three days, today, tomorrow and Sunday. You have already told the people in the Front de Libération du Québec what you intend to do. They know all about it; the surprise is over. You have done all you can by surprise. If you are sincere, and if you are guided by what you say, there is not the slightest excuse in the world why this Order in Council should not be annulled by Monday morning. There is no reason why this Parliament should not be presented with a projet de droit, a bill to amend the law to deal with the critical situation in Quebec.

If the government does not do that, I give it this warning now. It is the intention of my colleagues and myself to use subsection 3 of section 6 of the Bill of Rights and we will, within the ten days or the time limit specified in the bill, under the signature of ten Members of Parliament bring forward the necessary motion praying that the proclamation be revoked. There will no longer be any excuse for it. It is not necessary for the minister to continue this undemocratic, authoritarian order in force any longer than is necessary—and one minute longer than Monday morning is unnecessary, Mr. Speaker.

It should not be necessary for me or for others to declare that we detest the FLQ in Quebec and any other organization that seeks to overthrow our society by force.

If I may be permitted to make a personal reference, I have been in active politics for a great many years. During the time when some members now in this House who hold high office spoke kindly about communism, dictatorial methods and violent revolution, I fought them inside the CCF and inside the labour movement of this country. I, therefore, do not have to emphasize that fact. Other members in this House in high places have to explain their previous association with or sympathy for organizations that wanted to overthrow democratic governments by force.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: That should not be necessary. After all that the Minister of Justice has thrown at this House, what are we being asked to approve? I say to hon. members that we are being asked to approve the complete suspension of the ordinary laws of this country, all the rights and freedoms of our people throughout the whole of Canada. That is what we are being asked to approve. The minister read only the first part of section 3. The hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) was right in drawing the minister's attention to the second half of section 3. The minister only read these words:

> The group of persons or association known as Le Front de Libération du Québec and any successor group or successor association of the said Le Front de Libération du Québec—

He finished there. Well, the section does not finish there; the section continues:

> —or any group of persons or association that advocates the use of force or the commission of crime as a means of or as an aid in accomplishing governmental change—

Not within Quebec, but—

> —within Canada is declared to be an unlawful association.

Even though it is unkind and perhaps even offensive, I say that the minister did not have the courage to answer the question of the hon. member for Yukon as to whether he intended any other organization in Canada to be covered by this law. Because he did not do that, every member, including members opposite, ought to look with the utmost suspicion at what we are being asked to approve today. We are being asked to approve placing in the hands of this government, in effect the Prime Minister, unrestricted and unlimited power. This is the first time it has been done in the peacetime history of Canada. We are discussing nothing less than this.

I am fully aware of the situation in Quebec. I am acquainted with the difficulties with the FLQ in that province. Despite all this, I believe the response of the federal government today to be excessive, hysterical and unacceptable. Furthermore, I doubt very much if it will be efficacious. Indeed, I deeply fear that in the long run this action may well do great harm to the unity in Canada and to the relations between Canada and the province of Quebec. I will have something to say about that matter later. The Prime Minister in his speech, and the Minister of Justice in his speech, in effect said, "Trust us. You know we are civil libertarians. We have made certain amendments to the Criminal Code. We propose other amendments to the Criminal Code. You know we are good democrats. Trust us. We will not do anything wrong. You know we are all in favour of civil liberty."

The Prime Minister has discarded and betrayed many progressive ideas in connection with the economic and social front which he formerly held. I am no more confident that he is not today also discarding his civil libertarian cloak, not in a temporary but in a permanent way.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Lewis: We cannot trust any man who takes unto himself dictatorial powers, myself, anyone in this House or anyone in this or any other country. I remind hon. members of the famous saying that power corrupts, and

absolute power corrupts absolutely. Although I may again be unkind, I say, on the basis of observation in this House for 2½ years, that the Prime Minister and members of his cabinet have given ample evidence that power has in fact corrupted their sensitivity about the rights and welfare of the Canadian people. I am not prepared to give them even more power than they now have. Personalities do not really matter; we are concerned with a basic principle of deep and overriding importance.

I say to the ministers present, including the Minister of Justice, that the proclamation is based upon a law which says that the mere proclamation itself is evidence that a state of apprehended insurrection in fact exists. That is so; the law is so. The Minister of Justice did not have to belabour the point that what the government has done falls within the law. The law has been used only twice before, both times in the case of a world war. It was never used before World War I or between the two world wars. This is the first time it has been used since World War II.

I make this point as strongly as I can. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice came to Parliament for approval of their proclamation and Order in Council. I say to them that we need evidence of the necessity for such a drastic and undemocratic measure. It is not enough to say, "We have a letter from Mr. Bourassa, a letter from Mr. Drapeau and from Mr. Saulnier. That is all we can give you. On the basis of those letters you ought to say we have done the right thing."

I not only listened to the letters being read, but I read them. Mr. Bourassa did not ask for the War Measures Act to be invoked; neither did Mr. Saulnier nor Mr. Drapeau. They asked for assistance to enable them to deal with the critical situation in Quebec and the fear of insurrection which they now have in their minds. This is not sufficient evidence upon which this House should be asked to approve the action of the government in suspending all the rights and freedoms of the Canadian people. I am not committing myself ahead of time, but I am half convinced that it was necessary at this time to extend the law to give the police powers of search without a warrant, much wider powers than they now have.

I suggest to the Minister of Justice and his officials that they ought to have looked at new section 98E of the Criminal Code which deals with offensive weapons. It gives the Governor in Council authority to declare anything an offensive weapon. It gives a very wide right of search without a warrant, with the exception of private homes. For this particular purpose, in Montreal it might have been necessary to amend that section with relation to searching for dynamite. The government could have removed the exception regarding private homes and given the right to search, without warrant, private homes as well as other premises. That might have been necessary.

It is conceivable that it might have been necessary for this House to consider the possible detention of people arrested on reasonable grounds for believing they were guilty of a crime, and extending the right to detain beyond 24 hours without bringing the person before a magistrate. This period could have been extended to two, three or four days. These are the measures which I read into the letters which the government received. Of course, there may have been telephone calls and other conversations that I do not know about. There probably were. I cannot speak of those things. A measure extending the right to search and the right to detain for two or three days before bringing a person before a magistrate might be necessary in the present situation in Montreal.

• (3:50 p.m.)

I cannot see any way in which this wholesale elimination of the rights and freedoms of Canadians could be efficacious in the work which is now necessary in Montreal and the province of Quebec generally. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the proclamation of the order in council which is before us merely proves that the Department of Justice, that the Department of the Solicitor General of Canada, that the Department of the Attorney General of Quebec, that the Quebec provincial police and the Montreal police have all failed in their duty to deal with the situation which existed in Quebec for at least seven years since 1963. It proves that the FLQ has been allowed to continue its work without any of our police forces, federal, provincial or municipal, being able to carry out the kind of security job, the kind of infiltration of the organization which would have enabled those law enforcement agencies to prevent the possibility of the FLQ threatening the fabric of life in Quebec, as it now does.

It appears that the government, for some reason which I cannot understand, stood by and hoped that the FLQ would go away, instead of having the courage to persuade the Attorney General of Quebec and the police agencies concerned that they ought to deal with the situation in an efficacious manner. I am reminded that the other day, when the Prime Minister was asked whether or not he would bring—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I know the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) is leaving now, but I had some difficulty in communicating with the speaker and I hope that in future care will be taken not to stand in the line of sight between an hon. member who is speaking and the Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, you flatter me by being so anxious to see me through the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen). I was reminded, when the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice were speaking, of an exchange which took place between the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) and the Prime Minister last Wednesday, October 14. The Leader of the Opposition asked the Prime Minister whether he would assure the House that no action would be taken without approval being sought from the House of Commons. The Prime Minister said, "Whether it would be immediately before or immediately after would depend, of course" and there were some comments at that time and the Prime Minister said:

> I am sorry to observe the lightness with which the opposition treats this question. It is obvious that if urgent action is needed at some time in the middle of the night we cannot ask Parliament to approve it first.

I call attention to that last sentence. Last Wednesday the Prime Minister knew what he was going to do and precisely the hour at which he was going to do it. If not, it is the kind of prescient remark which one could scarcely expect even of this brilliant Prime Minister. I wish I had time to cull the writings and speeches of the Prime Minister when he was a great champion of liberty against Maurice Duplessis in Quebec. I wish I had the time to read them, whether in English or in French, because I am certain that in those writings I would find innumerable statements which would condemn his action today in language as eloquent as any used from this side of the House in the debate in which we are now engaged.

In fact, I can imagine how the late Maurice Duplessis must be chuckling, in whatever place he is resting, on seeing one of his arch enemies produce to the Parliament of Canada precisely the kind of measure which he, in his time, had produced to the Parliament of Quebec and which Pierre Elliott Trudeau so eloquently condemned in years gone by.

I feel strongly about this, not only because of what I consider to be the democratic immorality of the measure before us but because I am certain it will do great harm to the unity of Canada and to the relationship between Ottawa and Quebec. In 1968 Canadians thought the Prime Minister might help to unite the citizens of our country. The record is heartbreakingly black. During the 2½ years in which he has been Prime Minister of this country we have seen, not a weakening but a strengthening of separatism in Quebec. Separatism today is stronger than ever before in the history of the province, stronger than it was in 1968. The FLQ has become a dangerous force, such as it never was before, to the point at which the Prime Minister and the government ask us to approve this measure because, they say, they apprehend an insurrection.

What is happening to Quebec as a result of the policies of this government and as a result of the inflexible attitude of the Prime Minister, which he is continually incorporating in his policies. He calls people bleeding hearts and nonentities; anyone who cares about democracy is being soft. The result of this has been an increase in the threat to Canadian unity. When the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) spoke earlier he was critical of my leader, mainly, I thought, because he misunderstood my hon. friend from Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas).

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Lewis: I may not be able to make myself any clearer than my hon. friend did, and the minds of hon. members opposite are probably no brighter now than they were then, but let me try to repeat what my leader said, in somewhat different words. After criticizing my leader, the hon. member for Témiscamingue then went on to make precisely the same point himself, talking about the poverty, the unemployment and the frustration which results in the kind of thing one sees in Quebec today. This is precisely what our leader was saying.

Though minority groups may advocate violence, they have never been a threat to society unless objective conditions in society make it possible for them to win the support or, at least, the sympathy of the people around them. The communist party has never made progress anywhere in the west except where objective conditions of injustice, poverty, deprivation and degradation made it possible for it to attract the support and sympathy of the population. In exactly the same way, though to a lesser extent, thank God, this is true in the province of Quebec.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Lewis: It is. The economic and social policy of the government has created the atmosphere in which the FLQ feels strong enough to act as it is now acting, counting on much more support from members of the universities and those in the ranks of the unemployed. Hon. members shake their heads, but that does not alter the situation. That is the fact of life in Quebec. Every economist foretells that this winter unemployment in Quebec will climb to a rate of 15 per cent. This is very likely.

• (4:00 p.m.)

This is why I say to the government that no matter how many Orders in Council it may pass, there will be unrest, demonstrations and violence as a result of the economic policies it has pursued and the unemployment they have created. It is the mess created by the Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans) when he was Postmaster General, which created an environment wherein the FLQ could hope to gain sufficient sympathy from among the population as to be able to do some of the things it has done. It is the failure of the government to accomplish anything in the field of regional disparity, and the despair and frustration resulting therefrom that has created the objective conditions for disorder which no Order in Council will do away with.

The frustration of the young, the despair of the poor and the hurt of the unemployed are causing the present difficulties in Quebec, as much as anything else. The government must deal with these basic economic and social problems. Depending on this kind of Order in Council is an extremely reactionary way of settling the Quebec situation. Since when has repression solved anything? I challenge the Minister of Justice and any other spokesman for the government to give the House one single example in the history of the western world where repression has accomplished the preservation and reintroduction of order. It never has and it never will. I hope with all my heart that I am wrong, but the result of this action in Quebec will be that a good many of our young students in that province will look upon those apprehended in the middle of the night as heroes and martyrs. It will result in building a still higher and thicker wall between Ottawa and the people of Quebec.

The Minister of Justice said that this entire exercise is directed, not at all the people of Canada or all provinces of Canada but at Montreal and the province of Quebec. I say to the men in government who have just as much concern about the problem of unity in Quebec and Canada as I claim to have—and I respect their sincerity—that they have not given this matter any thought; that

they could have acted differently. They could have assisted the various law enforcement agencies in Quebec in a different way, by increasing the police forces, by amending the laws in the way I suggested, by insisting that those agencies do their job, by getting rid of any corruption there may be in some of the police forces involved—I do not refer here to the RCMP; by insisting that some of the police forces be freed of people who may have infiltrated those forces, making the work of the forces in seeking to find FLQ members difficult if not impossible.

It is not the law that has stood in the way. The Minister of Justice referred to the provisions regarding subversion, sedition and treason contained in the Criminal Code. We have referred to the section dealing with offensive weapons. There were powers in the Criminal Code that could have been used had the law enforcement agencies done their job and put their finger on the people against whom those powers could have been used. For ten years they have looked for them and have failed. No Order in Council will change that situation.

The government is able to imprison 200 or 250 or 154 people, whatever the number is. Is anyone on that side of the House sanguine enough to think that this will end that particular organization or another organization like it? Is anyone here sanguine about the possibility of this sort of thing reoccurring? I say to the members of this House that therein lies the great danger behind the kind of measure we are asked to support.

What will be the long-run effect on Canada-Quebec relations of this kind of behaviour? What will be the result on the separatists who are distinct from the FLQ? Will Mr. Levesque and the others now be able to point to Ottawa descending upon Quebec in a way that it did not descend on other parts of the country where violence has occurred, if not of the same sort as in Quebec, nevertheless violence of a sort? I am very worried about the effect of this measure on the young of Quebec, the students and the young professionals. I am worried whether this will not alienate them still further from the federal government, from federalism and from Ottawa. I am worried whether all the ills against which they have shouted for years will not now boil up in them in resentment and frustration against Ottawa and Canada as a whole.

It seems to me that every time the leader of a government or of a country takes unto himself this kind of allegedly tough line, he satisfies the ego of those in authority a great deal more than he satisfies the objectives of social needs and social conditions. That is happening in this case. I think this is a case of overreacting. It is hysteria that I think is unnecessary. Even if it were necessary to act in the middle of the night—and I do not admit that—it is not necessary beyond the next 48 hours. The government will stand tested on whether this evil and vicious measure is by Monday still on the statute books of Canada. We will then know whether the government has the sincerity, the democratic feeling and sensitivity to get rid of the measure and produce democratically laid-on-the-table legislation for this House of Commons to consider.

Invoking of War Measures Act

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to discuss proceedings for later this day. As the House knows, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) suggested that we continue to sit until we complete debate on this resolution; and that, of course, is the view of the government. The leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Douglas) suggested that the House leaders consider the matter. The best agreement we could reach was that we continue until five o'clock and resume our sitting at 7.30. At that time we will be in a better position to determine how long we shall sit this evening. I could have moved, under the rules, a motion if I had the floor in the regular way. But I am not moving that motion because I realize that if ten members want to stop me, they can. I am hopeful that by using this method we can reach agreement without a motion; I hope we can come to a mutually satisfactory arrangement.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, first may I say that undoubtedly the serious nature of this particular motion and of the action taken by the government warrants as full and exhaustive a study by the House as can be achieved, and as soon as possible. We are not unwilling to come back at 7.30. I would also confirm what the minister said, that if at that time it does appear there are a number of hon. members of the House who feel that their views on this matter should be expressed and want the opportunity to express them, obviously it would not be wise to try to sit through until the early hours of the morning or till late at night to complete the debate.

An hon. Member: Why not?

Mr. Baldwin: The government has done what it wanted. The procedures taken by the government in the form of the proclamation and the Orders in Council are before the House. No matter what this House does, the measures taken will continue in existence. If it is found possible, through an examination of hon. members who wish to participate, that the proceedings could be concluded and all questions taken dealt with, I would be happy to see this achieved. If it does not appear, because of the number of members who want to participate, that this can be done, under the circumstances we will have to review our position at 7.30. As the minister said, we can discuss it at that time.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, as the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) says, there were certain discussions among us as House leaders. However, the proposition he has now indicated varies slightly from what I thought was agreed to. We are willing that the House rise at five o'clock and come back at 7.30, but we thought it was on the understanding that we would finish this matter tonight.

We are not suggesting any cut-off or that it be concluded by nine, ten or what have you; but it does not seem to make sense for us to come back tonight if we are not

going to finish this debate. If it is going to go on and on, it might as well be set over to another day. I am not by these words saying we are not prepared to agree to this, but if we do take this supper break and then come back, we would hope it would be for the purpose of finishing this debate tonight. There are a couple of other things we might look at. We could go on to 5.30 or six o'clock instead of five o'clock. We might even consider, at some point, reducing the speeches to 30 minutes instead of 40.

An hon. Member: Oh, no.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): There is some objection to that. At any rate, I felt I should make clear what it was we had agreed to. We would prefer to stand by that agreement. Nevertheless, we are not going to stand in the way of some agreement for a sitting tonight.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, we of the Ralliement Créditiste understand the situation the government has to face and we offer our co-operation so that if possible, the debate ends early tonight.

[*English*]

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, in all fairness to the House Leader for the NDP, it is true that he did make that more extensive agreement, and I appreciate that he is ready to agree to the further proposal that I made as a result of a conversation with the official opposition House Leader. I think at the moment the best thing we can do is come back at 7.30. I am hopeful that then it will be possible to continue and, hopefully, finish tonight; but this matter will be reviewed at that time.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): May I suggest that we will agree to this on the understanding that at 7.30 we can assess the situation and not just diddle along not knowing where we are going.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There appears to be a measure of agreement between hon. members. Obviously, what we are agreed on is that we shall rise at five o'clock and return at 7.30. The suggestion is made that we then appraise the situation. I suggest we will at least have to start at 7.30 and recognize one of the hon. members who wishes to continue the debate. I should think there might be a discussion among the representatives of the parties on this matter.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Perhaps before 7.30.

Mr. Speaker: If there were no agreement then, of course, we would require unanimous consent and any member could bring the proceedings to a halt by pointing to the fact that he had not given his consent. The agreement is that we rise at five o'clock, return at 7.30 and continue, subject to unanimous agreement at that time.

Mr. Baldwin: Your Honour could issue a proclamation at 7.30.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I have paid much attention to

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

the speeches delivered in the House today. Since I am not a law expert, there are many points I will refrain from discussing and leave it to the hon. members of the Bar to bring clarification and find the best method of reaching our objectives.

Some items of the regulations submitted to the House appear odious and I do not intend to try and justify them. The thing is to ascertain whether this was the only possible action under the circumstances. If there was no other alternative and we just had to take the action we did, should we pursue it or should we resort to other measures more appropriate to the issues involved?

Moreover the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in moving the motion this morning indicated himself that the War Measures Act provided greater powers than were necessary to settle the Montreal problem. As he was the first to admit it, a series of speeches could be made stating that those powers are excessive. We agree that the act provides more powers than we need, but we do not intend to use all of them. How can this be done while avoiding the danger that, in spite of its statements, the government might misuse such powers? That is a matter that will have to be discussed.

Suffice it for me to say at the start, Mr. Speaker, that we may very soon come up with one of the formulas that may have been suggested by some hon. members, which would enable us to restore law and order in Montreal. What is the situation exactly? Have we exaggerated it? Have we over-reacted? All that, of course, rests on an assessment of the situation and knowledge of the environment. Inquiries were made on the causes of the situation prevailing in Montreal and elsewhere in the province of Quebec. They might prove valuable. However, I could make others just as valuable whose findings will be in flagrant contradiction with those I am talking about. That could be discussed ad infinitum but it will not solve the problem now existing in Montreal.

Perhaps I should have referred first to the hostages since sentimentally, emotionally and morally that was imperative. I shall therefore talk about the two persons held at gunpoint by their kidnappers.

What is the government doing to protect them? What are we doing to weaken or destroy the *Front de Libération du Québec*?

This question was raised earlier. The right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) has asked: Why did you not intervene sooner? You were aware of the situation; it was all in the book that you had in your hands. The script was there in full. What have you been waiting for? You have done nothing.

After today's debate, in spite of all our efforts to convince the hon. members opposite, in spite of the two persons whose lives depend probably on our action here and in spite of all that has happened since their abduction, we are having some difficulty in getting the House of Commons to act quickly and agree to certain measures. You can just imagine what would have happened last year if, without any request from the provincial government, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police or the provincial Sûreté du Québec, the authorities had said:

"We need emergency powers in order to bring this movement to heel".

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Some people say we have not done anything. They insist on using global expressions to impress I don't know who. But at the present time, the kidnappers demand the release of 25 members of the FLQ now in prison following their appearance before the courts. We have been told: Mr. Vallières is free and Mr. Gagnon who was refused bail for a long time by the Attorney General has been let out on bail under the laws of this country. This government is no doubt responsible for that. We have done what we could. The police have acted well. It is quite unfair to blame the government today for not doing what it should have done, considering the FLQ activities.

Before dealing with the situation proper, allow me for a few moments to analyse the causes. Why are there FLQ members in Montreal or in the province of Quebec? True enough, our friend from York South (Mr. Lewis) has readily found why: the stupidity of the government, the postal strike, a few other deficiencies in the economic area, and above all, unemployment. Those are the causes of this discontent and, obviously, we are blamed, we who came to Ottawa in good faith, and did our best to represent the citizens of Quebec, for not having succeeded in solving the problem, separatism having increased—and it may be true—from what it was when we took office.

On the other hand, the hon. member has not cared to prove that separatists would not have been still more numerous, had it not been for a group of French Canadians who came to Ottawa and pressed for recognition of the French fact all across Canada, despite antagonism, not from the hon. member for York South—I would not even want to suggest it—but despite the most tenacious opposition which was experienced from the other side of the House. And we have tried to do what we could, even for Quebec, in spite of the protests that we were acting only for Quebec, because we are in the situation we know of. People say: "You know in Quebec, it is only an economic issue. Solve the unemployment problem and the French Canadians will be satisfied!" If we take special steps to boost the Quebec economy, people say: "These people are only interested in Quebec, and they want to give Quebec privileged treatment." This is the situation in which we place ourselves—

Mr. Lewis: This is not the opinion of the New Democratic Party—

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): I did not understand, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lewis: This is not the situation of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Maybe I spoke too fast, but I definitely excluded the New Democratic Party from this matter, and therefore, it cannot be involved.

Anyway, the NDP becomes involved when it says that "the arrogance of the Prime Minister" is responsible for the birth and growth of the FLQ.

If the actual reasons for this unrest are solely those mentioned by the NDP members, namely, unemployment, slow economic growth, etc., there is no doubt the NDP should be occupying the FLQ's place in Quebec. In fact, these are goals they have long been trying to achieve honestly in Canada. It is known that the NDP is not their representative. If this is what they want, if this is where the problem lies, it is because the trouble goes deeper. And I do not understand why the hon. member for York South, who is intelligent and educated, does not see in the FLQ the expression narrow-minded and racist nationalism, and that this is the main reason for the problem. He did not mention it, merely to annoy the government a little more, no doubt. That is how the FLQ was born. It is the result of a certain form of narrow-minded racism or nationalism. Nobody is talking about that. Who is responsible for that? Is it the Prime Minister or is it the lact of understanding of some colleagues of the hon. member for York South or of some of his compatriots?

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to pursue the subject, because this would tend to shift the problem. I do not like the attempts that were made to exploit every sore spot in our society to embarrass the government at a time when it is trying to save not its own life but the Canadian state.

In my opinion, that is the only problem that remains. Everything else may be part of the normal political game and I think this is not the right time to play it. In some people, that attitude is so deep-rooted that they cannot act otherwise, and I can understand that.

The problem is whether the situation in Montreal justified drastic measures and, in the affirmative, whether the emergency was so great so as to require us to act as fast as we did.

That is the problem that came up. Mr. Speaker, I understand that those who are safe behind the Rockies or the heart of the city of Toronto have no idea of what is going on in Montreal and in the province of Quebec at the present time. Of course some people know it theoretically. Some may make sociological analyses of what goes on in Quebec. But there are other developments and hon. members should perhaps be aware of them.

At the present time in the province of Quebec the freedom is dead, people are afraid to go out, and this does apply to me, as I am no better than anyone else, nor do I have more courage. Let us put the question to all hon. members from Quebec, red or blue, and if there were NDP members they would be in the same situation too.

The members from Quebec are afraid, very often not for themselves, but for their children and for their wives. Some businessmen are in the same boat: I have met some here in Ottawa today who had run away from Montreal.

There have always been people who are threatened day in and day out in public life, that is true. I, myself, have been the object of threats. One does not die because of a threat.

But, from the moment when threats are carried out, then the danger increases. And by whom are they carried out? By two or three men with guns who have kidnapped one or two people? No, Mr. Speaker!

The situation is much more serious than that. Any person having knowledge of the FLQ organization in the province of Quebec at the present time cannot but be aware that the state of Quebec and the federal state are truly in danger in Canada.

Why? The most pessimistic say that the FLQ has some 3,000 members.

An hon. Member: More.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): I do not know if that figure is accurate but I am aware that there are quite a few.

And I know something else: these people have infiltrated every strategic place in the province of Quebec, every place where important decisions are taken, and without giving complete details let us say that at the present time they are in a position to cause the Quebec and the federal governments, as well as the city of Montreal, irreparable harm, with the support of outside organizations which are not necessarily in agreement as to the measures taken because it is well organized.

Some say: Why have you not made it illegal? That is what we are doing under these regulations, though it might not be the best solution. It is known that the FLQ is made up of cells of two or three persons each, cells that do not know each other, that do not necessarily work hand in hand and that are now in touch simply through coded messages broadcast free of charge by our radio stations. What you might think are only speeches are in fact coded messages which are sent here and there.

We are dealing therefore with a well-structured organization which is able, with the help of other organizations seeking the same objectives, to make life impossible, in the province of Quebec, for all those who do not share the ideal of the FLQ, whose primary aim is to destroy the country.

Had we failed to act today, and had separation taken place in a month or a year from now, I know quite well what would have been said in this House. Had Place Ville-Marie in Montreal been blown up someday, people would have said: "But what kind of government have we got? All that information was available to you, you could have used emergency powers and you did not do so? This is a government of incompetent men."

And when we try to do it, people say: "You over-reacted"! That's it: "You over-reacted"!

One thing is certain, Mr. Speaker—I dont know anymore than the police, probably much less—there is an organization which has thousands of guns, rifles, machine guns, bombs and about 2,000 pounds of dynamite, more than enough to blow up the core of downtown Montreal.

Those are people ready for assassination, kidnapping. All that exists in the heart of our country, at a time when the situation is already difficult, and the government would say: First of all, we shall introduce a bill for democratic discussion in the House. During that time, the culprits would get away and the police would be left in the lurch. At least this case would be treated in a democratic manner!

It is as democratic as Chamberlain's action when he went to meet Hitler in an effort to avoid the war.

An hon. Member: Come on, come on.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, there was an emergency. We deemed it to be so. I do not say that we are gods. We deemed it was so, and we believed that was the thing to do at the time.

It has been claimed that the means resorted to might be out of proportion to the objectives. The Prime Minister told you himself this morning that he was the first to recognize that. It is not my intention to dispute the fact. It has been recognized.

If there are other means to achieve the same objectives, to protect the citizens of Quebec who are also citizens of Canada and want to remain such, we do not exclude the possibility of examining proposals submitted and it may be that within a very short time we are going to find a solution that will please everyone.

We take it for granted that no one in this House condones the current events in the province of Quebec, especially what is happening within the FLQ.

I am not making a superficial speech. I do not want to suggest that some members find this funny. No one is finding this funny, I am convinced of that.

Tonight, our problem is to determine what means we should use and, whatever they are, no doubt we will be criticized. We accept it in advance. But as a government, without pleasure and rather regretfully, we have decided to use the only means available to protect ourselves against this extremely serious danger threatening the lives of a number of citizens.

If the House considers that the situation was not urgent, that a notice should have been given, that a debate should have been called in the House or that we should have waited for 48 hours, I think that we must first worry about saving democracy. Democracy cannot work when the opponents do not accept to play under the rules of democracy.

The right hon. member for Prince Albert was talking about the exchange of ideas in Canada. I entirely agree with him on this point: there cannot be any restriction on the exchange of ideas, even if the right hon. member does not like them and even if there is a separatist faction in Quebec! We were never asked to declare it illegal. This faction intends to destroy the country and its members try to reach their objective through democratic means. This is normal. We do not have to intervene. But when people refuse to play the democratic game, a government anxious to safeguard democratic institutions cannot be paralysed in the name of democracy. In my opinion, democracy in this instance would be of the wrong kind.

Some people say that this action will be tantamount to building up a wall. Even if we did accept the suggestions of the hon. member for York South, even if he had

* without giving complete details -

developed the only true democratic formula for preventing revolutionary activities, in a word, even if we did implement his solution, we would come at exactly the same results.

The FLQ members will be satisfied only after the country has been destroyed and anything that we undertake will amount to raising a barrier between them and us, there is no doubt about it.

Such is the challenge we have to meet. We do not ask that the Opposition assume responsibilities which are ours to assume, but at least please refrain from tripping us up while we are trying hard to drive the country out of this jam.

• (4:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if hon. members opposite wish to issue a proclamation to stop me from speaking now.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baldwin: The Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) has made a fiery and impassioned speech. Speeches of this quality and character, sincere as they are, taken together with the quality of the actions of the government give us cause for concern on this side of the House and should give cause for concern to all Canadians who wish to preserve the freedoms which they prize so dearly.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: The minister said there was overreaction. Let me read to the House from the Ottawa *Citizen* of today an account of what sort of action was taken under this proclamation, action which causes us to say that there cannot be overreaction on the part of opposition members or anybody else in Canada who worries very much about what could be the facts in the future. The article in the *Citizen* reads in part as follows:

A knock—then police.

The full impact of the War Measures Act was impressed upon the family of Hull doctor Georges Lebel early today as five policemen barged into his house and roused the eight members of the family out of bed.

Doctor Lebel, still shaken from the incident when interviewed hours later, said the policemen knocked at a basement door, then barged in at about 4 a.m.

They hurried upstairs, ordered everyone out of bed and told Doctor and Mrs. Lebel to gather their children in the kitchen and stay there.

Doctor Lebel's teenage daughter was sleeping behind the locked door of her room. Mrs. Lebel said a policeman asked her who was in the room and before she could answer, he kicked in the door and brusquely ordered the girl to get up and get into the kitchen.

Doctor Lebel said he was told the object of the raid was Roger Monette, an engineering student boarding in a basement room. Police went through every room in the house, emptying drawers and shelves. They even searched the Lebel's birdcage.

Doctor Lebel's daughter worked for the Parti Quebecois during the April election.

Police took PQ literature from her room.

They also took other documents from other rooms...

The police left as quickly as they had come, taking with them Monette and envelopes of literature.

They told the doctor they would be back later for another search.

P.Q.

Does the minister say, after listening to that, that we are not right in overreacting in regard to what could happen under the regulations which have been adopted? How many hundreds of times is that sentiment being repeated in the country at this time?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): How would you prefer the regulations to be applied, in order to avoid what you have mentioned?

Mr. Baldwin: If the minister stays here long enough he will hear my view. I do not intend to make partisan politics out of this matter.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baldwin: Do hon. members say that we are not right? Not only do we have the right, but we have the duty to bring before the House and before this country information on incidents of this nature.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: We do so, not when the government is bringing legislation before us but when we are being asked to give total approval to what the government has done.

An hon. Member: What proof have you of this?

An hon. Member: Do you know that what you have read is correct?

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Be quiet. If you want to make a speech, make it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. At the moment the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) has the floor.

Mr. Baldwin: I should have read from the same article that a gentleman named Cassavant was also taken. He phoned his wife this morning from the QPP headquarters in Hull. He is alleged to have told her that about 200 other persons from Hull alone were being held for questioning.

An hon. Member: Don't go away, Jean.

Mr. Aiken: The Prime Minister left a while ago.

• (4:40 p.m.)

Mr. Baldwin: The hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) asked a question which goes right to the heart of this issue. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), to give him credit, tried very bravely to answer a question that was extremely difficult for him to answer. The question put

by the hon. member for Yukon showed how difficult, how serious and how dangerous is the problem. It showed what could happen. It is like getting into quicksand—every step taken could plunge the country and the people further into the bog. Mr. Speaker, when the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) came here today, he did not even know how many people had been picked up for questioning. There was a blank in the text of his speech at that point, and he had to ask. This is the danger we face.

I have no hesitation in acknowledging that judging from my limited appreciation of the situation, something had to be done. But the questions we must ask ourselves are these: Was what was done the only thing that could have been done? Were there alternative steps which could have been taken, without taking the drastic and exceedingly dangerous step which the government has now undertaken and asks us to approve?

I agree with the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis), and I say this quite seriously, that when the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice again read the speeches which they made today—I have not had time to assess the full import of the speech made by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand)—they will see a remarkable similarity between the views and the principles they expressed and those expressed by other people throughout the history of the world who deemed it necessary to assume great, authoritarian powers.

There is no question at all, sir, that the rationalization and the justification which have been urged upon us in the speeches we have heard from the government side come dangerously close to the same, almost perverted logic which at times we have heard from those who, against the wishes of the people they have ruled, assumed dictatorial and unnecessary powers. Mr. Speaker, in that regard there has been a suggestion concerning the letter received from the province of Quebec. I listened very carefully to that letter being read. I may have missed part of it, but it did seem to me that the question about apprehended insurrection was thrown in as an afterthought.

The requests which were contained in that letter from the province of Quebec to the government of Canada included one for certain alterations in our criminal law, for certain departures from the practices which have prevailed in the past and for certain extensions of government and police rights so far as the curtailment of certain civil liberties are concerned. But the question of apprehended insurrection was thrown in as an afterthought. I raise that matter for the reason that it has been suggested that time was of the essence and that nothing else could be done. I have grave doubts about that and I shall make this clear later.

This situation reminds me of cases that I used to handle as a young lawyer representing certain municipalities during the depression instituted by the Liberal party back in the 1930s. I was often asked for an opinion as to whether a person was an indigent and entitled to assistance from a municipality. The test in such a case was sudden and urgent necessity. I am reminded of a woman who came to me—she was 8¾ months pregnant—and claimed that it was a matter of urgency and she went to hospital within the next week.

In the eloquent speech read by the Prime Minister this morning, this passage appears at page 3:

> Yet in recent years we have been forced to acknowledge the existence within Canada of a new and terrifying type of person —one who in earlier times would have been described as an anarchist, but who is now known as a violent revolutionary. These persons allege that they are seeking social change through novel means. In fact they are seeking the destruction of the social order through clandestine and violent means.

I do not necessarily quarrel with that statement, but there is a clear admission, augmented by the evidence read into the record by the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas), by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), by the hon. member for York South, and admitted by hon. members opposite who have participated in this debate, of knowledge that a situation exists and has existed for some time under which the apprehensions now felt by the government should have been known and should have been considered months ago. It is not often that a member of this House has an opportunity to quote what he said the preceding day, and I will not attempt to do it and create a precedent.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baldwin: I am not going to quote myself; I am going to paraphrase what I said. I always hope that if hon. members opposite listen to reason often enough, some day they may practise reason. So far they have not shown much indication that they know how to do that. Yesterday I said I was quite willing to accept the fact that the government must take some measures. I referred to the fact that in the United States of America the Congress of that country had just passed, and the President signed last night, a quite severe law and order measure. I referred to the War Measures Act, but I made it implicitly clear that in my view there was an onus on the government to refer to this House, for decision by it, measures of a legislative kind and that this was the way to act. I do not think the government has discharged the onus which it must accept, of indicating and proving beyond any reasonable doubt that the steps it took last night were reasonable and were the only alternative.

During the course of this grievous problem we on this side of the House have shown restraint and understanding. We have shown a willingness to co-operate within the proper definition of the discharge of our responsibilities. I am completely convinced that if yesterday, or the day before, the government had come to the leaders of the opposition parties and said to them, "Here, generally, is the information which we have. In our opinion there is a need to extend the right of the police and of the civil authorities for certain specific reasons and in certain specific ways," and if an outline of the legislation had been indicated, there would have been a willingness, certainly on the part of this party and I would like to

think I speak for all opposition parties, to accept within a reasonable period of time, within the limitation of one day, legislative changes of that kind. It is nonsense to say, as some have said, "We did not dare do that because we would have been telegraphing our intentions."

Mr. McIlraith: That is not nonsense.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, it was the worst-kept secret in the world. I was in the parliamentary library the day before yesterday and there saw some newspaper correspondents examining the War Measures Act. There is no question that if a reasonable suggestion along these lines had been made, had been conveyed to the leaders of the opposition parties and through them to the members who sit on this side of the House, there would have been a disposition to allow the government to put before the House, and have passed and become an act of Parliament, those changes which in its opinion were essential. I do not think there is any question about that.

• (4:50 p.m.)

I am very unhappy; I am most concerned about what is being done. The highways of history are littered with the debris of democracy's tattered constitutions, of those states where there have been encroachments in the same way as this government is now seeking to make encroachments upon the liberties of the people of Canada. Mr. Speaker, as one reads the terms of the War Measures Act one sees that it speaks of war, invasion and insurrection, real or apprehended. Surely we can take these phrases together and conclude from them that the intention of the Parliament of Canada in 1914 was not to include, as being susceptible of action under this act, the set of circumstances, grievous and serious though they are, which exist today in the province of Quebec.

I am convinced that this alternative which was available to the government, and which it could have acted on, would have succeeded in accomplishing what the government has now accomplished. The government's action may well result ultimately in driving deeper divisions between the peoples of Canada, as has been suggested by hon. members on this side of the House. Violence begets violence; hate breeds hate; confrontation leads to more violence, and the whole rotten and vicious circle starts its cycle again. This has been the history of a great many countries of the world during the past 20 or 30 years. I shudder to think of what may well happen as a result of the government's acting as it has.

It is not—I will repeat this, if necessary, ad nauseam—that there was no other alternative. If it could have been demonstrated, and it has been demonstrated today by any speaker on the government side of the House, that there was no reasonable alternative, I would most reluctantly have gone along with the government and said, "I will approve what you have done." But when there is this alternative and the government rejected the opportunity to exercise it, I must say it is most difficult for me to approve in total some of the exceedingly repugnant provisions contained in the Order in Council.

The government, through the Prime Minister, has indicated its willingness to discuss—I think it was the term used by the Prime Minister—with the leaders of the opposition parties the introduction of legislation. It seems to me, having in mind the news item I read and the extent to which the circumstances depicted therein may have been duplicated across large portions of the province of Quebec, that at this time, as was so eloquently stated by the Leader of the Opposition, the right hon. member for Prince Albert and members of the NDP, the government could say, "We have succeeded in achieving what we set out to do. We give notice that a minister of this government will stand up in the House today and say that on Monday the government will seek unanimous consent for the introduction of a bill setting out, in a much narrower fashion, those changes which in the opinion of the government are essential and have been discussed by members of the House."

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Baldwin: I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken):

> That the motion be amended by striking out all the words after "that" and adding the following:
>
> "the government should forthwith introduce legislative proposals to meet the conditions referred to in the motion."

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question, perhaps after Your Honour has read the amendment? The hon. member hung his case on an article in the Ottawa *Citizen* of today. Is it not true that the report says that the action to which the hon. member expressly referred was not taken under the War Measures Act?

Mr. Baldwin: The very first sentence reads:

> The full impact of the War Measures Act was impressed upon the family of Hull doctor Georges Lebel—

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Read the end of the article. Read it all.

An hon. Member: The hon. member is misleading the House.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Baldwin: I wonder if an insurrection is going on on the government side.

An hon. Member: The hon. member was misleading the House.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Peace River has proposed an amendment to the motion which is before the House. I have obvious reservations, from the procedural standpoint, about the amendment proposed by the hon. member. He will perhaps have considered himself that he is really proposing an entirely new question to the House. This, to my way of thinking, does not even look like an amendment. If the hon. member thinks he can argue the case, I will hear him and other hon. members who may wish to speak from the procedural standpoint on what has been proposed.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, we have not been given a copy of the amendment, and therefore cannot consider it.

Mr. Baldwin: I am sorry. I will send a copy over.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Make sure it is the same as the copy that was sent to Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Baldwin: I was under the impression that the hon. member could read quite well.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, may I make a suggestion? In view of what Your Honour has said on the matter put forward by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), could we not consider this matter during the dinner hour? We are to come back at 7.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members who are interested in this matter from the procedural standpoint and wish to give advice to the Chair when we resume at 7.30 p.m., will have the opportunity of doing so. After that a ruling can be given by the Chair as to whether the amendment can be put to the House.

Mr. Baldwin: I undertake to give a copy to the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) and explain it to him.

Mr. Speaker: It being five o'clock, and pursuant to the order made earlier this day, I do now leave the chair. I remind hon. members that the House will resume its sitting at 7.30 p.m.

At five o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 7.30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. When the House rose at five o'clock a point of order had been raised in connection with the proposed amendment of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). As I indicated, I am quite prepared to give a ruling now. If, as I have said, hon. members can bring forth arguments to support the proposition that this suggested amendment is acceptable procedurally, I will of course hear them.

Mr. Baldwin: In view of the fact that the child is mine and Your Honour appears to look upon him with some disfavour, I would like to comment very briefly. Recognizing that I am departing from precedents, I point out to Your Honour that the motion of the government is unprecedented, calling upon this House to give its approval to a certain type of action taken by the government and brought before the House in this way. This is a unique and unprecedented motion.

The motion I have sought to put before the House in the form of an amendment simply seeks to provide an alternative course that could be taken by the government. Your Honour may well say, and I recognize the truthfulness of the statement, that we have our right to dissent by voting against the motion. However, that does not permit us to offer for the consideration and the division of the House, what we feel is the most logical and sensible alternative. That is the unprecedented amendment which I offer to the unprecedented motion.

Mr. Speaker: Without going into the details of the situation I am sure the hon. member for Peace River, who knows so much about rules, Standing Orders and precedents, will agree that it is difficult for the Chair to accept this interesting amendment from a procedural standpoint. I indicated to hon. members before the House rose that in my view this motion brought in an entirely new proposition. I concluded that, on this basis, the amendment was not acceptable. In support of this view, I refer hon. members to Beauchesne's fourth edition, citation 203, paragraph (5) which reads:

> An amendment was ruled out because it raised a new question which could only be considered on a distinct motion after notice.

This is the suggestion I respectfully make to the hon. member at this time. I also refer hon. members to citation 202(12) which reads as follows:

> An amendment proposing a direct negative, . . . is out of order.

Hon. members realize that the way to express their disapproval of a motion before the House is to vote against it rather than to propose an amendment which is, in fact, a direct negative. I will spare hon. members other citations with which I was occupied during the dinner hour.

I am not suggesting that the motion now before the House cannot be amended. I have no doubt that it can. I certainly do not want to use the rules to prevent legitimate amendments, but in the case of this suggested amendment I respectfully submit to hon. members that it cannot be put at this time.

Mr. MacEachen: I believe Your Honour suggested that we ought to decide our course of action as soon as possible on resuming business at 7.30. I have had consultations with the other House leaders. In order to provide a maximum opportunity for members who wish to speak, to provide a definite time for a vote, and to give certainty on that, as well as to recognize the urgency of the subject matter, the House leaders propose the following arrangements to the House.

The House will sit tonight until ten o'clock and then adjourn until eleven o'clock tomorrow morning. Tomorrow, we will rise for lunch and resume at two o'clock. There will be routine proceedings tomorrow as usual. We will continue in the afternoon until every member who wishes to speak has had an opportunity to do so. Following that, we will adjourn until Monday. The vote will be the first item of government business on Monday. There will be no further speeches at that time.

Monday will be regarded as the fifth appointed day for the Address in Reply. I believe that will give every member an opportunity to speak. There will be a certainty as to when the division will take place on this impor-

tant issue. It will assure the people of Canada that members have expressed their opinion immediately and have taken a vote on the matter at an early date.

• (7.40 p.m.)

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, the President of the Privy Council has accurately summed up the views of the House leaders. That seems to be a resumé of the feeling of the hon. members. I endorse fully what he says. An hon. member who feels he has a view to express on this most important subject should not be deprived from doing so.

On the question of the vote, I repeat that in the light of commitments which may well have been made for Saturday, the vote should not be taken until Monday in the circumstances which the President of the Privy Council has indicated. Tomorrow, we should have a question period to make up for the one we magnanimously gave up today.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, the President of the Privy Council has correctly outlined the points on which as House Leaders we reached agreement a short while ago and we are happy to support this order at this time. There is one point which might be underlined—maybe it was stated, but, if so, I did not hear it. It was understood as part of our agreement that when the debate on this motion ends tomorrow it will be deemed that a recorded vote is to be held on Monday, whether or not there are sufficient members here at the time the debate ends to ask for a recorded vote. In other words, it is part of the order to which we are agreeing now that there is to be a recorded vote on this motion as the first item of government business on Monday.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Speaker, we agree with the suggestions made by the President of the Privy Council.

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): May I just ask one question, Mr. Speaker? At what time are we sitting on Monday under these arrangements?

Mr. MacEachen: I expect we shall sit at eleven o'clock on Monday and deal with routine proceedings, then take the vote as the first item on government orders. Then, we shall call the debate on the address and it will be regarded as another appointed day.

Mr. Baldwin: Would the President of the Privy Council be good enough to tell us upon what day the next vote will be taken in connection with the debate on the address?

Mr. MacEachen: I think it will be on Tuesday.

Mr. Speaker: I shall not attempt to repeat the details of the proposals which appear to have been agreed upon by hon. members. I think a reading of *Hansard* will probably indicate what it is we have agreed upon. I shall perhaps seek authority to publish tomorrow an abbreviated Order Paper, one which would contain only government orders and routine proceedings. As hon. members know, there is a backlog of private members' motions and it would complicate the lives of many people were we to attempt to publish the usual Order Paper tomorrow. I suggest we have an abridged Order Paper for tomorrow's sitting.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy LeBlanc (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, I was wondering what could be my role in this debate, in my capacity as member for Rimouski, especially when speaking after ministers and members both from the government and the opposition side, and I concluded it was the role of a Quebec backbencher who believes that he has been elected not to destroy Canada, but to bring about the Canadian ideal.

It is useless to insist on the fact that the situation is serious, and that some adventurers, citizens of Canada, want to destroy our country, beginning with the province of Quebec. It is clear that what is being sought is to deprive Canadian citizens of their freedom.

Free member of Parliament elected by free citizens, I shall endeavour in the next few minutes to say briefly what my fellow citizens of the riding of Rimouski and a good number of other Quebecers think and want.

Most of my electors in the riding of Rimouski are happy with the step taken by the government of Canada to enable Canada to keep its good name with regard to freedom. When I speak of the majority of my electors, I think not only of those who have voted for me, but also of numerous personal friends, even amongst the Progressive Conservatives in the riding who would have been grieved by the woolly attitude of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Stanfield) during the debate today. I could say the same about the friends I have among the Creditistes in the riding of Rimouski.

As for those we call separatists, independentists or members of the FLQ who always feel they respect freedom, they refused to take advantage of certain rights inherent in freedom by failing to exercise their right to vote.

My fellow citizens of the riding of Rimouski, like most Quebecers, are dynamic members of the Canadian society, because they are honest, responsible and efficient, not because they speak up loudly; on the contrary, they are called "the silent majority".

• (7:50 p.m.)

In my opinion, dynanism is not only a matter of loud and forceful words but of results. Those serious and honest people work every day to make a success of their careers and to help Canada grow. What do they want? I can say that as a member of Parliament I have the same ambition, although it may appear more radical. We all think, however, that this is not the appropriate time to express lofty thoughts. We should not be wasting our time stating our views however inspiring they may be; the time has come to act in order to get concrete results

that the Canadian population, and particularly that of Quebec, has been waiting for.

The people want a progressive Canada and, most of all, the unmasking of all subversive organizations in Quebec as well as their elimination.

In view of the great number of letters and messages that I have been receiving from my constituents for a long time now but particularly today, I must at least mention one fact with regard to the CBC. All the people who have contacted me have stated that the CBC was very partial in giving free publicity to the conspirators and revolutionaries who think they are with it. In fact, to use some of their favorite expressions, the time has come to bring the CBC into line and to put an end to its partisan system of information which shows total disregard for our society.

We must first grant as much authority as possible to our police force. Then the government of the province of Quebec and the government of Canada should shoulder their full responsibilities in order to neutralize these parallel powers.

What has been decided upon during the night and what we are now debating, that is the War Measures Act, is what the people want in order to live in peace and see the troublemakers brought to heel.

Like my fellow-citizens, if I had had any illusions left, I would have lost them today upon hearing some opposition spokesmen. Responsible citizens believed, I am sure, that, on such a day as this, hon. members, because of the very serious circumstances, should have been of one mind to ensure peace and order in Canada. One should not seek order as such but one should seek freedom. However, without order, there can be no freedom. Our aim, it may be stated, is freedom within order.

For his part, the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette), leader of the Ralliement créditiste, deserves our congratulations.

I do not want to become a flatterer but in fact he behaved as a convinced and earnest citizen of Quebec and we can say that he did us proud.

Some hon. Members: As always.

Mr. LeBlanc (Rimouski): As far as the hon. members for the New Democratic Party are concerned, several people including myself, after reading the newspapers and listening to the news tonight, at least in eastern Canada, will certainly be disappointed and those who still had any illusions will lose them.

In my opinion, through the voice of its leader, the New Democratic Party has showed itself in an unfavourable light. The first spokesman for the New Democratic Party said, for instance, that the government overreacted to a critical situation. We know that our voters do not share this opinion at all.

At a time where we should try to keep cool, not to lose our heads in order to consider things just as they are, the spokesmen for the New Democratic Party attempted to arouse passion in a true election speech.

[Mr. LeBlanc (Rimouski).]

I was reading recently—as I said not too long ago—that statesmen—and the leader of the New Democratic Party should certainly be considered as such—should think less of the next election and more of the future of their country. If we consider the stand taken by the leader of the New Democratic Party, we find that he did not behave today as a statesman but as a politician or rather a "petty politician". He was even bold enough to talk about ownership and, in my opinion, the leader of this party and his group do not show too much respect for private ownership. He contradicted himself.

You should not condemn a man for his ideas, he said. This is a truism because a man's ideas are intangible. If somebody voices seditious ideas on television, I do not know what they are if they are not acts.

He went so far as claiming that had he been in the shoes of the FLQ leaders, and should that organization take office, he would have first gotten rid of the elected representative he referred to this afternoon.

What is his approach to freedom? The fight against air, water and land pollution are among today's topics. One of my friends talked recently about the pollution of brains and minds.

As we often forget the true sciences of man in all our activities, it would be perhaps advisable to speak here of pollution of the mind, and, from what we have noted today, if there is a nucleus of mind polluters here in Canada, I think that it is to be found among the members of the New Democratic Party which has changed its name several times since its foundation.

As far as the Leader of the Official Opposition is concerned, he too has been disappointing. His colleagues from Quebec have been somewhat saddened by his attitude, because we know that, whatever decision is taken, the Quebecers who are concerned for their freedom wish to see a statesman such as the Leader of the Official Opposition take a clear-cut position.

His speech today was vague. He has referred to several things without taking any stand.

I think that my friends from the constituency of Rimouski who had placed their confidence in the hon. leader of the opposition a couple of years ago would be disappointed to see his comportment today. Electors from the riding of Rimouski and Quebecers in general want the government to take a positive and concrete view in these painful hours. They know that some Quebecers have tried to turn to their advantage the problems of the unemployed, of other workers and of low-wage earners. We are aware of those problems and so is the government, but we all want, with the government to work honestly and actively at their solution without destroying anything. They note that some of these revolutionists, these adventurers, who have nothing to lose because they were never able to earn anything, endeavoured to corrupt our youth before they could satisfy their thirst for power only. They made false representations to our workers, making them believe that the government would give them everything, all cooked on a silver platter.

Same thing for our farmers: their leaders delude them in the same manner as union leaders delude workers and

as some leaders of the Quebec Farmers Union deceive the farmers. My friends can understand that we, on the contrary, want to give workers, farmers and small-wage earners the means to help themselves. How proud of them we are!

In order to strive for progress, my fellow citizens do not use the same means as the fomenters of sedition of the FLQ. They want to make a success of their case and to further Canada's development by working honestly, trying to teach their children to look truth and to respect the best rules of life possible. They are also in favour of freedom, but they do not want tolerance.

As I said earlier, there is no freedom without order or rules. It is said that Parliament is the forum where we can express our freedom, but without order, discipline, procedural rules, we would not be free. Thus, when the Speaker asks a member to resume his seat, does he infringe on the freedom of the latter? Not at all, he protects the rights of the majority as well as those of the minority. Long live freedom in order and discipline!

Evidently, it does not do to be fanatical about order. It should be applied kindly, and primarily sensibly.

We all know in Quebec that we are Canadian citizens. It is true that we want to retain our identity but some people waste our time when they insist so much on constitutional problems and I will even go as far as to say language problems. Proud as I may be of the language I speak, my mother-tongue which I am anxious not to lose and which no one, I hope, will cause me to lose, each value should be put in its proper place on the scale of values.

We want to retain our identity because we are aware of being part of the Canadian family and want to continue doing so.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude my remarks I should like to indicate that I have described my fellow citizens in Quebec to the best of my knowledge. I can assure the House that they are proud of being Canadians and I shall try to state more briefly what they wish and what they think. As they do, I believe that the government though essential, is not everything. It should be noted that each individual in a democracy must belong to the elite, and my fellow citizens as well as all the Quebec members join me in support of the right honourable Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). We consider that he has done his duty. We congratulate him and we are basically happy with what he has accomplished.

Of course some distasteful things have to be done, but they are dictated by the present circumstances. We are against war. We are in favour of peace, but when we must defend ourselves, we must be prepared for war. We are all standing behind the right hon. Prime Minister and the government in order that Canada remain a country of freedom and order.

• (8:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege which I am required to do at the first available opportunity during a sitting when an issue has come up which entitles an hon. member to rise.

During the course of my speech to the House this afternoon I quoted from an article which appeared in the Ottawa *Citizen* of today's date. At the conclusion of my speech, the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) intimated that I had misquoted the article. In fact, some hon. member from the opposite side said I was misleading the House. At the time I had before me a photostatic copy of the particular article and I hesitated to impose my views because sometimes a photostatic copy does not include the entire article. The minister indicated I had not read the last part.

I have before me now the article. It is precisely as I indicated it was and the wording is the same. It indicates beyond any doubt at all that all of the operations that are referred to by the police were conducted under the present provisions of the War Measures Act which is now in force.

An hon. Member: What is your page number?

Mr. Baldwin: The page is number 3. What the minister was referring to was an article which appeared on the front page which indicated at the conclusion that the Ottawa police had not taken any action under this particular proclamation. I thought I should make that position clear at this time.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The Chair does not pretend to be a judge on such occasions as this, but because of the importance of the debate now taking place this might be an appropriate opportunity for the Chair to bring to the attention of hon. members citation No. 113 in the fourth edition of Beauchesne which reads in part as follows:

> But a dispute arising between two members, as to allegation of facts, does not fulfil the conditions of parliamentary privilege.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, Canada is now going through difficult times and I think Quebecers should express their views on the measure now before the House.

As several members have said today, the legislation under study cannot appeal to any member since Canada has always had the reputation abroad of living in a true democracy.

When, in the light of facts, the government decides to resort to such exceptional measures, it is because the situation is most serious.

Should we repeat that the measure before us involves the granting of extraordinary powers to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his cabinet? These powers can even restrict freedom of speech, of the press and of association or assembly. But as a member of this House, am I in a position to judge of the advisability for the government to bring this legislation before us, when I realize that the government must know much more than I do on the present situation.

Some speakers today took pleasure in attacking the government about certain social and economic conditions existing in Quebec which they blame for the situation now prevailing in our province. Obviously, this is choosing the easy way.

We cannot ask that those who live outside Quebec be fully aware of what is going on presently in our province, and I express the wish that our fellow members from the other provinces will never have to live through an ordeal like the one we French Canadians are experiencing in Quebec at the moment. Now, it is Quebec's turn, but maybe in a week, in a month from now, it will be the turn of Ontario or of any other province.

Obviously, the younger generation in Quebec is far from satisfied with the social security programs, or with the political system. Obviously, changes are called for in the province of Quebec as in other provinces. I have often said so. The young people want governments to do something. They no longer want to get involved in an obsolete structure, the Canadian Constitution. The majority of young Quebecers want to stay within Confederation, provided they are recognized by our English-speaking colleagues as equal partners in this great country of ours.

Have we, members of Parliament, done anything to reassure them in that regard? Amending or redrafting the Constitution is taking too much time. Decision-making in the fields of social security and political mechanisms is being delayed. Knowing very well the temperament of our young people, I am aware that they are restless, that they want change and progress. They protest and most of them protest objectively. In Quebec some professional agitators have no respect whatever for democracy and take the opportunity to stir up university students and organize demonstrations similar to the one we watched last night on television. 3,000 young people gathered to discuss the present situation in Quebec and unscrupulous people, one of whom was Michel Chartrand, lectured them and stirred them up to agitation.

As Canadian parliamentarians, we have our responsibility in the crisis Quebec is going through at the present time.

Our immigration regulations have not been strict enough for one thing. We have admitted from Algeria people who have come here to preach revolution. We have also admitted Cubans who have come to set up Maoist groups in Montreal, Quebec and Trois-Rivières, because this is a democracy and we must respect freedom of speech. In so doing, we have been remiss through our failure to assume our responsibilities.

It is useless to cry. Even if we could correct our past mistakes, our task now is to build for the future and to restore in our country the respect for authority of people who wish to live under a truly democratic system.

The government has decided to adopt emergency measures and we are considering them now.

This afternoon the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) admitted quite frankly that this measure granted the government much greater

powers than were needed to control the situation in Quebec. It is true.

• (8:10 p.m.)

It is true and as a lawyer I should think, first, that this measure which is going to be applied for six months and a half, will perhaps reduce for too long civil liberties of our fellow citizens. The danger I should like to point out to the House is that the government has that power in its hands. Who will use it, if not the police? How will they use the means put at their disposal by the government in order to control the situation?

Here is where the danger lies, Mr. Speaker. Because of that, maybe, innocent people who have nothing to do with the FLQ will pay for those who support a measure such as the one taken today by the government.

Some families will be searched, even though they have nothing to do with the FLQ in Quebec, because it is an emergency measure.

My leader was asking the government today, in an objective manner, to apply these urgency measures on a temporary basis. He also asked the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) to introduce as soon as possible amendments to the Criminal Code sections dealing with sedition and kidnapping. He was then merely suggesting amendments to the measure in order to give back to citizens the civil liberties that this measure tends to remove.

Mr. Speaker, such is the position that my leader took today on this important issue. Naturally, dishonest newsmen will say tonight, as they have done during the day, that the Progressive Conservative party through its leader supported the subversive movements in Quebec. I say those people are in bad faith because what the leader of the Progressive Conservative Party wanted to point out to the government is that implementation of these measures has been solicited for a period of six and a half months and that our leader, considering this to be too long, would wish to see other means taken.

The Minister of Justice could introduce in the House amendments to the Criminal Code in order to achieve the objectives the government set when deciding to adopt this emergency measure. That is what the Progressive Conservative Party is requesting of the government through this evening's amendment.

I repeat that we parlementarians should have a feeling of guilt because of the present situation in Quebec. Today, the situation which has prevailed in Quebec for close to 15 days has been clearly outlined.

Of course you cannot expect that people who live in British Columbia be aware of that situation. But, Mr. Speaker, we know that our people live in an atmosphere of terror and fear.

Some public men receive anonymous calls or blackmail threats. The terrorists will try by any means to spread panic among the people.

Unfortunately, I think that subversive forces in Quebec are better organized than we think. As a matter of fact, the Quebec Labour Minister was abducted a week ago and a British diplomat was kidnapped more than ten

days ago, and neither the provincial police nor the police force of the city of Montreal nor the RCMP, who work as a whole, have been able to find the hostages. Where have they been hidden? We do not know yet. That is evidence that the revolutionaries are well organized, which is very serious. Mr. Speaker, I think that extraordinary measures have to be taken...

Some hon. Members: This is what we have done.

Mr. Asselin: I am not giving you hell; let me finish my sentence.

I said that extraordinary measures have to be taken to reestablish order and peace in the province of Quebec and renew the people's confidence in our democratic system.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Asselin: I do not wish either to congratulate Quebec's silent majority. The people remain silent. They leave it to the politicians to untangle the problems we are experiencing. Most Quebecers agree that Quebec and Canada can continue to live in a democratic system.

When do we see people taking to the streets to support those responsible to maintain order and peace in Quebec and in Canada? It is total silence.

This evening, I appeal specially to the silent majority in Quebec. It is its duty, to show massively to those who have the responsibility to order and peace, that it is with them and disapprove of the acts of subversion now being committed in Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, I know that many other hon. members wish to speak in this debate. Before I conclude my remarks, I express the wish that the enforcement of the measure before us will only be temporary and will be replaced by another one through an amendment to the Criminal Code. I fully support the leader of my party and my colleagues, who have called for such an amendment. If a motion along those lines is introduced, I, as a Quebecer and as someone who is seeking respect for order and authority, will vote in favour of that motion.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Mr. Jacques Guilbeault (Saint-Jacques): Mr. Speaker, first of all I wish to congratulate as warmly as possible the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Asselin). His words and particularly the position he has taken, clearly identify him as a member from the province of Quebec who understands the serious problems now facing Canada, and especially Quebec.

I would ask the hon. member for Charlevoix and his three Progressive Conservative colleagues from the province of Quebec to talk to the other members of their party and bring home to them what the situation is in the province of Quebec, so that when the question is put they will not be the only ones to speak with the voice of reason, but the whole opposition along with them.

Mr. Speaker, rather than make a bombastic speech leading nowhere this morning, the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Standfield) should have immediately given the floor to his colleagues from the province of Quebec, for they can appreciate fully what is taking place in their province and will know which way to vote when the motion is put.

Mr. Speaker, I was disgusted today when I heard the member for Peace River, (Mr. Baldwin) read from the *Ottawa Citizen* a melodramatic story telling of a family being awakened and a bird cage searched. I have always respected and trusted the member for Peace River. He is a serious man, steady and experienced. But, when in a debate as serious as this one is, he introduces sentimental and futile arguments like that one, I wonder what to think.

Mr. Speaker, we have had, in the ranks of the New Democratic Party, dedicated defenders of the rights of the individual, but I imagine that today's spectacle will continue later when one of its members is recognized. Still, I should like all hon. members to understand that when we come to a decision later on, we will have to decide on the suspension of individual rights. We all realize that whether or not we like it, individual rights will be suspended temporarily, and it is up to us to decide whether they will be suspended by an order of the government, or by the activity of the terrorists in Quebec. That is the choice we must make. We will suspend them through the legality of an act adopted by this House, or we will allow the terrorists in Quebec to suspend them in their own way.

We will also have to choose between the rights of the individual or collective rights. We may be violating individual rights by granting greater powers to the police forces; this doubtless will annoy some people. But, are not the collective rights of the people to live in peace, harmony, free from fear, more important than sparing a few individuals the annoyance of being awakened in the morning? That is the whole question.

To my mind—and I say this sincerely—the harmful effects of the legislation the government put before us will be very limited. Indeed, who is afraid of being disturbed by the police, if not that ¼ per cent of the Quebec people who live outside the law and pursue the aims and objectives of the FLQ.

• (8:30 p.m.)

As for me, I am not afraid of the police force. I am sure that my honest neighbours, the citizens of my riding who lead a normal life will not be inconvenienced by such measures. Of course, those who live in cells, who attempt to destroy our society, who are plotting, I am sure, while we are discussing, are inconvenienced and cry that their civil rights are being violated. However, common sense tells us that the majority of Canadians were expecting some action on our part, a positive action. Well, the time has come. Whether we extend the debate for two three or four days, the people expect Canadian parliamentarians to restore law and order in Canada.

Before closing, I should like to read an excerpt of the editorial published in *La Presse*, in this morning's edition. We can read the following, and I quote:

For the second time in one year, the army has been called out in Montreal. These two interventions of the army prove, in the

last analysis, that there can be no lasting authority without force.

The purpose of any civilization is to delay the outbreak and the use of force; to replace force by words, that is to say by the law and negotiation within the law. But when words have become meaningless, through too much lies; or when they have been replaced by machine-gun and dynamite, force must be used. A disciplined and visible force is better than an invisible and lawless force.

Is authority necessary or not in a society? The answer is simple: It is necessary.

[*English*]

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, when a democratic country faces a threat, a crisis, from any external or internal enemy it has to balance two things, the safety of the state on the one side and the rights and liberties of the individual on the other. Even in time of full scale war, worldwide war, it has been found necessary, if not popular, in countries that cherish freedom, to ensure in the process of seeking to safeguard freedom that freedom is not undermined. The real question that faces this House is, where does the balance lie?

I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the government in proceeding to proclaim the War Measures Act has gone far beyond any reasonable balance and unwittingly has endangered the rights and the liberties of Canadians in a manner and in a degree far beyond that required to meet the present crisis. What, I ask the House, has the government in fact done? It has invoked the application of the War Measures Act. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) in his speech this afternoon sought to play down—

An hon. Member: What did Ed Schreyer say?

Mr. Brewin: I am not interested in what Ed Schreyer said. I am speaking in this House on my own responsibility. I do not know what he said. I would request members of the House during this debate, which is an important one, to listen rather than inject senseless questions.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. I wish to bring to the attention of hon. members that the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) has the floor.

Mr. Brewin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I can claim also to have had enough experience that I might be able to say something that is new, and impart some knowledge to some of the members of the House who have not had the same experience. I suggest that for a change they listen. I was saying that in his speech the Minister of Justice sought to play down the importance of the proclamation of the War Measures Act. What he, in fact, suggested was that all we were faced with were the regulations that were passed under the authority of the War Measures Act. I suggest that that is not the case, and that the proclamation of the Act by itself has tremendous consequences.

It confers vast, almost unlimited powers on the executive or the government of the country. It has never before been invoked except in the midst of worldwide war in which civilization as a whole was threatened. Let us consider what the proclamation of the War Measures Act enables the government to do. First of all, that proclamation suspends the constitution of the country. We are at this moment without any fundamental law. The constitution which governs the affairs of this Parliament and country is temporarily suspended because of the proclamation of the emergency. Secondly, the proclamation enables the federal government to override provincial legislatures and provincial legislation. I am rather surprised that so many who in this House proclaim themselves to be the champions of provincial rights, and who are loud in their defence of provincial rights, should remain silent at the wholesale invasion of provincial rights which is involved in the proclamation of the War Measures Act in peacetime.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would be kind enough to permit a question.

Mr. Brewin: Certainly.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Is the minister seeking the floor for the purpose of asking the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) a question?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I understand the hon. member had yielded the floor.

Mr. Lewis: He has courteously agreed to answer.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Does the hon. member not agree that although the War Measures Act potentially confers a great deal of power upon the government, this power is only exercised by regulation? Should one not turn to the regulation to see what power is being exercised?

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, I do not accept that argument. I have a copy of the War Measures Act in front of me and it says that the Governor General in Council—I suppose the Governor General in Council usually acts by regulation—may authorize such acts and things and make from time to time such orders and regulations, and so on.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): "May."

Mr. Brewin: Of course, it is only permissive. But I point out to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) that the government does not have to operate by regulation. Let me repeat what I have said. The Governor in Council, which means the cabinet or the executive, has authority under the War Measures Act to do almost anything it likes, including the setting aside of provincial legislation and invading the fields of the provincial legislatures. I am pointing out that is rather a drastic power. I am rather surprised we have not heard anything about it—

An hon. Member: What imagination!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): When did the hon. member wake up?

Mr. Brewin: I will deal with the question of imagination later. I intend to show that these powers have actu-

ally been exercised by governments here. No effort of imagination is required to demonstrate what has been done under the War Measures Act by governments of this country which, incidentally, were of the same political stripe as the present government.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Hear, hear!

Mr. Brewin: The third result of the proclamation of the War Measures Act is this: the Bill of Rights has been torn up. We do not have an effective Bill of Rights at present, by reason of this proclamation. Some think that the government's regulation is reasonably restrained. I do not think it is very restrained. For the time being, at any rate, the Bill of Rights is torn up by this proclamation of the act. Also, Mr. Speaker, the proclamation of the act jeopardizes freedom of speech and freedom of assembly for all Canadians from one end of Canada to the other. The effect of the proclamation of the War Measures Act is this: it authorizes internment and imprisonment without trial; it enables the wholesale confiscation of property; it even authorizes the deportation or exile of Canadian citizens.

It is claimed by some that this may be an exaggerated account of what can be done under the War Measures Act or what is enabled to be done by its proclamation. My answer is that it is precisely those powers which have been exercised in the past under the War Measures Act. Some hon. members of the House may be too young to know the facts personally, or they may not have read about them. I had the experience of representing the Japanese Canadian community at the end of the last war. By Order in Council passed under the War Measures Act, Canadian citizens of the Japanese race were ejected from their homes, deprived of their property, herded into relocation or internment camps and, finally, subjected to exile or deportation from the country. All this was done by Order in Council under the War Measures Act, without there being any suggestion that these people had been guilty of any act of sabotage or disloyalty.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): But the Order in Council had to be passed to bring that regulation into force.

Mr. Brewin: Indeed, it was passed. If I may make a personal comment here, I think that is one of the most shameful episodes in Canadian history. It was passed by the government. Finally, the government rescinded its own order when public opinion caught up with the iniquity of that legislation.

Mr. Woolliams: A Liberal government did that.

Mr. Brewin: That is right. This brings me to the crucial point of my remarks. The powers of the government, once the proclamation has been carried into force, are so sweeping and so liable to abuse that they should only be called into play if necessary. I understood the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to recognize this in what he said.

In expressing his own anxiety about the matter, I think the Minister of Justice spoke about the distasteful step which had been taken. The Prime Minister recognized that such sweeping power should be invoked only in cases of clear necessity. As I recall it, the Prime Minister in his speech said that circumstances dictated the use of the War Measures Act. He said there was no alternative. Mr. Speaker, I challenge that assertion.

There would have been no difficulty in meeting the challenge of the FLQ and meeting the request of the government of Quebec and the city of Montreal by strengthening the existing law by act of Parliament. That could have been done. That was a clear alternative and was infinitely preferable to what the government has seen fit to do. The members of this party and the official opposition have made it abundantly clear that they would have facilitated amendments to the Criminal Code to authorize more widespread and effective means of search in this emergency than the present law allows. We have approved the government's unwillingness to meet the outrageous demands of the kidnappers.

I now want to say a word about the regulations which have been passed. The regulations have been passed with speed. I suggest they are overzealous and ineffective. One of the main provisions in the regulations is the banning of organizations declared to be illegal. I suggest that is a futile gesture. We have had experience of doing just that under the War Measures Act. During the last war the communist party was declared illegal. What was the result? That drove them underground. It made them seem the champions of oppressed groups and enabled them to emerge after the war stronger than they had ever been in the history of Canada. I think you have to trust people a little. We in this party are in favour of banning lawless acts, but we are not in favour of banning dangerous thought. Suppressing thought and freedom of expression and association has never been effective. The only effective way to deal with grievances is to remove their causes.

I have spoken, Mr. Speaker, of the effect of this measure on the fundamental rights and liberties of all Canadians and the extent to which they are endangered by the government's action. What worries me as much, or even more, is the direction the legislative blunderbuss that is being used in this case is pointing. It is directed at one province. I fear the result of this. It will bring about the further alienation of people of good will in that particular province.

I have always believed that one of the first duties of the members of this House is the fostering of the unity of Canada and the fostering of good will and understanding between the peoples of all Canada. I fear, Mr. Speaker, that this legislative intervention will in the long run have a counterproductive effect. I know that the government claims it is responding to the request of the government of Quebec and the city of Montreal. But did those authorities really ask for the suspension of the constitution? Did they ask for the legislative blunderbuss that is being presented to us? Did they actually mention the War Measures Act? In the long run, will the people in that province welcome this particular type of intervention? I venture to suggest that they will not.

Invoking of War Measures Act

• (8:50 p.m.)

Parliament's chief and most glorious function is to be the watchdog of freedom. If Parliament surrenders this role, it abdicates its chief function. Freedom in security is worth fighting for. Freedom depends upon continued vigilance against encroachments on freedom, whether real or apprehended. Freedom does not depend on force, not on the severity of laws in the face of dissatisfaction, but on the ability of government to remedy the abuses that have created the dissatisfaction.

I suppose that the party system and the attitudes, particularly of government members, are such that it will be quite useless to appeal to them to change their minds and not support this particular resolution. We know this resolution will be accepted no matter how firmly the opposition does its duty to oppose what we think is an unwarranted encroachment on the rights of citizens of this country. I urge the government to demonstrate its good faith, concern for freedom and sensitivity to the supremacy of Parliament by rescinding the application of the War Measures Act and this proclamation with its wide and dangerous consequences, which I and other speakers have outlined, as soon as possible and to substitute a law to be passed by Parliament which can meet, rather than exacerbate, the crisis that Canada faces today.

Mr. Norman A. Cafik (Ontario): Before getting to the primary remarks that I have in mind, Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment on the observations of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin). I have in front of me a copy of the War Measures Act. I do not say that the hon. member has deliberately misled the House, but I interpret this Act in a different way. The hon. member stated that these broad and far-ranging powers are in fact in force now. I quote from the act as follows:

(1) The Governor in Council may do and authorize such acts and things, and make from time to time such orders and regulations,—

The act goes on to provide:

(2) All orders and regulations made under this section shall have the force of law, and shall be enforced in such manner—

I contend that to say we have passed the War Measures Act in such a broad way as the hon. member has outlined is simply and totally false.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cafik: This act can only be interpreted in a reasonable way. I suggest we have to look at the act. It clearly states that the regulations are what will go into effect. These regulations are what was tabled in this House today. I suggest that comments which go beyond the range of those regulations are irrelevant and that it is silly to present them at this time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cafik: It has been suggested by some hon. members that some, if not all, members on this side of the House have no respect for personal rights and liberties. I think I speak for members on both sides of this House when I say that we all have a great and abiding concern for individual rights and freedoms.

[Mr. Brewin.]

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cafik: I do not subscribe to the view that the state is supreme over the individual. Quite the contrary. None the less, I feel very strongly that no man is allowed to exercise his freedom and rights in such a way as to deny those same rights to the collective group of Canadians. I further suggest that this is the situation we have before us. The FLQ traitors and bandits are threatening to take the lives, and indeed have taken the lives, of individual citizens in this country. If we do not act in a responsible, quick and efficient manner, we are not fulfilling our obligations as members of this House or members of this government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cafik: Every one of us can surely make a not too subtle distinction between freedom and licence. Licence gives the right to do anything without any consideration being given to its effect upon others. Freedom does not give that right. Freedom implies obligations and duties. Freedom is a sham if it does not allow other people the same freedom that we want for ourselves.

We cannot defend freedom by destroying it. There are always dangers. I agree with the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in his statement that this is an act he would have preferred not to bring forward, but the situation before us demands that kind of positive action to protect the people of this country. No nation which lacks the courage to defend itself deserves to survive. In fact, in our troubled times I suggest it would not survive. We live in an age of violence. Violence exists to some extent here and abroad because we have not been careful enough to preserve these basic rights in the past. Far too often we have mollycoddled those people who have been willing to deny us our fundamental rights and have not defended ourselves against them. It is damn well time we did.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cafik: I believe this proclamation is necessary, and indeed essential, to protect the civil liberties of all Canadians, not to destroy them. It is an interim measure. As soon as possible I hope we will take other steps in order to have permanent laws and regulations in order to safeguard ourselves at all times. I do not know how in this moment of crisis we could have acted otherwise. The element of surprise was absolutely essential. That quality could never have been fulfilled had we listened to the advice of opposition members presented here today. How could we act differently than we did when the Premier of one of our great provinces asked that we act immediately so that his province could be protected? How could we not listen to him and the mayor of Montreal when they outlined the urgency of the situation? How can we do otherwise than give them the power to protect the people they represent? We could not remain helpless in the face of this treachery. We had to act, and we did.

We must use whatever lawful means are at our disposal to crush these bandits and common criminals who would destroy our nation. I further suggest that no person in this country need fear the loss of civil liberties except those who are trying to deny the rest of us those same liberties. The kidnappings were unfortunate. God knows, we are all praying that these men will come out of this situation alive. It is unfortunate that it took this tragedy to precipitate us into action and to realize how serious and dangerous the situation has become. In my view we have no right to spend the public's hard-earned money, garnered through taxation, to support and encourage certain of the means of communication in this country to subvert our own people. I do not think it takes much imagination, when you turn on a television set or a radio set, to know what I am talking about.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cafik: We see these people subsidized as they spread their voices of hate across this nation. We recently set up a Committee on Pollution to clean up our rivers, streams and air. Surely to God we can do something to clean up the filth that is being passed into the minds of those who live in this country by those who would subvert us.

I suggest that the government give serious consideration to the passage of a special act in this Parliament. For want of a special name I would entitle it the "Security of the Nation Act." It would clearly set out what lies before those who would try to destroy us, so that they would know their rights and we would know what powers we had to deal with them. Such an act ought to be introduced into the House and debated, with everyone having a chance to express his view.

I further suggest that the government give consideration to the following ideas in connection with the act to which I have referred. First, I believe capital punishment should be reintroduced and made applicable to anyone who blackmails the state, its elected officials or those who are entrusted with the enforcement of the law, such as magistrates and judges. Second, capital punishment should be the penalty for kidnapping and hijacking which endangers the lives of human beings. Third, it should apply to bombing or other acts of violence directed against the state where danger to human life is involved. Fourth, we should deport those who come to this country to encourage the commitment of any of the offences to which I have referred.

I do not think we can afford to tolerate those who advocate political violence in this country if they are not Canadian citizens. Indeed, I wonder whether such people should be tolerated even when they are Canadian citizens. Fourth, I believe that those who belong to associations which advocate the use of violence for political purposes should be regarded as having committed a criminal offence, the penalty for which is a minimum of five years in jail. Fifth, I believe that special powers should be provided in any such act to enable law enforcement officers to deal with insurrection in an effective way. This would not be easy, because this section of the legislation would make permanent such things as arrest without a charge being preferred, and so on. Perhaps this section should only be implemented on the orders of the Governor in Council. Sixth, I believe we also have to make provision ensuring that those charged with sedition or treasonable activity are brought to trial more quickly.

In addition, I believe two further steps should be taken, though they have nothing to do with the act I have proposed. The government, in concert with other governments, should make arrangements with friendly nations—indeed, with all nations, as far as possible—in an effort to have the death penalty imposed for international kidnapping and hijacking offences. Efforts should be made to agree that such countries would not submit to national or international blackmail in any shape or form. If this were done, we might see an end to violence of the kind which is so prevalent today. I also suggest that in conjunction with other states we should take action against those nations which give political asylum to people who perpetrate such crimes. I support the interim measure which is now before us. Like everyone else, I am unhappy that it should be necessary. But it is necessary, and I hope the government will take action by setting up a separate act to deal with this situation in a permanent way in future.

I wish, now, to make some comments on observations made by hon. members opposite. I, too, am disappointed at the reaction of some members of the opposition. I know that were I an opposition member I would have supported this motion, outlined the potential dangers and put the government on notice that it ought to be very careful, and that if it did not exercise these great powers in a responsible way I would be on their tail. I do not think it behooves anyone in this House to oppose this drastic measure taken in order to ensure the security of our country. The leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Douglas) said earlier today that if he were the captain of this ship of state, one of his first acts would be to get rid of me, a barnacle on the ship of state.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Cafik: Some of you may laugh. You are the very ones who are getting up and crying for the civil rights of the people of this country, yet attempting to deny me mine.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Cafik: I am no less important in this chamber than any of the members opposite or those on this side of the House, and when I have something to say, I intend to say it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cafik: I suggest that the leader of the New Democratic Party ought to be very careful before making such stupid and senseless statements. It is unfortunate that I have been so kind to him, but that is my nature. I should

like to close by saying that we all hope and pray that God will give this government and this chamber the courage and the wisdom to know how to act in these difficult times.

An hon. Member: Amen.

Mr. Cafik: I also hope that the two men who are now captives of these bandits will gain their freedom. I know the government will do everything in its power to try to secure this objective, and I hope to God that they are successful.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, after listening to the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik) I find myself recalling the words of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) with a good deal of discomfort. I have always had a great deal of admiration for the Minister of Justice; I believe that he will always carry out his job to the best of his ability. He said, in effect, "Don't worry, I realize we are being given too much power, but as long as I hold the job of Minister of Justice the members of this chamber and Canadians generally do not have to worry." I should like to say through you, Mr. Speaker, that if the Minister of Justice were traded for the justice minister of the province of Ontario, I would not feel quite as safe about interpreting the regulations.

• (9:10 p.m.)

The point I want to emphasize is this. This sort of expression is often used as a Liberal trick, "Don't worry. As long as we are here, we won't do any harm". The fact is that it is the rule of law that governs, not the rule of people. I have absolute trust in the Minister of Justice, and I believe the average Canadian also has trust in the Minister.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: But men may come and men may go. Today we have a certain minister of Justice; before these rules and regulations expire we may have another minister of justice. At the outset may I say that I do not think anyone underestimates the crisis in Quebec at the present time, one which has no doubt brought about the passing of certain Orders in Council bringing into force the War Measures Act and the regulations made thereunder. The Minister of Justice and those working in his department are to be trusted with the powers they have been handed. But, Mr. Speaker, when the members of the government walked into this chamber this morning they had already proclaimed the law. It was proclaimed last night. Therefore, we are now debating something that took place last night. This law was proclaimed before Parliament met this morning.

That is the basic premise upon which I commence my speech. This law came about by executive action and was proclaimed before Parliament met. Although this is no time for recrimination and reproach, surely the government knew for a long time the crisis that existed particularly in this one province, as so ably described by the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), and could and should have taken action. Government members talk about confidentiality, about the element of surprise. This chamber could have met in camera and passed this law. We are all aware of the problems facing the province of Quebec. We are all aware that the situation is such that not only could law and order in the province break up, but so could the unity of this country.

However, it is the method in which the situation was handled about which we are complaining. We have pressed the government to take action. We have been asking the government to establish law and order in the province of Quebec. Many members on this side of the House—though some of us stand alone on this question—wanted our immigration laws tightened up so that the revolutionaries from other places who have caused the crisis in the province of Quebec would have been unable to come to this land and infiltrate themselves into our society in order to erode the rule of law. Consequently, the government must take some responsibility for this situation.

Let me repeat: when Parliament met today, this law was already in effect. The position I want to get across, and I take it to be my leader's position, is that we are saying there must be some extraordinary law passed at this time in order to restore law and order to the province of Quebec and to Canada wherever required. But, Mr. Speaker, what tools should we use in the process? We have asked for a war against crime. We begged the government as long as two or three years ago to set up a royal commission which would document the situation, hear evidence and list all the people who have infiltrated our society. Had this been done, we would have had their names and would have known what they had been doing. However, no action was taken along this line. That is why we asked for a war against crime, against those people who are trying to disrupt society and all that it stands for in Canada today.

I repeat, what kind of tools should we use? You cannot cure one evil with a worse. The first charge I make against the Minister of Justice is that what the government has done is just that; it has tried to cure one evil with a worse. This kind of law is as bad as that which it is trying to cure.

An hon. Member: What would you have done?

Mr. Woolliams: I will come to that, if the hon. member would listen. If he had listened to my leader today he would not need to ask that question, so I can only conclude he must have been absent from the Chamber. What this party would have done, as we have already said, is amend the Criminal Code to give it the necessary powers to cope with the situation and the crisis at hand. I congratulate the Minister of Justice for having some sympathy for this position, as revealed in his speech.

After procrastinating for so long, the government decided it needed surprise and it has already sprung its surprise. Let the government bring in next week a law to replace these regulations, a law that would establish the rule of law in Canada and at the same time protect the civil rights of every Canadian. I have heard what the mayor of Montreal said and what the Premier of the

province of Quebec said. They asked for action, but they have been asking the government to take action for the last two years and the government has done nothing. The government has now secretly brought into force the War Measures Act.

I should like to quote the words of a man who was the kind of Liberal who used to sit as a member of the Liberal party. I shall read to the House what Mr. Power had to say, as recorded in *Hansard,* when in 1945 the government brought in a secret Order in Council, P.C.6444. The pertinent part of the order reads as follows:

> The Acting Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice, if satisfied that with a view to preventing any particular person from communicating secret and confidential information to an agent of a foreign power or otherwise acting in any maner prejudicial to the public safety or the safety of the state it is necessary so to do, may make an order that any such person be interrogated and/or detained in such place and under such conditions as he may from time to time determine.

Those words are part of an Order in Council passed exactly like the one last evening, by surprise. Mr. Power was one of the members of the executive. I have not heard one Liberal today take a stand against the establishment in the Liberal party, and I am disappointed. I would have thought one of them would have taken a different position from that of the government, but all of them have used the same argument and given the same support. The words of Mr. Power, I suggest, should be remembered tonight while we are debating this resolution.

The government has argued that it does not want to go after the FLQ. We want to be just as tough with the FLQ as the government. In fact, two years ago we wanted to get even tougher. But as William Pitt the Younger said, you can never cure one evil with a worse. This is what Mr. Power said:

> As for me, brought up in an atmosphere wherein a framed photograph of Magna Carta was on almost every wall, accompanied with a warrant for the execution of Charles I, and steeped through my reading in the traditions of the martyrs of liberty and freedom, I cannot wish to turn back the pages of history seven hundred years and repeal Magna Carta. I cannot by my silence appear to approve even tacitly what I believe to have been a great mistake on the part of the government.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Our position is that this Order in Council, put into force in this fashion, constitutes a great mistake on the part of the government and that they could have achieved the same ends just as effectively with other methods. They could have returned law and order to the province of Quebec just as effectively by coming to Parliament and bringing about an amendment to the Criminal Code giving the necessary power to police officers to clean up the mess to which the government contributed. This could have been done even if it had been done by the cabinet.

Continuing the quotation, Mr. Power said:

> If this is to be the funeral of liberalism I do not desire to be even an honorary pall-bearer at the funeral, and I do not wish by not taking part in this debate to give silent approval to the procedure which has taken place.

Those are the words of a Liberal at that time a secret Order in Council was passed in order to deal with a spy case. I know the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) recalls that matter, because he referred to it in his speech. Let us consider what Right Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King said when speaking in the House of Commons in 1934, as recorded at page 2342 of *Hansard* for that period. The House was dealing with the law at that time. He said that we are behind the traditions that are the foundation of law and order. These are the traditions on which law is based.

An hon. Member: Not to the Liberals.

Mr. Woolliams: It may not be to the Liberals. This is what he said:

> Now let us come to another point which I wish particularly to stress. I refer to the right set out in Magna Carta that no man shall be dispossessed of his rights without the lawful judgment of his peers under the law of the land; not the law as made by the Governor in Council, not the law as made by some unnamed and as yet unexisting body, but the law of the land as known to everyone.

At six o'clock last night this law was not known to Canadians. At four o'clock this morning it was not known, but it became the law. That is what I meant when I said you are curing one ill by treating it with something worse. The law should not make its first appearance in the *Canada Gazette* through the power of the Governor in Council rather than that of Parliament. It should appear in the Statutes of Canada. The Minister of Justice said that we have really nothing to worry about because if they change the law through Order in Council, it will come back to Parliament for consideration. The Prime Minister this morning—this was confirmed by the Minister of Justice—left the impression that they had to act quickly. I have some sympathy for that position, but he left the impression that the government would prepare a proper bill to be brought before Parliament and put into the statute books. This would contain the powers they felt they needed to cope with the situation. I ask the Minister of Justice whether he will stand in his place and say that the government intends to bring in a bill which will give them the powers they feel they need to deal with this crisis, and that this bill will supplant the regulations passed early this morning. Is that the government's policy? Does silence indicate it will be? Of course it does not. This Order in Council is the law, and it will be the law for the next six or seven months.

Surely this means, if it means anything, that the Prime Minister in presenting that argument, as confirmed by the Minister of Justice, was handing soft soap to the opposition who were opposed to this kind of law, in order that it might be passed quickly. It would then be passed on to the public of Canada through the news media. I suggest if they meant what they said, they owe it to the Canadian people to keep their word. They should bring in a bill which would provide the kind of law needed to cope with the crisis which exists in Quebec. That is what this party is asking for, and I believe that is all that the opposition members who have spoken have been asking

for. If the government will indicate that this is what they will do, we will confirm the action they have taken to handle this crisis.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: It seems to me that the powers under th War Measures Act are particularly stringent. This is so of the Order in Council. We should have a specific statute to cope with a specific situation. There is a crisis in the province of Quebec, but there certainly is not a war. The government says they had to act quickly and so they brought in this Order in Council. They should now put their law drafters to work on a bill to amend the Criminal Code and enact the law necessary to cure this crisis. We would then have a specific law for a specific purpose. If they followed this proper parliamentary procedure the new law would become a permanent part of the Criminal Code.

I am not very concerned about who might be elected a Member of Parliament and appointed Minister of Justice. Whoever it might be, I am sure he would carry out his duties with a degree of responsibility. But when you invoke a law like this, what will happen throughout the country? As the Minister of Justice said today, the administration of justice is a function of the attorneys general of the provinces. So we will have ten attorneys general administering this act. What will happen is that every police officer will have the right to act under this measure. How can the Minister of Justice know what houses are being walked into tonight? How can he tell us tomorrow in the House of Commons the number of doors that have been knocked on, the number of arrests that have been made and the number of people who have been detained without bail, without counsel and without the right of a trial within a certain number of hours or days? How can he fulfil that responsibility? That is the situation which results when you create law by Order in Council rather than by Parliament.

Many policemen are dedicated to their jobs and I am sure the majority of them will carry out their duties with the proper degree of responsibility. However, it takes only a few irresponsible police officers to create a great deal of injustice, and the responsibility for that will lie at the feet of the Minister of Justice. Let us not conclude this debate with the idea that because the Minister of Justice says we should not worry, because he will always accept the responsibility, everyone will interpret the government's intentions with responsibility and the courts will determine that what is intended is reasonable. The actions of the government in this respect have, in effect, made this country a police state. This debate is really a process of speaking and listening. This law existed when the government came into the House: today make no mistake about that. The law was in existence and this debate has given us an opportunity to express ourselves and indicate where we stand.

Through the implementation of the War Measures Act and the Orders in Council contained therein, the government has set aside the constitution and civil rights for everyone in Canada. What is going on in Alberta tonight, that they need this kind of law? What is going on in British Columbia, that they need this kind of law? Indeed, what is going on in Manitoba, that they need this kind of law, or in Ontario or the Maritimes—

An hon. Member: And Newfoundland.

Mr. Woolliams: Yes, and even Newfoundland.

An hon. Member: Oh, but Joey is there.

Mr. Woolliams: I appreciate that someone might say these criminal elements could move out of the province of Quebec into Ontario or any other province, but that is no excuse for making law by Order in Council and in secret. The law should be known by Canadians who sit in their living rooms and by Canadians who walk the streets. When the law is made by Order in Council, in secret and at night, particularly when it is made retroactive, the civil rights of Canadians leave the purview of this Parliament and go out of the window of every home in Canada. That is the point we are making.

• (9:30 p.m.)

So, I say this. We have the question of civil rights. What are they? They are the right of the individual to life and the right of the individual to liberty. We have heard so many definitions of liberty. We appreciate the kind of liberty we talk about in respect of Canada when we all give up something for the benefit of the whole society. Then, they talk about freedom of speech. This is evidence that they knew for a long time they were going to do this. In fact, I am convinced that when the Leader of the Opposition asked the question two or three days ago this Proclamation was on the tracing board.

Last night when I was at the CBC I was told the personnel of the CBC had been advised that there was censorship so far as discussion of this problem is concerned on the air, through television or radio. I should like to ask what minister picked up the phone and called President Davidson of the CBC. Had this ever been done when the Conservatives were in office, I wonder what would have happened. I should like to know what minister gave the instruction to the president which caused the close-down of the news last night on the CBC.

We now not only have this type of law, but in addition we have a news agency set up and controlled by the executive of Canada which has become all powerful by means of an order in council implementing the War Measures Act. It does not really matter what position members of the opposition take in respect of this particular Proclamation. If they vote against it, they would be saying they are voting against the methods, although they appreciate the crisis and realize there must be some action taken. If they vote for it they would, in effect, be saying this government was caught because it procrastinated for so long. I am sure these people must have accepted the statements of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice today that a statute would be brought in to replace this secret Order in Council which was made in the middle of the night. If the minister is shak-

ing his head, may I say that I at least understood him to say that.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I think the hon. member should read my speech.

Mr. Woolliams: When the minister says I should read his speech this means that he does not intend to do it and that we are going to have a dictatorship in Canada for six months under this particular Order in Council which re-implements the War Measures Act. In fact, there are people in Canada who have believed that this government led by the distinguished right hon. gentleman has wanted this kind of dictatorship for a long time.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Woolliams: I said there are some people who believe that. This belief has been confirmed by this type of action because the same objective could have been accomplished by Parliamentary action. There is no need for me to say anything more. I have set out very carefully the reason we have taken the position we have. We say we appreciate the crisis which exists in the province of Quebec. We appreciate the fact that extraordinary measures were necessary. We say they could have been achieved by amending the Code in Parliament through the proper democratic process. That is our position.

We say it is a very dangerous process of law to do this by order in council. This very order in council could be amended tomorrow night without any consultation with Parliament whatsoever. With that, I thank the members of the House for their kind attention.

Mr. John Roberts (York-Simcoe): I shall not speak for long, Mr. Speaker. I doubt that I shall add to the arguments that have already been presented by members of this House. However, perhaps some of the arguments bear repeating because they do not seem to have penetrated the perception of many members of the opposition. Given the level of perception they have shown in the past, that may not be too surprising. I was essentially provoked to take a part in this debate because of the remarks of the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis). I regret that he is not in the House now. The hon. member gave us a display of rhetorical fireworks instead of the considered judgment of which he is capable. I regret to say that for the first time in the long time I have known him, he descended to the level of a bush league politician. He alluded to the government backbenchers, as I regret to say did the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) later, and said they would be forced to support this government legislation contrary to their conscience. Well, I can tell you I do not hold my conscience in fee to the hon. member for York South, nor to other members of this House. We hold our conscience in relation to our God, so I suggest the hon. member for York South take care of his own and I shall take care of mine.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Roberts: In the past I have not been afraid to speak against, and vote against, this government when I felt its action might even remotely or intangibly interfere with the area of free speech and civil liberties. I remind the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) that we two found ourselves on the same side on this matter once in the past. It is not a fear of conscience that keeps me from speaking out against this government's decision. It is because this decision has the full support of my conscience that I speak now. I think it important not only for my constituents but for the people of Canada to know that in this House the backbenchers support the government, not out of fear but out of a genuine and honest conviction that this is the only course of action now open to us.

The hon. member for York South, in some peculiar argument in contradiction of the Minister of Justice, said that the argument of the Minister of Justice was wrong because we all feel strongly about this event. Of course, we all feel strongly. But feeling is not enough. Feeling is not the test. The test is what do you do. There are those who feel strongly who are not now faced with the responsibility of action. What we must decide upon is not the feelings of the members of the House but on the action of the government. We must ask ourselves what has that action been? It is not that vague strawman that has been set up by the leader of the New Democratic Party when he spoke about deportation. It is not those lengthy descriptions of possible dangers developed by the hon. member for Greenwood and the hon. member for York South. It is not the kind of scarecrow presented to us by the hon. member for Calgary North, the master of wild accusations, when he speaks about dictatorships and a police state. Those, I suggest, are creatures of his fervid mind.

What we are talking about is this act, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Greenwood was less than forthright and open when he alluded to the possible provisions of the act, because he did not go on to explain that in section 3(2), it is precisely under regulations that the act is carried forward. What we should be concerned with are the exact limitations which are imposed on the civil liberties of Canadians, not vaguely and hypothetically through the act, but specifically through the regulations. That is what the government has done. It has brought in regulations and has not utilized the full power which the act provides.

• (9:40 p.m.)

There is one thing which has concerned me more than anything else throughout this debate. This is the continuing accusations of the "sweeping" nature of the action of the government when in fact it is not sweeping but limited. There have been accusations that there is abrogation of parliamentary authority when in fact we are at this moment involved in bringing this question before the House of Commons so that it can pronounce in an authoritative way on the action the government has taken. The hon. member for Calgary North says, "Oh, they passed this law deep in the night at four o'clock and it doesn't matter what we say." I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if the House of Commons voted against the

motion today, those regulations would not stay in effect. We are appealing now to the House for its decision.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Roberts: The government is not escaping its responsibility; it is coming to the podium of the people and their representatives to hear their declaration on the appropriateness or not of its action. I do not think we can say, as some hon. members have suggested, that it is fear that keeps members from pronouncing honestly on this question, or that there is one member in this House, given the gravity of this question, who would squelch his conscience in order to support a government in an action of which he fundamentally disapproves.

This measure is not sweeping. Its limited regulations refer only to organizations which are threatening to overthrow or to reform the government by violence. It is not a permanent measure, it is a temporary one. This measure does not give continual authority to the government. It calls that authority back into question within six months. It is not a blank cheque; it is a cheque that can be cancelled within six months. There is not a suspension of legal processes in these regulations but simply a delay in their operation, a maximum delay of 90 days before a trial must be set. That is the most extensive interference with what has been the traditional liberty of Canadians, not a suspension of the judicial processes but simply a delay in applying them.

How should we judge this limited specific set of regulations which the government has provided? Not, I suggest, with wild alarms and excursions in the night. Instead, we should ask ourselves: do the conditions warrant this kind of limited response? Is there a "clear and present danger" to the security of our society? I suggest that while members may have different views on this, the responsibility must be weighed by the government carefully and it must be taken not simply in conjunction with the isolated set of events that have taken place in the past two weeks. We are not simply speaking of the possibility of two brave men going to their death. We are speaking about events that have taken place this last week in the context of events over the past decade, in the context of a society which is larger than that of Canada, of an international society of which we are members.

I suggest that in the past decade we have had sufficient experience in South America, and in other countries, and sufficient knowledge of revolutionary techniques and ideology to see that this is not simply an isolated event but one step in the continuing process to an increasingly violent attempt to overthrow established government. It is a step on a road to considerable insurrection. We are not speaking simply of one series of events. We are talking about a slippery slope. We are asked to approve action which will determine that the government will not descend that slope and start running away from its responsibilities for action, a running away from which there would be no turning back.

The fundamental question that faces us is whether our citizens can rely on the protection of law or whether they must submit and come to terms with the practitioners of violence and terror. I suggest to you that a terrorized society cannot be a free society, and I doubt whether anyone who had any knowledge of Quebec could have doubted in the past week that it is a society in danger of being terrorized. If the government loses its own confidence in its capacity to maintain the principles of law and order, how can the citizen find that government credible? What we face is the possible replacement of the law of authority by anarchy and the law of the jungle.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak on behalf of Quebecers. The hon. member for York-South (Mr. Lewis) has dared do so. He made predictions as to the future of Quebec and acted as spokesman for that province.

I cannot speak on behalf of Quebecers, but I can speak to the French Canadians of Quebec and of Canada with the hope of getting through to them. I want to tell them that some English-speaking Canadians do recognize the situation which their province is facing. I want to tell them that the issue is not one of choosing between imperialism and independence, between isolation and membership in the Confederation, between francophones and anglophones, but of a choice between democratic and liberal institutions mellowed over centuries of tradition. The choice open to Quebecers is one between civilization and barbarism.

Mr. Speaker, I am a young man and if I were a Quebecer, I could perhaps be a separatist. However, I could never be a separatist in an independent Quebec animated by a spirit like the one which we have come to know these last couple of weeks.

The heart of the matter lies not in whether or not Quebec must stay within the Confederation, because if the terrorists come out on top, whether Quebec is in the Confederation or not, Quebec society will fall a victim of terrorism.

The hon. member for York-South has mentioned an "over-reaction" on the government's part. He fears that the population of Quebec will direct its sympathy towards FLQ members.

However, I can see the possibility of a crystalizing of opinion in the province of Quebec.

I hope this will be a true acknowledgement of the facts, for revolution is not a game played by amateurs or an abstraction concocted by intellectuals; it is the thirst for blood rampant in the minds of evil-haunted murderers.

The FLQ terrorists do not fight for the independance of Quebec; they seek violence not order, fear not freedom, distress not peace.

[*English*]

I would also like to say something to my fellow Canadians who are English speaking. That is to emphasize what I have already said in French, that this is not a question of one part of our country being against another, of one faction being against another faction. It is a question of a group of extreme, violent, determined, warped madmen, a tiny group who are seeking to impose

through the means of terror and violence their undemocratic will upon a society which has democratically shown that it rejects their pattern for the future of Quebec. The men who have violently conducted their tasks within the past two weeks are no more typical of the Quebec society of today than the Doukhobors with their violence are typical of western Canada.

The greatest error that we could make, a tragic error, would be to let the events of the past seduce us into believing that there is divergence among the views of the English or French speaking Canadians on how those criminals should be treated. I am confident that the people of Quebec will react with hostility and with anger to the desperate actions with which we have been faced.

Liberty must grow out of order. It cannot grow from anarchy and it cannot exist in a society where the government has renounced its responsibility for the preservation of the authority of the law.

We have heard from some members of the opposition today counsel for delay, for drift, for reflection, for compromise, for irresolution, for continued delay in legislation. I say we are face to face with those who believe that power grows out of the barrels of guns, who will fight for power with guns and who will maintain a violent society with bloodshed and guns. It is time for a determination to maintain the principles of civilized conduct and law and order so that we do not relinquish ourselves to that black night of despair of a society which has succumbed to the strength of brute, violent and unprincipled power.

• (9:50 p.m.)

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I would think that no one on either side of this House could feel the debate we are having here today is not one of great import for the nation. Regardless of what views have been stated here in this debate today, it would be a very foolish person indeed who did not feel we were in effect dealing with the very vitals of the nation itself.

I cannot help but think as well, as I stand here as a member of this House, that there is a very unusual situation in this country tonight in that I am one of the 264 people left in the Dominion of Canada who still have the right to say what they feel and believe. Tragically, none of my fellow citizens has that kind of freedom in this land tonight.

Mr. Olson: Nonsense; read the regulations.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I am going to deal with the regulations very shortly, but I think it must be a person either with lack of eyesight or ability to read who has looked at these regulations even quickly and not realized the kind of sweeping power that has been given to less than 30 men in terms of the freedoms, rights and privileges exercised in a free society. And while some may not be thinking it tonight, I believe that many of our fellow citizens will look back on this day, this black Friday in Canadian history and say, "This is the end of what has been termed a just society." The just society has come to mean, and will come to mean, the suspension of freedoms and privileges for the citizens of this country.

We have been concerned over the last week or two weeks with the kidnapping of two eminent men in our society, one a citizen of this country, the other a diplomat. We have been concerned about the fate of these two men, the possible securing of their freedom, and the questionable ransom involved. Now, we are not just concerned with the ransom of two men, we are concerned about the possible ransom of 21 million people in this country. I, for one, engage in this debate not with any great sense of wellbeing as to the outcome of this action by the government of the country.

What has been done? There has been some suggestion here today that we have spent too much time looking at the War Measures Act because, as speaker after speaker on the government side has said, from the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on down, "We have been asked to take this action and proclaim the War Measures Act. We have of necessity proclaimed it as an act in effect, but we have confined ourselves to these regulations." And while I think it would be quite possible, as it has indeed been possible for many members of the House, to make the case that at two o'clock, three o'clock or four o'clock tomorrow morning, or any morning, the government might want to expand and broaden these powers, I am quite prepared for the purpose of this debate to confine myself to what the regulations have to say. I think that any person concerned with the basic functioning of a free society, giving only a modest amount of thought to these regulations, would be disturbed to the greatest possible degree.

I invite members of the House to look at the regulations with me and to examine, first of all, the interpretation of particularly important words used in the regulations. Perhaps I should even raise a question at this stage upon which the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) could advise us, although I am not sure that a legal opinion given by him in this House would be binding in any future legal action. The first definition of which I speak, concerning a peace officer, reads;

> —a peace officer as defined in the Criminal Code and includes a member of the Canadian Armed Forces;

We are not told by this definition whether that means active or reserve, duty or off-duty. One could well wonder at the kind of implications this might have for men who might suddenly be faced with a situation which would lead them to take the law into their own hands. Certainly, there is no definition along those lines in this particular interpretation.

But that is not the most serious of the interpretative aspects of these regulations because in the very next paragraph, in the definition of statements, we find this:

> "statements" includes words spoken or written or recorded electronically or electromagnetically or otherwise, and gestures, signs or other visible representations;

I ask members of the House what kind of sweeping power does this give to any police officer or any court when the reference is to gestures, signs or other visible representations, which could be part and parcel of man's indictment? We have a Prime Minister who is very well

known for the kind of gestures, the kind of signs and other visible representations that he makes from time to time. Some of them he demonstrated for us here in this House today. Are we to be told that if a man makes a certain sign with his hand, with his head, with a shrug, with a wink, or with a nod that this will be regarded as incriminating evidence? There is no reason not to believe that if the situation is treated as desperately as some people are prepared to treat it, this could well be used as an argument for a man's arrest, indictment and conviction.

Those are the kinds of regulations that we are being asked to approve, quite aside from other major provisions in the War Measures Act itself. We are being asked to believe that membership in a particular organization is to be considered a crime. Earlier, when the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) spoke, he indicated that to him this was one of the most objectionable parts because, for the first time in the history of this nation, it expresses a willingness to believe people guilty of a crime because of the ideas they hold, or the thoughts they might profess. This strikes at the very heart of the freedom of speech and expression in this country, or in any other country that seeks to be free.

We are told that if a person advocates the use of force or the commission of crime as a means of accomplishing governmental change, this is also to be regarded as being a criminal act. I do not have to remind members of this House, because we are continually altering and changing the Criminal Code, that from time to time the Criminal Code itself becomes obsolete and incapable of enforcement.

May I call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: It being ten o'clock, pursuant to the order made earlier this day, this House stands adjourned until eleven o'clock tomorrow morning.

At ten o'clock the House adjourned pursuant to special order.

APPENDIX

[*Translation*]

GOVERNMENT OF QUÉBEC
THE PRIME MINISTER

Quebec City, October 16, 1970.

Mr. Prime Minister,

During the last few days the people of Quebec have been greatly shocked by the kidnapping of Mr. James R. Cross, representative of the British Government in Montreal, and the Hon. Pierre Laporte, Minister of Labour and Manpower and Minister of Immigration of Quebec, as well as by the threats to the security of the state and individuals expressed in communiqués issued by the Front de Libération du Québec or on its behalf, and finally by all the circumstances surrounding these events.

After consultation with authorities directly responsible for the administration of justice in Quebec, the Quebec Government is convinced that the law, as it stands now, is inadequate to meet this situation satisfactorily.

Under the circumstances, on behalf of the Government of Quebec, I request that emergency powers be provided as soon as possible so that more effective steps may be taken. I request particularly that such powers encompass the authority to apprehend and keep in custory individuals who, the Attorney General of Quebec has valid reasons to believe, are determined to overthrow the government through violence and illegal means. According to the information we have and which is available to you, we are facing a concerted effort to intimidate and overthrow the government and the democratic institutions of this province through planned and systematic illegal action, including insurrection. It is obvious that those participating in this concerted effort completely reject the principle of freedom under the rule of law.

The Quebec Government is convinced that such powers are necessary to meet the present emergency. Not only are two completely innocent men threatened with death, but we are also faced with an attempt, by a minority to destroy social order through criminal action; it is for those reasons that our government is making the present request.

The government is confident that, through such powers, it will be able to put an immediate stop to intimidation and terror and to ensure peace and security for all citizens.

Please accept, Mr. Prime Minister, my very best regards.

Robert Bourassa

The Right Honourable Pierre Elliott Trudeau,
Prime Minister of Canada,
House of Commons,
Ottawa

[*Translation*]

CITY OF MONTRÉAL
CANADA

Office of the Chairman
of the Excutive Committee
15 October 1970

City Hall
The Right Honourable Pierre Elliott Trudeau, P.C., Q.C.,
Prime Minister of Canada,
Parliament Buildings,
Ottawa, Canada

Mr. Prime Minister,

The chief of the Montreal Police Service has informed us that the means available to him are proving inadequate and that the assistance of higher levels of government has become essential for the protection of society against the seditious plot and the apprehended insurrection in which the recent kidnappings were the first step.

We are forwarding as a matter of the utmost urgency the report describing the scope of the threat and the urgent need to reinforce the machinery to cope with it.

We ask for every measure of assistance the federal government may deem useful and desirable in order to carry out the task of protecting society and the life of citizens in this difficult period.

Lucien Saulnier
Chairman of
the Executive Committee

Jean Drapeau
Mayor of Montreal

Police Department
Office of the Director

City of Montreal
City Hall Annex
October 15, 1970

His Lordship Mayor Jean Drapeau
Mr. Lucien Saulnier
Chairman of the Executive Committee

Gentlemen:

An extremely dangerous subversive organization has gradually developed in Quebec over the last several years with a view to preparing the overthrow of the legitimate government by seditious means and eventually armed insurrection.

The recent kidnappings of a foreign diplomat and of a minister of the Crown of the province of Quebec by this organization are the first stage of its seditious plan and of activities leading directly to insurrection and the overthrow of the State.

Under the circumstances, the investigation which must be carried out by police authorities must necessarily include all the activities of the various cells of this seditious organization and should not be restricted, if it is

not to be doomed to failure to a mere search for the individuals who have perpetrated the heinous kidnapping of the two (2) persons who are still being held.

The threat to our society from this seditious conspiracy that has swung into action in the last eleven (11) days, the investigation problems created by the internal structure of this organization divided into many small autonomous cells and the incredible amount of checking and searching imposed upon us have taxed and are taxing to the utmost the resources available to our Police Department.

The extreme urgency of obtaining concrete results in uncovering all the ramifications of this organization and its seditious activities, the volume and complexity of evidence to be gathered and filed, finally the enormous task that we must carry out without resorting to unhealthy and undesirable repression, make it essential for higher levels of governments to come to our assistance if we are to succeed.

The slow pace of procedures and the restrictions resulting from the legal machinery and means at our disposal do not allow us to meet the situation.

Consequently, I recommend to the Executive Committee of the City to ask the higher levels of government to give us the means which in their estimation are suitable and useful to enable us to gather and submit the evidence necessary to protect society against the seditious and insurrectionary activities triggered by the kidnappings.

Very truly yours,
M. St-Pierre,
Director.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Saturday, October 17, 1970

The House met at 11 a.m.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

NATIONAL SECURITY

ABDUCTIONS—INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO REPLACE REGULATIONS UNDER WAR MEASURES ACT

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether there is any information he can give the House about Mr. Cross and the Hon. Pierre Laporte?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I regret, Mr. Speaker, there is no information I can give at this time.

Mr. Stanfield: With regard to the legislation to be introduced in substitution for the invocation of the War Measures Act and the regulations proclaimed by the Governor General in Council under that Act, is the Prime Minister prepared to give an assurance that legislation will be introduced at an early date? In particular, is he prepared to give a specific assurance that such legislation will be introduced next week?

Mr. Trudeau: I think I covered this point in my speech to the House yesterday as well as I could. I remind the Leader of the Opposition that I suggested at that time we would give serious consideration to introducing such legislation but that we need a period of time during which to see how the regulations might be improved before being changed into statutory form. I asked the leaders of the opposition parties, indeed, all members of the House, to put forward any suggestions as to how these regulations might be improved before ultimately being transferred into a statute.

Mr. Stanfield: I assure the Prime Minister that we would be happy to make suggestions of the kind he has in mind, but does he not recognize that the statement he has made does not contain any assurance of a concrete nature and that according to other statements he has made the present situation might conceivably continue for the duration of the proclamation? Can the Prime Minister not give the House some specific assurance that legislation will be introduced within a given time which will do the job necessary to be done but be sufficiently narrow in import so as not to interfere with the normal course of civil liberties any more than is required?

Mr. Trudeau: The answer to all of that is yes, except for this. If the hon. gentleman wants to know exactly how much time it would take, then I cannot give him an assurance. Obviously I could not undertake to revoke the War Measures Act next week if next week we have not passed this legislation. I do not yet know from the Leader of the Opposition how long he will take to co-operate with us in producing such a measure.

FLQ ACTIVITIES—DURATION OF EMERGENCY POWERS

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): In view of the fact that the proclamation bringing the War Measures Act into effect and the subsequent Orders in Council are related to the FLQ and the activities of the FLQ, can the Prime Minister indicate whether it is the intention of the government to keep these emergency powers until the government is satisfied that the FLQ and associated and related bodies have been wiped out?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Not necessarily this particular legislation, Mr. Speaker. I repeat that if we can replace the regulations by some statute that would have the same effect we would be very happy to give up this theoretical exercise in which we are engaged which includes powers much broader than we need under the War Measures Act. When this will happen, of course, remains to be seen. We will have to continue to exercise powers in one way or another under the War Measures Act or under a special statute while there is a danger of insurrection.

VANCOUVER—COMMUNICATION RESPECTING APPREHENDED INSURRECTION

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Has the Prime Minister received a communication from the mayor or other authorities in the city of Vancouver indicating that there is an apprehended insurrection there requiring the application of the War Measures Act to that city?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, I have not. Has the hon. member?

NEGOTIATIONS FOR RELEASE OF KIDNAP VICTIMS

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister whether he could inform the House, since Mr. Lemieux has again been detained and the two radio stations concerned consider that it would be illegal to transmit any messages, if either of the two governments are carrying on any negotiations for the release of the two kidnap victims?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I cannot answer that, Mr. Speaker.

[*Later:*]

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Prime Minister indicate to the House whether his inability to answer my question results from not knowing or whether—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

DEATH OF MEMBER OF ARMED FORCES ON GUARD DUTY IN OTTAWA

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of National Defence may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Will there be an investigation into the unfortunate death yesterday of a member of the armed forces while he was on guard duty in Ottawa, and can the Prime Minister say whether the government will make sure that any survivor's benefits that are available will be put into effect?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the Minister of National Defence has asked that a board of inquiry be set up to look into this matter.

* * *

GRAIN

WHEAT—NUMBER OF ACRES TO BE SEEDED IN 1971—LIFT PROGRAM

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture having to do with the estimate he has been making recently as to the number of acres of wheat which should be seeded in 1971. Would he say what that estimate is and also whether, having regard to that estimate, he has concluded that the reasons for setting up the Lift program have not been justified by events and demands for wheat from all over the world?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): No, Mr. Speaker, I would not agree with that conclusion. Canada will have at the end of this crop year sufficient quantities, notwithstanding the 50 per cent reduction under the Lift program, to meet all anticipated demands for Canadian wheat. What I and my colleague the Minister of Manpower and Immigration responsible for the Wheat Board have said is that it would appear at this time that up to about 20 million acres of wheat in 1971 would be appropriate.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Then may I ask the minister whether the estimate given by a prominent member of the grain trade and economist that on the basis of world demands almost 30 million acres will be required is not correct?

[Mr. MacDonald (Egmont).]

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, if world demand appears to increase sufficiently between now and planting time in 1971, of course that will be taken into account in our information to farmers.

* * *

MANPOWER

NEWS RELEASE INDICATING SUMMER EMPLOYMENT FOR CANADIAN STUDENTS IN GERMANY IN 1971

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Manpower and Immigration whether he has now looked into the matter I brought to his attention the other day about opportunities for summer employment for our students in West Germany and, if so, with what result?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the department has been looking into the source of the proposal and of the news release. It has no connection whatever with the department and so far it has not been related to the generally well known student organizations. Of course, the department at the same time is interested in the pursuit of exchange programs of a different scale and a different sort. Therefore I do not have complete information yet for the hon. member.

* * *

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

NORTHEASTERN NEW BRUNSWICK—RENEGOTIATION OF FRED AGREEMENT

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Can he say whether the government has under reconsideration the renegotiation of the FRED agreement in northeastern New Brunswick?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Bell: May I ask the minister if he can say whether there will be favourable word on this in the near future, say by election day, Monday, October 26?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question as asked has too much of an election flavour and as such is not acceptable.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

NATIONAL SECURITY

APPREHENDED INSURRECTION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43 TO APPROVE ACTION OF GOVERNMENT IN INVOKING WAR MEASURES ACT

The House resumed, from Friday, October 16, consideration of the motion of Mr. Trudeau:

That the House approves the action of the government in invoking the powers of the War Measures Act to meet the state of apprehended insurrection in the Province of Quebec as communicated to the Prime Minister by the Government of Quebec and the civic authorities of Montreal and further approves the orders and regulations tabled today by the Prime Minister on the clear understanding that the proclamation invoking the powers as contained in the regulations will be revoked on or before April 30, 1971, unless a resolution authorizing their extension beyond the date specified has been approved by the House.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I resume my remarks this morning even more disappointed, if that is possible, than I was last night at the inability of the government, as reflected through the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the members of the cabinet, to give the House sufficient indication why it should support the extreme and, in my view at least, unwarranted measures which have been taken by the government.

It is very difficult for an individual member of the House to believe that he is actually participating in this kind of debate and that at one stroke both the constitution and the civil rights of the people of this country have been suspended.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): It is also difficult to believe that a man who used as the thread of his campaign for election a little more than two years ago the unification of the country should now threaten to divide it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Those who do not see this are victims of their own blindness. Perhaps they do not recall the remarks of the Prime Minister earlier this week to a press conference in response to a number of questions relating to the dreadful kidnappings in Montreal. He replied:

> Yes, well there are a lot of bleeding hearts around who just don't like to see people with helmets and guns. All I can say is, go on and bleed, but it is more important to keep law and order in the society than to be worried about weak-kneed people who don't like the looks of—

Then the reporter interrupted:

> At any cost? How far would you go with that? How far would you extend that?

The Prime Minister answered:

> Well, just watch me.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I hope it will be recorded that a number of government members applauded that quotation.

Some hon. Members: Shame, shame!

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Are these the words of a man who seeks both to resolve the differences of opinion and points of view in this country and to accept the rule of law? They are the words of a man who in fact has suspended the rule of law.

Invoking of War Measures Act

• (11:20 a.m.)

I am troubled by the many grave aspects of this problem, not the least of which is the indication, much too obvious across the country at this moment, of a fanning of the flame of ancient misunderstanding, prejudice and bigotry that would pit English-speaking and French-speaking people against each other in this country.

An hon. Member: Shame on you.

An hon. Member: You can do better than that.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): These may be difficult words both to hear and say but they must be said if we are to face the problems confronting this country in a manner that will allow for the continuity of all that is best and good in Canadian life and its social fabric, because the traditions, attitudes and hopes of Canadians have been dealt a serious body blow by the actions of this government this week. Those who argued so strenuously yesterday, and who I assume will do so again today, that what has been done is really a very limited kind of action will soon become aware that the limits to this action are not at all narrow and involve not just a few or a few hundred but many thousands and, potentially, perhaps even millions of our fellow Canadians.

I shall not read at any length what is being reported by the press of this country, but we are told that political literature is being confiscated. I venture to guess it is not just literature advocating the overthrow of government—municipal, provincial or federal—but political literature of many different aspects and produced by many different parties.

An hon. Member: That is a lie.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): If it is a lie then I trust this will be fully established in the days to come in light of what seems to be becoming painfully apparent now. Not only in the area of political literature, however, is there seeming indecision concerning what constitutes a grave threat to the safety of the state and its citizens. We also see the abuse, arrest and detention of innocent individuals and in a free society the fear—

Mr. Cafik: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Would it be one worth replying to?

Mr. Cafik: You can judge that. You suggested that innocent people have been arrested because of these measures. Would you care to name one who is innocent?

Mr. Baldwin: The police will not release the names.

Mr. Nowlan: We cannot even get names in this police state.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): The question merely indicates the ignorance of the author.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I thought there was still a little opportunity left to be heard in this place because, as I said last night, this is the only place in this country where one can now express any kind of political opinion.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is quite right that he should be given the hearing he is entitled to. I would suggest he be allowed to continue.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): It is bad enough that fear and anxiety are now being felt by many people in our society because of this action, but what hits most directly at the vitals of a free society is the obvious reluctance of much of the mass media, particularly in the province of Quebec, to express the kind of views and opinions that enhance and encourage free discussion and free assembly in a society.

An hon. Member: Where did you hear that?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I ask for order and for the co-operation of hon. members. I do not think that the kind of interruptions we are hearing at this time help the debate very much.

Mr. Aiken: It seems that some members are pretty touchy.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I find that there appear to be two classes of people in the discussion of this problem, those who make their home regularly in the province of Quebec and everyone else. If it will console those who feel that I have absolutely no understanding of the problem, let me say that I spent five weeks in the past year living in the province of Quebec. I do not say that that makes me an expert, but perhaps it does make me a little more understanding of and sympathetic to the problems of all Canadians, and it is with this in mind that I hope I am speaking today.

I do not expect all hon. members to agree with me. Quite obviously I may be in the minority as the majority party seems to support the government action. But what I do expect is that if Parliament is still free to function, I will be given a hearing. That is all I ask at this point; that is all any member can hope for in the forum of Parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): But I am deeply troubled by the fact that much of the mass media in the country generally and certainly within the province of Quebec is extremely reluctant at this very moment to offer the kind of free information that they are able to provide in relation to the free exchange of opinions and the exercise of freedom and liberty within our society. There have been reports that not just in the private sector of broadcasting but even in the public sector unwarranted influence may have extended to the higher levels of administration in order to curb the kind of speculation and comment that the government feels would encourage the free expression of opinion that it no longer finds acceptable in that province.

It seems also, by implication, that Parliament itself is to be considerably limited in considering these vital questions. We were told at the outset that the reason the War Measures Act was invoked was that there really was not the necessary machinery within Parliament to deal effectively with this question, that too many other problems would arise, and therefore Parliament was an outmoded and ineffective instrument to deal with this problem.

An hon. Member: Nonsense!

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): That is what was said yesterday and I invite the hon. member to look up the record of yesterday's proceedings. Arguments were put forward by both the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) to the effect that it was not possible for the Parliament of this country to make decisions involving the temporary suspension of the Bill of Rights of this country.

Quite frankly I find it passing strange that a number of provincial premiers seemed to respond favourably so quickly to the action that the government has taken. I am not sure what methods were used to elicit this response. But I do think it passing strange that, although we have watched meetings to make changes in our constitution between the provincial governments and the federal government for some two years now, at which the discussion has been long and difficult, with seemingly little progress made to date, suddenly overnight a number of these premiers are willing to let the whole of the constitution be suspended for an indefinite period of time. I cannot accept it and as a Member of Parliament I will not accept it. We must be sure that the people realize the grave and serious measures that have been enacted by the government.

• (11:30 a.m.)

I want to try now, Mr. Speaker, to discover the reasons for the action taken by the government. Why is it being done? I have noticed that even in the editorial opinion this morning of those who, by and large, support the government's position there are reservations about what has happened to force the government into this extreme position. The question is being raised, and I think will be raised increasingly over the next few days, is it panic? Has the government in fact been panicked into taking this serious action?

What happened on Thursday to force the government, in the wee small hours of Friday morning, to bring forth a document suspending the constitution and the civil liberties and human rights of the people of this country for the stated purpose of dealing with apprehended insurrection? Where is this insurrection, Mr. Speaker? When did it occur? What information was available to the government on Thursday and early Friday morning of this week that it did not have in the earlier part of this week, last week, last month or last year?

Indeed, the Prime Minister has told us that he well understands the problem in Quebec. He has told us ever since he became leader of his party that he knew how to handle this problem, that if the country would entrust leadership to him he would deal with it effectively, that there would be no more of the difficulties, uncertainties and fears that had been growing in number in the province of Quebec in the middle and late 1960's, that he was the man to deal with the problem rationally, coolly and without provocation. We can now see the result of his dealing with the matter.

Of course, the reason advanced by the government for what has happened is that it has special information which, if it were revealed, would endanger the very kind of detection and apprehension that needs to be undertaken if we are to overcome this serious and grave risk to society and its governments. In how many other countries throughout the centuries have certain individuals, having asked for in effect dictatorial powers, said to the people, "Give us these powers because only we know best, only we know how to deal with the difficult situation that exists in this country today, so trust us and we will not desert you"? Mr. Speaker, such words have always been, and still are where they are echoed, an invitation to accept a dictatorship.

I hope the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand), who has left his place in the chamber, will not go too far. I would like to raise a question with regard to his speech in a moment. As I was saying, such words are an invitation to accept the kind of authoritarian or totalitarian state that I am sure no right-thinking person in this country would ever choose.

Surely the very reason that we have Parliament and this House is that people can be fully informed, so that the people can in fact exercise their right to know.

We have lost this week, Mr. Speaker, not only all individual and property rights that pertain to living in this country but we have also lost the most basic right of all, the right to know. That is what the government has deprived this House of both yesterday and today. Is there panic? Has the government responded in some degree to panic?

There is another possibility, one so terrible that I am extremely reluctant to raise it this morning, but I certainly could not be true to myself, to my own opinions and to my own ideas, which I feel I have a right to express in this House, were I not to express it in this debate. Does the action which has now been taken by the government represent, in effect, the seizure of an opportunity to suppress and repress those who have disagreed with them and whom they cannot accept?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I hear some ohs and ahs as if this were a terrible thing to say, and that is why I want to quote what the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion said in the debate last night. I am glad he is still here because he can correct me if I misquote him.

An hon. Member: Quote *Hansard*, not a newspaper.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I certainly have not had a chance to read *Hansard* this morning. It was a little late in reaching us. The minister is here and he can certainly say if it is a misquotation. He is reported as having said in the debate yesterday:

> If we had not acted, the separation of Quebec would have been a fact, a month or a year from today.

I ask the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion—I will allow him a moment if he wishes to return to his seat—if in fact—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This is not the question period. The hon. member should make his speech.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I will ask him rhetorically, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps he can communicate with that well known nod of his head. Is there some confusion, perhaps not confusion, but is there some feeling—

An hon. Member: In your mind?

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): —in the mind of the government, particularly in the minds of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, the Prime Minister and perhaps others in the government, that the FLQ to some degree or other means separatism? Is that what the Prime Minister is saying, that separatists are the FLQ, that somehow or other you really cannot distinguish, that they are one and the same thing?

Has the minister in fact spoken for the government in saying that what we are really out to deal with here by these measures is not just acts of terrorism by one relatively small group of people, who are seeking through violent and anarchic means to destroy society, but a much larger group of people, 25 per cent if we can go by the last provincial election results, who believe there is a realistic option in considering some form of independence for the province of Quebec? Is that what the minister was saying to us yesterday afternoon? If it is, Mr. Speaker, then all of us, English-speaking and French-speaking alike, had better examine our consciences extremely quickly because we have allowed to be launched in this country this week the most dangerous kind of political action ever known in the history of the country and one that I refuse to accept.

Let me be perfectly clear. I am not a separatist either for the province of Prince Edward Island or for la belle province de Quebec. I do not support those who believe that the people of Quebec, French-speaking, English-speaking, whatever language they speak, would find a better destiny apart from Canada than within it. I support a viable and vital place for the people of Quebec within the Canadian confederation. But God help me if I believe that the only way I can convince those who disagree rationally, honestly and fairly with me is by the taking up of arms, that men who do not hold this opinion can only be subjugated by force of arms and by repression. If that be so, Mr. Speaker, this country is on the threshold of doom and disaster. This is of such paramount importance that if the Prime Minister or the Minis-

ter of Regional Economic Expansion would like at this moment to take the floor I will yield it so that they may make perfectly clear that what is being attempted here is not in any way directed toward suppressing the free expression of the opinions of those who believe there is another political possibility for the province of Quebec that can be achieved through a rational and democratic process.

• (11:40 a.m.)

The Prime Minister, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, and no other minister, has made this fact clear to the people of this country. If the Prime Minister wishes to avoid, as I most sincerely hope he does, the very grave possibility of misunderstanding on this matter, he will not hesitate for one moment to let all the people of the country know that at the very least what is being attempted here is that the government is dealing with those who will not respect law and order and the democratic process of choice and change. If, in fact, the Prime Minister is directing his ammunition and the repeal of law in this country at a wider audience, at those who disagree with the federal option, what hope can any of us have for the workings of a rational, democratic process in this country? I remind him, as I would remind the Premier of Quebec if he were here, that those members from that province who were elected to this House and to the Legislature of Quebec who support their governments do not represent even half the people of that province. If one looks at the matter merely from the standpoint of those who speak French in that province, one sees that the proportion who did not vote for these governments is even greater.

I want to refer to what surely is another basic question, the extent to which this action will be effective. Presumably the basic reason behind the measures the government has taken is the belief that only through the use of extensive powers of this kind can the authorities detect with effectiveness the kind of terrorism that they believe is at present abroad within the province of Quebec. Yet I remain very seriously troubled.

I have found from my reading and from my listening to the news media in the past few days that those who are being detained are from all ranks of society, that some of those who are suspected of having connections with the FLQ are even in the police. How is it possible, just through the use of increased and wide-ranging powers, to assure us of the effectiveness of the detection that we are told is so badly needed? What are the long-term effects of this kind of detention going to be in our society? Surely we realize that when we throw great numbers of people into prison, sometimes on short notice and with very little information, a number of them are bound to be peaceful and innocent citizens who may have expressed a point of view at some time or other which is in disagreement with that of others. They may not be inclined toward violence. What will detention for 30, 60 or 90 days in jail do to innocent people who have held opinions differing from those of others? May I remind hon. members that what we have learned over the past two years of the general jail situation in Quebec would not lead anyone to believe that the kind of bitterness that may result from holding people under those conditions will not lead to more and greater violence. Will that solve the basic problems confronting us in this situation?

We have been told time and again during the past two and a half years that the government and the Prime Minister knew how to deal with the situation. The Prime Minister knew how to solve these big, basic problems. Have they been solved? Have they been alleviated? Speaking yesterday, the Prime Minister reminded us that the action that had been taken could be considered by some as a trap, that by the state's use of strict and authoritarian—one might say totalitarian—measures, there is a danger of giving both encouragement and credibility to the forces of darkness the government is trying to stamp out. Earlier this week the Prime Minister said that what this group really wanted was lots of publicity. Has any organization ever received more publicity than this organization has received as a result of the actions the government took?

There is another troublesome thought that comes to my mind increasingly. By this action of dealing with terror by imposing a kind of state terror we have descended to the level at which these people operate. Mr. Speaker, this House must have, if it is to maintain its freedom and its responsibility, more information. A free society can only live by free communication. If the government, in addition to bringing in the War Measures Act, has actually said to the people of this country that they no longer have a right to information, then our situation is even more grave than we are willing to admit.

The lives of two men, Mr. Speaker, are central to this tragedy. No one in this House this morning knows whether or not they are alive. All of us cannot help but be deeply troubled by the dreadful circumstances into which these men, their friends and their families have been cast. Yet I cannot help feeling that we have compounded the tragedy by endangering the safety and security of all our people. I remind all hon. members, Mr. Speaker, that democracy can not be inherited; it can only be preserved. There has been a tendency over the years in Canada to be smug about the kind of tolerance and freedom we have exhibited. That we may have endangered our freedom by one stroke of government action this week is taken altogether too lightly.

Does one not see a paradox when one considers man and his social system? In the world of today, or of any day, one will find men of strong opinions and individual differences. Most often they live in a society which itself is of a fragile quality. Greater or lesser risk always underlies the functionings of such a social system. On the other hand, you will find weak and docile individuals within authoritarian and totalitarian systems. If we are opting in this House to bring in that kind of system, then we have seriously endangered not only the liberty of individuals in our country but their future opportunity to be the strongminded, independent individuals that surely God has given each one of us the right to be.

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, last night, when I felt compelled to enter this debate, I gave much thought during the evening as to the philosophy underlying the type of speech that I would make today. I do not like talking from a prepared text. I have listened to the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald). He is a man with whom I have sat in this House for many years. I respect him and I know that everything he said today was said with that degree of sincerity which is one of his characteristics. Nevertheless, when he says that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) of the country—I believe I have his exact words—is fanning the fires of bigotry or increasing the possibility of bigotry across this country, it indicates that if there is any panic that panic lies in the remarks of the hon. member for Egmont.

• (11:50 a.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: Despite the five weeks the hon. member spent in the province of Quebec he does not understand the difference between the FLQ, the terrorists and bandits who make up that organization, and the legitimate political party known as the Parti Quebecois of Quebec. I would sacrifice my life to see the existence of that party preserved because it is a legitimate, political party. It wants to bring an end to this country through democratic means, but that is the privilege of that party. That is what the House of Commons and democracy are all about. I endorse the right of the Parti Quebecois to exist, but when we try to equate the FLQ with the Parti Quebecois we are equating bandits, terrorists and part of an international movement with a legitimate political party in this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I do not think the Minister of Labour deliberately wants to misquote me. I was not confusing the difference between those who support separatism and the FLQ in Quebec. I was asking whether the confusion did not lie in the minds of the government.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, I also have a question of privilege. I have been in this House of Commons since 1962. I am a member of the government and of the cabinet. What is even more important to me at this moment is that I am a Canadian from the province of Quebec. I was born in that province 49 years ago. My family still lives in Montreal. We will remain in Quebec as long as it is part of confederation, which will be long after all of us are dead. No separatist group that espouses violence, such as the FLQ, will force me or anyone in my family out of our homes. To suggest that the Prime Minister does not understand the difference is ironic.

The speech I want to make today is on the failure to make a distinction in the debate yesterday between separatism and the FLQ. I have a few words to say about that.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Why don't you—

Mr. Mackasey: I listened to the hon. member with respect and I ask him to do precisely what he asked us to do, listen in quiet. Possibly he will learn something.

I have often been laughed at, sometimes even by members of my own party, for regarding myself as a House of Commons man. I am not ashamed of that. Some backbenchers were in my office last night. They reminded me of what I told them when they were elected to this House two years ago. No matter what changes we make in our parliamentary system, sooner or later the action comes back to the House of Commons. We must understand this procedure and its existence. It is the heart of the democratic system of this country.

Having understood this all my life, having sat in cabinet and having taken part in the agonizing decision which the government took under the War Measures Act, let me say that there are very good reasons why people who pride themselves on their liberalism made this decision. At the risk of being accused of vanity, I think I am one of those. I support the government, not because of cabinet solidarity but because I am convinced as an individual, a member of this House and a citizen of this country, that what the government did the other night was the right action for the future of this country. I now want to direct my speech to the motion.

This country has been blessed like no other country. Until the last few years we have never known bloodshed. In the eyes of some cynics we were united 100 years ago in a way that was too peaceful. We have never known civil war. Perhaps we have taken democracy too lightly on both sides of this House. We have been blessed like no other country.

For some ironic reason, throughout Canadian history we have had the right Prime Minister at the right time to deal with the particular crises that have faced this nation. We had Laurier when we needed a man to bridge the gap between the two cultures. We had Sir John A. Macdonald who had the vision to weld together the British colonies. We had Mackenzie King for many years, who piloted this country very skilfully through the war, the problems of conscription and other things that could have torn this country apart.

When this party got too smug and too arrogant we were replaced by the right hon. member who sits opposite in 1956 or 1957 until 1963. That reminded this party that there is no room for arrogance or dictatorship veiled or otherwise. This party had grown old in office. The right hon. member for Prince Albert was eventually replaced by another, Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson who gave this country some of the symbols that stand us in good stead today including our flag. Finally, we have the present Prime Minister, the man who in 1964 had the power to stand up in Quebec when very few people were standing up at the height of the separatist movement and say, I am a federalist and prepared to say so.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mackasey: Can anyone here think that a man with his record in the field of civil liberties, a man who fought against the infamous padlock law, against a law not designed to put down insurrection but designed to prevent amongst other things freedom of religion and religious expression, a man that fought for the Jehovah's Witnesses along with Frank Scott right through to the Supreme Court of this country, would treat this situation lightly? I refer of course to the Prime Minister of this country. Who else went side by side with the present Minister of Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) and the Secretary of State, whom the opposition laughs at periodically, to stand up for the oppressed workers of Quebec against Duplessis and his infamous bill? Do you think that these people arrived at this decision lightly? With their background they know what they are doing.

Mr. Nowlan: Can I ask the minister a question? I have a question for the minister.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I heard the hon. member the first time. He does not have the floor. The minister has the floor.

Mr. Mackasey: I also heard the hon. member. Knowing the tenor of his questions, I am not prepared to answer them right now because I have a vein of thought I want to pursue. I might also say I am proud of the present Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner). Although he now represents an Ottawa riding, he spent most of his formative years in the province of Quebec, in the heart of French Canada.

Do hon. members opposite really think that we take civil liberties and the rights of individuals so lightly that we would bring in this particular Act without agonizing soul-searching based on facts we have which cannot be revealed? What other reason do we have? How many people have even bothered to read between the lines of the letters appended to yesterday's *Hansard*? How many people have bothered to read the emotional but factual speech made by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion yesterday?

The hon. member for Egmont cannot have it out of both sides of his mouth. If the democracy he is talking about is something that should be preserved, then we have to do everything to preserve it, even temporarily invoking laws such as the War Measures Act to ensure that democracy remains in this country.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): You want to destroy freedom.

Mr. Mackasey: The hon. member asked us to remain quiet when he was speaking. Why does he not practise what he preaches?

• (12 noon)

There is a letter printed in the back of *Hansard* signed by the Mayor of Montreal and the Chairman of the Executive Committee. It begins:

[Mr. Mackasey.]

The chief of the Montreal Police Service has informed us that the means available to him are proving inadequate and that the assistance of higher levels of government has become essential for the protection of society against the seditious plot and the apprehended insurrection in which the recent kidnappings were the first step.

But it is like using vaccine against the flu. If the steps we have taken prove successful, then certain events do not take place. We are then in the embarassing position, of course, of being accused of over-reacting. People may say there was no plot really; nothing happened; Place Ville Marie was not bombed out of existence or razed to the ground. In a few years we could be accused of having over-reacted because certain things did not take place. But if we waited until they had happened, what would we be accused of? What do you think might be happening in Quebec while we dawdled over the possible passage of special legislation, having made a start on it in yesterday morning's debate without first having used the powers under the War Measures Act.

I am prepared to listen to another man who is well known for his views on the rights of individuals in this country, Mr. Eugene Forsey—I do not think he loses any of his credentials because he is now a member of the other House. When he spoke last night on television—and I suppose his answer surprised a lot of people—he said he thought the government had acted wisely; he could not understand the excitement. When he was asked to analyse the word "forthwith", he said: "Any time within the next ten days." He expressed the opinion that it could be even more tragic for democracy if a hastily designed emergency bill drawn up so as to pass through the House of Commons and the other place in the space of 24 hours had been adopted. Eugene Forsey thinks such a bill is essential. The Prime Minister thinks it is essential. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) thinks this is essential—

Mr. McGrath: Well, where is it then?

As hon. Member: Bring it in.

Mr. Mackasey: There you go. As Eugene Forsey said, such a bill should be well thought out. It should reflect the best advice of members of this House and of the other House. Above all, it should be proceeded with in a deliberate fashion. If we had followed this procedure rather than the procedure we have adopted under the War Measures Act, tell me how many people we would have apprehended among those it was necessary to apprehend? Who knows where they would have been while this debate was going on? They would have been laughing at us from other lands and, again, we would have been accused of bungling and failing to protect the democracy about which everyone is concerned. The way the hon. member for Egmont talks about civil liberty, one would think he had a monopoly of feeling on this subject. We all share those sentiments. This is what made our decision an agonizing one. But certainly, if the Prime Minister goes on television and says he will bring in such a bill, he is the Prime Minister of this country and I am satisfied with what he says.

The logic of the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker, is amazing. I do not know why I always come back to that party; it has been suggested I have a love-hate relationship with it.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): He really loves us.

Mr. Mackasey: Only certain members. I listened to the leader of that party speaking on television last night, hoping that because he speaks from the heart and without prepared notes he might unintentionally have adopted what I believe to be a most falacious argument when he spoke here earlier in the day. He suggested then that the FLQ existed only because there is unemployment in Quebec, only because there are slums in Quebec. This part of his speech is reported on page 200 of *Hansard*. He makes a valid point that every terrorist movement, every revolutionary movement, must have a base. I agree with that. Then he goes on to ask: "What is the base of the FLQ?" I apologize to the hon. member for Egmont for my emotional attack on him. This is the point which really upset me. This is what the hon. gentleman has to say:

> The base of the FLQ lies in the disadvantaged and unfortunate people in the province of Quebec.

He goes on, then, to talk about unemployment, slums, and regional disparity. Mr. Speaker, by those criteria the FLQ should exist in Newfoundland where there is more unemployment, more disadvantaged people and more regional disparity.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I believe the hon. member for Egmont seeks the floor on a question of privilege.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I do not know who is responsible for the quotation which the minister has just made, but it does not come from any speech of mine.

Mr. Mackasey: I am sorry. I suspect the hon. member was not listening closely. I was referring to the speech of the leader of the New Democratic Party.

This is precisely my point. If the people of Quebec have a right to be sorry and upset about the high rate of unemployment in that province, and I think they have, if they are concerned about slums in Montreal and Saint-Henri, and I think they have a legitimate cause to be concerned, and if certain people in Montreal look at some of our delusions of grandeur in that great area and compare the results with their own environment, this is bound to breed unrest. But there is a legitimate way of expressing this unrest and that is at the ballot box. Any time the people of Quebec feel sufficiently fed up with the free enterprise system they can vote for the New Democratic Party—though the NDP has never been able to achieve power in Quebec since confederation. Nevertheless the people have this right. If they do not want to vote for the Liberal party in Quebec they can vote for one of the other parties, and one of the other happens to be the Parti Quebecois. And if the vote in favour of the Parti Quebecois in the last election represented one out of four, this should provoke us to think about doing something to ease the unrest, and this is the best defence against the legitimate aspirations of the Parti Quebecois.

But let us have no illusion that the base of the FLQ is limited to the underprivileged people of the province of Quebec. The same FLQ would exist in Quebec if there was no poverty, if there were no slums. In fact, it would exist even if the Parti Quebecois was in power, because they are there for one reason only, and that is to overthrow the state, not only in Quebec but as part of an international movement. When I look at the position of some of those in that movement, I wish I had their income; I wish I earned in a year what some of them get in a week. Nevertheless, I can understand the concern of the New Democratic Party about a free enterprise system which tolerates the rate of unemployment which prevails in this country. We all share it.

• (12:10 p.m.)

Mr. Woolliams: Ten per cent.

Mr. Mackasey: It is fine to listen to one of the millionaires who does not understand poverty. What I have been saying is that there is a legitimate way in Quebec of expressing disapproval, just as there is a legitimate way in Newfoundland. If the ingredients of the movement behind the FLQ consists simply of poverty, unemployment, slums, and that type of social disorder, then the FLQ should exist in many other parts of the country, not only in Quebec.

My point is that the NDP have either underestimated or failed to understand at all the real forces that drive the FLQ. My job as Minister of Labour is not the easiest one in the world, but it is a revealing one. I remember going to another part of the country and having to solicit the legitimate assistance of the communist party to put an end to a strike which was being prolonged by Maoist cells in British Columbia, and I can prove that statement. So if any hon. member thinks that the philosophy behind the FLQ is restricted to the province of Quebec, then it is about time people like the hon. member for Egmont get their heads out of the beautiful red sands of Prince Edward Island.

If I return to my notes I will run past my time, so I will not do so. I ask hon. members to take a good look at the letters contained in the appendix to *Hansard*, to read between the lines and see whether there has been any panic. Perhaps we have been a little slow in doing things, and we were reminded of that yesterday. Perhaps our reluctance to do things as repugnant as what we have had to do is based on the fact that there are more than the average number of members of this cabinet who consider themselves small "l" Liberals when it comes to the question of rights of individuals. I think this would also be true were the opposition in power.

The Minister of Regional Economic Expansion spoke yesterday of fear in Quebec. I am not any braver than he is and I am just as fearful as he is. It was not too many months ago that my office was set on fire by a Molotov

cocktail and a bullet was put through the front window of my living room. That occurred during the last provincial election in Quebec. It does not give me any satisfaction or make me feel any braver to stand here in the chamber knowing that my family is in Montreal; but I leave them there because I believe in democracy. I believe in the intelligence, the wisdom and the really deep feeling that French Canadians have for this country.

When the so-called three wise men, the present Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State, came to this Parliament in the sixties, their motivation was to stand up for what they believed to be federalism. They stood for the best interests both of Canada and of Quebec. They sacrificed what they were doing then, as have all other members from the province of Quebec, be they from this party or other parties. The members of the Creditiste party have stood up in their province and spoken up for Canada, and they are not ashamed or afraid to do so.

I do not want to appear smug when I say that we know what the events are in Quebec. We know them because we come from that province. If the New Democratic Party were able to elect a few members from that province, then they might be somewhat more enlightened about what are the real causes of the situation and what is the basis for the FLQ's existence. The NDP can claim that the 25 per cent of the vote given to the Parti Quebecois resulted from social unrest. I would say that the majority of the votes came from an abnormally high number of unemployed, and this is a real indication to all parties, including our own, that these people are fed up with the type of society which in their opinion, makes them second-class citizens in their own province. These people have shown an indication of that in the traditional democratic manner with which French Canadians are synonymous—through the ballot box, and have established a legitimate political party known as the Parti Quebecois, a party that has rejected the violence of the FLQ.

Sometimes unintentionally we blur the lines. I have heard more than one member say that the CNTU is part of the FLQ. The CNTU is not part of the FLQ. Some do not know who is the successor in the CNTU to Jean Marchand. They think it is that big mouth Michel Chartrand, but he is not. It is a gentleman called Pepin who has rejected and deplored the bombings, the kidnappings and the violence of the FLQ movement. This is also true of the Quebec Federation of Labour and Mr. Laberge, and it is true of the overwhelming majority of the Lapalme workers.

When we say that the discontent of the Lapalme workers is one of the contributing factors to the growth of the FLQ movement, let me point out that the plight of the Lapalme workers today is due to the unwillingness, rightly or wrongly, of a lot of people to examine the philosophy behind Bill C-186. If when the LaPalme workers had been offered integration into the Public Service they had been permitted under the laws of the land to bring their bargaining unit with them, or to apply in the normal manner through the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act for certification on a regional basis, then they would be working in the Public Service today.

Let us all understand that when that legislation came before the House it may not have been the best type and it may not have been the worst. But it never had the opportunity to be fully examined because it was rapidly made the subject of hysteria between employers and employees and all the vested interests in the country who felt that national bargaining units were best for Canada. And they may be. But that more than any other fundamental reason is the reason those men are out marching. They have refused to give up their bargaining unit, their union, which under the law we could not give to them.

In conclusion, when the Prime Minister says he will introduce a bill to provide all of the powers that the authorities need, and no more, to fight these terrorists, bandits and revolutionaries, then I believe him. Knowing the Prime Minister and knowing the agony he went through before putting the powers under the War Measures Act into force, before concluding he had no alternative but to move in the way he did—surprise was of the essence in the particular situation we faced—I am sure the Prime Minister will not wait one day longer than he thinks necessary before repealing those powers.

This country is going to remain united, and no bandits, terrorists or revolutionaries known as the FLQ are going to destroy it as long as we can combat them by democratic means. The War Measures Act is a democratic means. It is part of the laws of the land. The government came to the House of Commons at the earliest opportunity to explain as fully as it could the reasons behind its action.

• (12:20 p.m.)

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the remarks by the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey). We have also listened to several other ministers of the Crown who were involved in the decision to invoke the War Measures Act early yesterday morning, and I mention particularly the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand). I wish I could accept with confidence the remarks of these and other members on the government side who have spoken in this debate because it would be much easier for me to agree than disagree.

I believe that the vast majority of people across Canada and the vast majority of the press yesterday and today are giving support to the government for having done the right thing.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: They are so fed up with the activities of the FLQ terrorists in the province of Quebec and have pleaded for and expected action for so long to meet this problem that in the present emergency, about which we have not been given all the details yet except that it is

very serious, they feel this type of action is warranted. I understand their reaction.

Having said that, I am convinced that Canada will rue the day which is marked on our calendars as October 16, 1967. I say that not because I do not want action taken against the FLQ. I have many times pleaded for action. In fact, it is very interesting to note as far as history is concerned that on October 17, 1967, just three years ago today almost to the hour, I asked in this House the following question of the Solicitor General:

> Is the hon. gentleman aware that Radio Havana is broadcasting a daily half hour program on the 49 metre band in French, beamed directly at Quebec listeners and giving instructions in subversive activity and guerilla warfare—

They laughed at me that day. The Solicitor General would not give an answer. Many members then accused me of radicalism and extremism. I have in my hand a montage of clippings taken from various newspapers dated July, April and May, 1967. These are clippings from our own Canadian newspapers telling about the subversive activity that was already taking place in Canada.

On October 30, 1967, having been unable even to get an answer to a question in the House, let alone being given any credit for raising a pertinent question of some importance, I wrote an open letter to the Secretary of State for External Affairs listing the various activities which had come to my attention and were taking place. I was not conducting some witch hunt. I had picked this information out of the papers that were circulating in this country including the newspaper *Granma,* which is the official organ of the communist organization in Cuba. It was circulated in mass quantity in this country all during Expo right out of the Cuban pavillion at Expo. It was brought then to the public's attention, although there was no public admission by the police and certainly no admission or recognition given by the frontbenchers of the government at that time, that there were actual training camps in the Laurentians teaching subversive activity, guerilla warfare and terrorism. They laughed at that time. The people of Canada have been subjected to this kind of thing for too long. They are getting fed up and tired so today they have reacted in favour of extremism against something that should have been handled in the normal way a long time ago.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: I am convinced the police knew all about this. These things were not done in secret. It was open so far as those people who wanted to acknowledge and see that it was taking place are concerned.

Just last Tuesday, October 13, when I spoke in the House, I outlined a four point program I thought the government might accept. It is very interesting to note that the government has acted on all these points except one. They could have taken a much less severe and less dangerous step than the implementation of the War Measures Act which would have done for the FLQ crises exactly what has been done under the War Measures Act. The people of Canada have hoped and prayed that the government would take this action. I called then upon the Prime Minister to make a nationwide address to the Canadian people and to assert the primary rule of law and to assure the people of Canada that the government was resolved to take measures of appropriate severity.

I asked the Prime Minister then to declare, under the provisions of Section 91(1) of the British North America Act, that the terrible kidnappings in the city of Montreal were matters affecting the peace, order and good government of Canada and henceforth would be treated as a federal responsibility in close co-operation with provincial and municipal authorities. Had the government followed and strengthened the law it would have meant bringing a bill into the House of Commons, if that was necessary, to amend the Criminal Code. I also asked that he announce a substantial reward to anyone who could provide authoritative information leading to the apprehension of criminals, for that is what these FLQ people are.

I found it very interesting to hear the Minister of Labour talking about the difference between the Parti Quebecois and the FLQ, and then suddenly announcing to the House that he knew what that difference was. He then went so far as to say these were international revolutionaries. Anyone who knows the situation and has been following it at all knows that is what has been happening. I agree entirely that the Parti Quebecois has endeavoured to do something I cannot agree with but through legitimate, political means. It is an altogether different thing than revolutionary terrorism and no one on this side of the House has intimated they were the same. It is an altogether different thing when people are plotting revolution and terror and overthrow not only of the government but a system of government.

I am convinced that these people are part of a Communist organization which is working in the north and south of the western hemisphere to do that very thing. They would like to do the same thing in Canada as well and life means nothing to them. Violence and terror mean nothing at all to them except that they are a means to an end. So when the Minister of Labour acknowledges that here in this Chamber, let him not accuse anyone on this side of the House of not knowing that difference.

This whole exercise is an attempt to obscure and cover over the fact that action should have been taken several years ago, six months ago or a week ago but was not taken. The Minister of Labour, the Prime Minister, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion and the Minister of Justice have all mentioned in their remarks in this debate that they found it necessary to move with severity under the provisions of the War Measures Act because of the critical situation the country faced 36 hours ago. The Minister of Labour this afternoon has quoted from yesterday's *Hansard* the comments of the mayor of Montreal and the chairman of the executive committee, Lucien Saulnier, contained in a letter addressed to the Prime Minister. By coincidence, Mr. Speaker, these two gentlemen said the same thing last November. They pleaded for action and they were laughed at then.

Invoking of War Measures Act

• (12:30 p.m.)

Yesterday the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert outlined some of the actual facts contained in their submission. They referred to the fact that political kidnappings would be one part of the FLQ strategy. Had action been taken on the advice of Mayor Drapeau, we would not have Mr. Cross and Mr. Laporte where they are today, wherever they are, in the land of the living or not. These are the things which concern me. It is all right to say now that it was necessary to implement The War Measures Act, but why was some action not taken before? Last Tuesday I asked the Prime Minister and members of his cabinet to commit such officers of the RCMP and the Canadian Armed Forces as are necessary to ensure the speedy apprehension of those responsible for these heinous crimes. I asked them to explore every feasible way in which this could be done. Had they done this they might have been in a position to have acted in a more constitutional way than they have now.

I wish to make clear again that I do not object to what has to be done in respect of apprehending those who are dedicated to the overthrow of our way of life. I merely object to how it is being done. On the one hand, the government might have acted a little earlier had they listened to the facts. Surely the security files revealed this situation a long time ago. But they did nothing. A lot of what we hear today about the protection of law and order in this country is a smokescreen, on the one hand for the inactivity and indecision of this government and, on the other hand, is a cover for the real implications of what the War Measures Act really means to this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: Yesterday the Minister of Justice said that this resolution was brought before Parliament to test the will of Parliament. It is all right to test the will of Parliament in respect of the action taken, but some kind of justification is demanded and that is why we are here today. If in the next week or days ahead the people of Canada do not understand what we on this side of the House are trying to say, I am convinced they will later on. Again, having commended the government for taking action, late as it was, I should like to ask this question. Why is it necessary to take away the civil liberty and freedom of Canadian citizens living in Alberta or Newfoundland because of a situation which exists only within the province of Quebec? Surely there must have been some other way to do it. The period is indefinite, as the regulations are in force for six months with power to extend.

What I am about to say is not a popular thing to say but I shall say it in any event and do it at the risk of being criticized. I am old enough to remember what happened in Germany in the early 1930's. I can remember a voice we listened to on radio which pleaded for the support of the German people for the very same reasons—the maintenance of law and order. Tragically, the public responded to the plea. A few did not. Many of those who did not lost their lives because a few years later they even dared to complain.

[Mr. Thompson.]

Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask this question as well. Is it wisdom to entrust unlimited power to the Prime Minister under such a stringent measure as this because of a localized emergency which might have been controlled otherwise? I have spoken to many members from the other side, some of whom approached me at the close of the session last evening. I give them full credit for being just as sincere and dedicated to Canada as I think I am. They said: Look, regardless of the past and regardless of whether or not the government was slow in taking action it was obviously necessary that this kind of action be taken now. I do not disagree with that.

However, this morning I should like to ask these members why it was necessary that it be done in the way it has been done. Why could the Prime Minister not have said: Look, we had to take this action; we were slow in not taking action before with regard to a situation in respect of which I cannot give you all the details at this moment. He could have said that they took the action they did but that it has been taken for only a temporary period of time, perhaps only for a month. I would not have objected even to six months if the government could have said that within that period, or as soon as it is possible, legislation will be prepared to amend the Criminal Code or that new legislation would be brought in that would adequately take care of the situation after this emergency has passed. I do not think any of us on this side of the House would have objected to that. I believe that would have been assurance to us that the government was intending to use this only as a limited emergency power. The government, however, has not done this.

This extraordinary power has been granted for a period of six and a half months and the Prime Minister has reserved the right to extend the time if he wishes to do so. He has the same right or authority to extend the time as he had when he brought in this measure in the first place at four o'clock yesterday morning. Why could we not now have from the Minister of Justice and our Prime Minister a statement which would unequivocally commit the government to bring in the necessary legislation to limit to a shorter period the time in which the War Measures Act will be in effect? I would hope the Prime Minister would do this.

I have a good deal of confidence in the Minister of Justice. We have come to know each other very well in the years during which we have sat together in the House. I have confidence in his motivation. If I can have confidence in that regard I think we can differ and differ honestly. But having that confidence I should like to hear him commit the government unequivocally to the use of this measure strictly as an emergency measure for as short a time as possible and that beginning tomorrow work will commence on legislation to cover the specific situation. I grant that it will take some time to make sure that the proper legislation is brought before the House of Commons either as an amendment to the Criminal Code or in the form of a separate piece of legislation. We would give support to that.

No member of this House can like what is going on. The Minister of Justice does not have a reply for me in this regard. I wish to say to him what I believe was said in similar words yesterday. The means that are used to determine the end achieved—change predicated on violence or terrorism—are bound to end in a police state which can only perpetuate itself in violence and terrorism unless we deliberately and conscientiously include the safeguards and checks that are necessary at the time of implementation in order to prevent that taking place.

For the sake of the record and in reply to some members on the other side who have ridiculed our questioning and the stand some of us are taking on this side, may I say that we are being asked to approve the suspension—they laugh when we say this but it is true—of all the laws of Canada and replace them with dictatorial powers to be used at will. Maybe the regulations that we have before us do not exactly provide that, but the War Measures Act does. If the government can implement it on the one hand as it defined it yesterday, they can, on the other hand, extend it to complete the power which the War Measures Act allows them, again by order of the Governor in Council, and they can do it at night.

• (12:40 p.m.)

The authority in this measure enables the government to give police the power to arrest, detain, and deport those suspected of insurrection. The Act gives the government blanket authority to take any action it considers necessary in cases of feared insurrection. I think this is probably necessary at this time, and no one is really questioning that. But the government may also, according to the War Measures Act, do and authorize such acts and things and make from time to time such orders and regulations necessary or advisable for the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada. This includes such action as censorship and the control and suppression of publications, writings, maps, plans, photographs, communications and means of communication. That is what it means. It means the arrest, detention, exclusion and deportation of undesirable people. It means the control of harbours, ports and territorial waters and the movement of vessels. It means control of land, air and water transport and movements of people or their belongings. It means control of imports, exports, production and manufacturing. It means control of appropriation, forfeiture and disposition of property and its use.

Furthermore, the act automatically applies to every section of the country although its use is limited and directed by regulations devised by the government to assist in the apprehension of those involved in the recent kidnappings in Montreal.

This is why I am fearful that in the future we in this democratic nation, with a democratic way of life about which we have continued to boast, stand in jeopardy because of the action taken at this time. Such complete power is unnecessary to resolve the issue that is involved and it is dangerous in the hands of any man or group of men. That is why we on this side are concerned. Again I say that in that concern we recognize that action had to be taken. But it should have been taken a long time ago. We also recognize the danger of what might be the end result. I have yet to hear from any member on the other side an adequate assurance that precautions will be taken, that more reasonable alternatives will be initiated, to prevent the happening of what it is actually within the authority of the present legislation to bring to pass.

I only want to say again that I resent very much that the civil liberties and freedoms of the people of Canada, 21 million of them, have to be abrogated. Even the Bill of Rights itself has been cast aside because there exists in one part of this country a serious situation that demanded firm action lest the country should break apart. I believe it is not in the best interest of the country that Parliament should give unlimited power to the Prime Minister or to those who are responsible for the administration of the affairs of the country over an issue such as we face. I was shocked yesterday, when the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) was reading documentation that had been presented to the Prime Minister by the mayor and the chief executive of the city of Montreal, to hear the Prime Minister call it nonsense. Is this action reflected in the statement which was made by the Prime Minister on the steps of the House of Commons—just watch what I will do? It is the kind of response that we receive from the Prime Minister which leads me to believe that we are not out of order in being fearful about what might come to pass in the country as a result of having given him the powers that now rest in his hands.

I want to give credit to every member of the House for being a loyal Canadian. We are the representatives of millions more such people. We should be proud of what our nation has been, of our history and our heritage. But we should also be mindful of what has made it such. I believe that we could sum it all up if we were to quote here the very paragraphs of the Canadian Bill of Rights to remind us of what are Canadians' rights. These rights do not come from the government, they come from God himself. We are creatures in his image. It is our responsibility to protect them, to guard them, to perpetuate them, not to assume that the government can give these rights or take them away. Let us examine carefully the real issues before we are taken in by the heat and the emotions of the moment, and in the end lose what we still have.

Mr. Prud'homme: Would the hon. member allow a question?

Mr. Thompson: Yes, with pleasure, if the Speaker gives permission.

Mr. Prud'homme: When he said that the War Measures Act should apply to only one part of the country, was he aware that Canada is one country and that what applies to one part of the country should apply to all of it? Is there not a danger that if this were to apply to one part of the country only, Quebec at present, some people could profit from the situation in another part of the

country, could profit from the fact that all the forces were busy in Quebec by taking violent action in some other part of the country?

Mr. Thompson: I respect the question and the questioner, who is a good friend of mine, but I do not accept the validity of his argument. If I were playing football today and I cracked my shinbone and drastic action had to be taken such as surgery to correct the injury, need I bind up my other leg and arms as well? I do not think so. There is such an accident or unfortunate situation in one part of the country, that requires this kind of action but people who live there because of a danger that does not exist?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (12:50 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ovide Laflamme (Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, I would like to participate in this interesting debate which is drawing the attention of a great many Canadians, even though it is meant primarily to give members an opportunity to express their opinion on the measures adopted by the government to meet the present state of emergency in Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, when we listen to the speeches of opposition members, we wonder about the purpose of this debate. They say: The government could not act otherwise under the circumstances but assumed powers that are too extensive.

Mr. Speaker, when a state of emergency has to be dealt with, one is not justified in criticizing the government for taking too many precautions in order to regain control over a situation which is deteriorating from day to day.

But, as this debate permits the exchange of some views, I wish to call attention to the fact that the government's decision was made following a request from the Quebec provincial authorities, with the unanimous approval of the National Assembly, that of the executive Council of the City of Montreal, which represents close to one-third of the population of the province of Quebec, and that, I am sure, of almost the whole of the Quebec population. This was an urgent request and, in my view, the government acted wisely and speedily. The government acted so promptly that, in a few hours, throughout the province all those who advocate the use of submersive means to overthrow the established order were arrested and are now detained.

Mr. Speaker, who is responsible for such a situation? The matter can be discussed for hours and attempts made to find out causes, but this would only serve to provide us with guidelines for the future. But there is a point which it is important to consider for a few minutes and upon which many hon. members have insisted, that is the great influence of the mass media on the population.

The generation that is challenging the established order was born with the media, especially television. That generation has greatly abused freedom of speech and is guilty also of many other excesses. It is obvious that the great impact of the mass media has incited people unable to control themselves perhaps because they enjoy too much freedom to use subversive means.

Last Sunday, the premier of Quebec channelled the thoughts of all Canadians when he said that the responsibility for protecting order and justice rests with the competent authorities, even though the lives of two citizens—one British diplomat and the hon. Pierre Laporte, provincial member for Longueuil, a friend of mine who, I am sure, is mentally and morally fit to take it—are at stake. I hope, in the interest of the province of Quebec and of Canada, that they will be released safe and sound.

The Parti Québécois, as it was said earlier, is not directly concerned. One thing remains sure, however, and this is why some confusion may exist. The objectives seeked by the FLQ and the Parti Québécois are identical; only the means to reach them differ. The FLQ wants to upset the established order, destroy the country through violence and force. As for the Parti Québécois, while challenging the minds and attempting to destroy the country in the minds of the people, especially, in the minds of the young people of Quebec, wants to subvert the established order by advocating the separation of Quebec through democratic means, but it does it through excesses of language and the "rape" of young people's minds, as it has already been said in the House.

And during the few years when we have witnessed the rise of separatism and heard these inflammatory flights of oratory, hot-headed young people were setting themselves a sort of aim which was not a real one, that is the establishment of a Quebec state that, alone, would be able to settle all problems. This theory has been idealized on the one hand and on the other hand subversive minds, people unable to bear the wealth of freedom which we enjoy both at the provincial level and at the national level, have swung into action. Now, we are witnessing a series of bombings. Time has passed and, for a while, the bombings in Quebec may have answered the purpose of certain people, because they contributed to the unstability of the economy. While industries were being established outside the province, these people would say: "Bombings in Quebec are not such a bad thing after all as we can see industries being set up in other provinces".

The provincial elections held on April 29 had disappointing results for Mr. René Levesque, leader of the Parti Québécois. Last night on the publicly owned TV network, acting like the crow that dropped its prey, he tried to convince his viewers that this debate is tantamount to a federal-provincial crisis. He claimed that the government of the province of Quebec had ceased to exist. In my opinion, this is cheap politics on his part at a time when the National Assembly where some of his party members are sitting was unanimously begging the federal government to put into effect the measures which are now known to us, i.e. the intervention of the army to help out the police forces which for several months now have had more than they could handle in the way of

protecting the citizens in general, and more especially respectable persons like the hon. Pierre Laporte, from falling into the hands of kidnappers, and of bringing an end to any panic within the population.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It being one o'clock I do now leave the Chair to resume the same at two o'clock this afternoon.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laflamme: Mr. Speaker, at the time of adjournment, I was explaining certain issues underlying current events in Quebec, outlining to the House the significant influence of the mass media, particularly since the advent of television.

The great influence of the mass media and the misuse of the freedom of speech have lead a number of extremists to commit assault and terrorism. Those very people who want to turn our society into a "society with more freedom", deprive at the same time of their basic liberty the citizens of the country, especially Quebecers. It is not a question of establishing now who, in the past, could have been responsible for these actions and for the present situation. Rather, I think that action was imperative.

For years, civil authority has been jeered at in all structures of society, in Quebec as well as in the entire country.

By the information media, especially in Quebec, there is also "the challenge of authority constituted in the schools". And the entire present generation, which benefits from greater access to schools, is being indoctrinated by these revolutionaries who repeat emulously that our constitution is bad and should be completely remodelled.

Moreover if one would analyse the average age of alleged FLQ members one would see that they are 25 or less.

As these subversive activities were being planned drugs were distributed among young people. There is no city in Canada right now where youngsters of 16 or 17 have not impaired their health owing to uncontrolled use of drugs. Naturally, this created an atmosphere favourable to subversive action.

That is why, every time I hear members of the opposition say that the government should have acted and taken measures sooner, I contend that most of them would have been the first to say then that the government was reacting too quickly and was trying to exercise too strongly the powers it had under the law.

In my opinion, the government could not face the fact that in a society which had as much freedom as we have, subversive elements were fostering a revolution to establish a dictatorship such as the ones that exist in Cuba or other countries which do not have anything like the basic freedoms we enjoy in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, before recess I was saying that on television yesterday the leader of Parti Québécois Mr. René Lévesque had suggested a federal-provincial debate on the present situation, tragic and serious as it is. In this I submit he went against the opinion of the members of his own party sitting in the National Assembly where Premier Bourassa received the unanimous support of all members to ask the federal government for armed intervention in order to assist the police forces.

Mr. Speaker, it was said time an again that the present government action is one of assistance to police forces. I do not see how we can reproach the government for having acted so swiftly and I would even say so efficiently. Hundreds of lives have thus been spared by the armed forces and the police in resorting to arrests of a preventive nature. Prompt action was required.

In fact, in Hull, a young girl was kidnapped and held captive until four o'clock this morning. She was subjected to all kinds of tortures, then she was relaased only so that she could warn the Prime Minister that, unless a stop was put to the use of the army to fight the FLQ, children would be the next victims. This was a message that the Prime Minister was to give, with assurance, on the radio.

That is what terrorists are doing in our country. The time had come to use against criminals, who want to spread panic and terror by threatening the lives of individuals, every measure that a structured society like ours has at its disposal.

A society such as ours does not have the right to give in to blackmail, even though young people are used to seeing such tense situations unfolding on the screen.

If the Quebec or Ottawa government had yielded to that outrageous blackmail, a lot of young people would have witnessed that blackmail and that terrorism. It is fortunate that Quebec had at its head a young premier who was wise and forceful and who acted with insight and in co-operation with the government of his country; he was thus able to keep the situation under control and to tell those people, once and for all, that terrorism has no place in Canada and that the agitators will have either to die or to change their minds.

Those are, Mr. Speaker, the preventive measures that the House should adopt unanimously. It will still be time later on to discuss the subtle technicalities aimed at preventing any kind of subversive activity in Canada.

• (2:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): I will not be here on Monday when the vote is taken. For this reason, I wish to make my stand perfectly clear. Everyone should stand and be counted on this issue, but the

fact remains that some of us have to attend to other unavoidable commitments. I do not want any ambiguity as to my position and the reasons for adopting this position. That is why I am participating in this debate.

The main points of argument have been put forward very clearly by the various parties in this House. I have listened to these speeches exceedingly carefully. I do not think I have missed a speech since this debate began. I wish to sum up the reasons why I would vote against this motion. It amounts to endorsing and showing confidence in what the government has done by invoking the War Measures Act at this time.

I want it to be abundantly clear that the members of my party do not deny that the government of Quebec needs the extra powers for which it is asking. Nor do we deny the fact that this government has every right and responsibility to see that they get these powers. We have known for a long time that there is a cancer eating at the vitals of the province of Quebec, a cancer which is very likely to spread to other parts of the country. I am not talking about one province versus another. We know this has to be dealt with.

I want to give the reasons why we think the way in which the government is dealing with this matter is wrong. It is far too dangerous a method for those of us who respect Parliament to accept. I could not vote for this motion because it asks us to blindly approve the government's action. We have not been given the facts indicating why this motion is necessary. We have heard about sticks of dynamite, cells of the FLQ and other things. I have no doubt that these are the facts, and a great deal more could be alleged.

The members of this House have not been given a proper analysis or outline of the complete situation. This is our right. Why could there not have been a special in camera session during which the government could have briefed hon. members if there are other matters which we do not know about? If there are facts that in the opinion of the government warrant this action, why haven't the responsible elected members from every province and district in Canada been informed of these? As the representatives of the people of this country, this is what we have a right to expect. We have not received an answer to that question. Why were we not approached days, weeks or months ago with regard to this particular need?

An hon. member this morning very cogently indicated, with documentation, that for well over a year the city of Montreal and the province of Quebec have been in a state where they wanted help from the federal government. No action or insufficient action was taken to meet the need. Why was this not done? Why was it necessary to have a hurry up, middle of the night performance about which we were informed only after it occurred? It has now been more than ten days since Parliament resumed. Why could we not have been informed earlier about this proclamation to help the city of Montreal and the province of Quebec?

• **(2:20 p.m.)**

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) says this act is stronger than is needed at the present time. We want to know why we cannot have legislation of the kind which is needed, not far-reaching provisions which are sweeping away every vestige of hard-won civil liberty across Canada. What is needed now is a measure to deal with the particular emergency in Quebec. I have read carefully the letters of the Premier of Quebec and the Mayor of Montreal, but nowhere can I find a request that the War Measures Act be invoked. The idea did not come from them, or at least it does not emerge in the letters. The Prime Minister says he does not need all the powers contained in that act. Very well, let him ask for the powers which are in fact required. The explanation that it is necessary to pounce quickly upon suspects is not sufficient, in my view, to justify the action which has been taken.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) failed to explain yesterday why amendments to the Criminal Code could not have handled this emergency in Quebec. Why were such amendments not proposed? We in this party would have supported amendments designed to strengthen powers of search and confer other powers for dealing with terrorists. But this was not the course taken. Instead, a statute was invoked which had been designed to deal only with a situation in which the country was in a state of war or insurrection of a kind no one has yet referred to in this House. No reply has been made to the suggestion made by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) and others that a statute be drafted rapidly to meet the situation and replace the sweeping powers conferred by the War Measures Act. The only answer we got was that we must have faith in the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister is a fine man, an upstanding man, a lover of his country—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mrs. MacInnis: Why cannot we rest our confidence there? I want to say that if the angel Gabriel appeared to me in person and asked me to turn over the functions of Parliament to him because he was a clean-living, fine angel, my answer would be, no. To do so would be to negate our very reason for being here as representatives of the people.

There are altogether too many unanswered questions in this situation. Those of us who come here believing we have a duty to represent the people cannot be fobbed off by excuses, or persuaded to give in to a small group of members, in fact, in the ultimate instance, to the wishes of one man over an issue which will affect this country for a long time to come.

The Prime Minister promised he would consider drafting such a statute as I have described but there is nothing to compel him to do so. Between now and next April he could, if he wished, extend the powers he presently has beyond April 30. There may be members on the other side of the House who are prepared to abdicate their responsibility to the extent of approving the inten-

tions of one man, not knowing under what conditions he may have to operate, but I, and those associated with me, have no intention of belonging to their company. This is my first reason for opposing this motion.

The second reason is that this action in invoking the War Measures Act is one which should not have been taken in the absence of consideration and debate by this parliamentary body. I am aware of all the excuses and reasons given for the course taken, but there is no reason under Heaven for bypassing the elected representatives of the people when such sweeping powers are brought in, particularly since we are in session and quite able to deal with emergency legislation. There are procedures by means of which a suitable measure could have been got quickly through the House. In my opinion this is just another example of this tendency to downgrade the authority of parliament. People have remarked that liberty is seldom taken away in one sudden swoop but that it is usually taken away piece by piece. In my opinion, this is one more serious step in the downgrading of the authority of this Parliament, the legislative body, the decision-making body of the people of Canada, that is, if more than lip service is to be paid to the idea of democratic government in this country.

In the third place, I believe we should oppose this motion because no serious reasons have been given for the government's failure to use another method of meeting the situation, such as amending the Criminal Code or the passing of a special statute. I will put forward a further reason for opposing this legislation. We have found in the past in this country and in other countries that once measures of this kind have been put into force they are extremely difficult to remove. My memory goes back to days when I was a very young girl and section 98 was placed on the statute books of this country. It was debated by Parliament. It was before the House for two or three hours and received Royal Assent quickly; it was put through in a panic situation. People at that time—nobody believes it any more—believed firmly that we were in the midst of a red revolution on the banks of the Red River. They panicked, and the government of the day put through section 98 which in its own way provided sweeping powers to deal with what they considered to be a dire emergency.

That section, section 98, was on the statute books of this country for 17 long years. It was used in the depression to very bad effect. During the 'thirties, when he was a member of the opposition, Mr. Lapointe, later minister of justice, tried to get legislation through Parliament to repeal it. He was unsuccessful because once a measure of this kind comes into force it is extremely difficult to get rid of it. Those who cheerfully say "Give the Prime Minister a few weeks and he will be bringing a suitable measure before Parliament to replace this statute" are optimists to a very high degree indeed, in my view. I would not be a bit surprised to see this measure remain in force a lot longer than April 30 next year. I hope that will not be the case, but on the basis of experience these measures are terribly hard to remove.

• (2:30 p.m.)

Another reason that I must oppose this measure is that no one knows where this sort of measure will end. We were led to believe by the Prime Minister—no, the Prime Minister was a little more frank than some of his supporters who have spoken; he indicated that the measure was to be used to deal with the FLQ and perhaps other organizations of an illegal type. Other speakers on the government side were very much more careful to point out that they felt the measure was invoked solely to deal with the FLQ. But who is to say where the measure is going to end? Once you move into the area of calling organizations illegal, heaven alone knows where this will end.

It is very interesting to note that not more than 36 hours after invoking the act the mayor of my own city of Vancouver, a city where no one has yet heard of a state of insurrection existing, showed himself to be very eager to take action under the act. I should say he wanted the authorities to take action since he is unable to wield its powers himself. The mayor desired to have what he regarded as "nuisance organizations" declared illegal. The fact is that he is running for election and badly needs to have demagogic material to assist him to return to office; but his election has nothing to do with the powers that can be exercised under this act. However, I am just citing the fact that throughout British Columbia it is already very well known that this legislation is available to those who are in a position to use it.

It was made abundantly clear to me yesterday in the speech of the Minister of Justice that the authority for declaring what is an illegal organization rests with the attorneys general of the provinces. In my opinion this is a very peculiar way to secure even handed justice in Canada. The act and the orders in council that were passed may be federal in form; but if the attorney general of each province is to be permitted to determine what is an illegal organization in his province, then Canadians do not have uniform justice across the country.

The fears that have been expressed by many in this House that the action taken by the government will not help to solidify Canadian unity but, on the other hand, will divide Canadians becomes all too real. To my mind it is wrong to leave the definition of what is an illegal organization to the whim of the attorney general of a province. In fact, if I were in charge of the government, knowing something of the composition of the present government of British Columbia, I might even be a little alarmed at allowing the attorney general of that province to declare which organizations are legal and which are not. Perhaps there is no immediate danger in this regard, but we must remember that this sort of thing can snowball at an accelerating rate.

These are some of the reasons that I oppose this measure, but there is one over-riding reason, and it is that I believe firmly in democratic government. I believe that although people may not be as informed as we would like—and they cannot be informed so long as we have a situation where even their representatives are not told

the truth—and even though people are unable to use the machinery of government to achieve their objectives, I still believe that government by the people is the only form of government that is worthy of people like us who have a great heritage to preserve and to protect.

I believe that this sort of measure has reduced the members of the House to the role of rubber stamping a decision by the Prime Minister of the country. This applies to the backbenchers on the opposite side of the House as well as those of us on the opposition benches. If we are going to be reduced to the role of rubberstamping, after the event, something the government has done, then I believe the sooner the doors of this Parliament are closed and the truth becomes apparent to the people, the better. The people are being lulled into a sense of false security as a result of our not being given the facts. As I say, their representatives are being faced with a fait accompli when they are invited to endorse a policy adopted by the government without their knowledge, and without being given any information on which to base a judgment.

Those are the reasons I must oppose this measure. When the votes are registered on Monday, let no one say there were those of us in this House who were afraid to stand up and be counted. I am getting my vote in early. My vote will be one that says I believe that, serious as the situation in the province of Quebec undoubtedly is, it is important that, in giving the government power to deal with the situation, we should not throw away those liberties that all of us from coast to coast have won, liberties which our forefathers gained for us with such difficulty.

These rights that we have won are worth preserving. In my view their fate cannot hinge on the decision, judgment and honesty of one man, no matter how able he may be. We must keep these rights in our own hands if we are to consider ourselves worthy to sit in this House and to represent the people in our constituencies.

Mr. Mark MacGuigan (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) said yesterday morning, this is a most serious matter. I sincerely regret that many of those on the opposite side who have spoken to this question have not regarded it as sufficiently serious to comment on the matters genuinely at issue and to avoid political recriminations.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has invited the members of this House to make constructive comments on the changes they would like to see made in the regulations, and to comment on the provisions they would like to see incorporated in the new piece of legislation of a less sweeping nature that he has promised to bring forward as soon as it is feasible to do so. If opposition members are not prepared to fulfil that duty, then I am. I should like to begin my remarks by commenting briefly on the regulations which have been presented to the House for its consideration and approval.

• (2:40 p.m.)

I would comment in particular on two of the regulations before commenting in general on the question of unlawful associations. First of all, with regard to regulation 7(2), which provides for a detention for 90 days before a person is brought before a judge, I would submit that 90 days seems to be an unnecessarily long period. I believe this period in these regulations, and also in any subsequent statute which might be passed, might well be limited to 30 days. This would seem to fulfil the needs of the moment and would also provide for somewhat greater protection for the liberty of the subject.

I would also draw the attention of the House to regulation 8(a) where it is provided that:

> In any prosecution for an offence under these Regulations, evidence that any person
>
> (a) attended any meeting of the unlawful association,...is, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, proof that he is a member of the unlawful association.

I think this sub-paragraph goes too far. I do not think we ought to have this type of provision in the legislation which states that mere attendance at a meeting, even of such an unlawful association, in the absence of more evidence is proof of membership. I would also have some reservation about sub-paragraph (c), if this purports to mean that someone who, as a result of negotiations entered into between the government and an organization such as the FLQ, were ipso facto to be considered a member of that association. I believe if there were evidence to the contrary in such a case, such a person would not be guilty of any offence under these regulations.

Despite my feeling that several of these regulations go too far, I am very firmly in agreement with the principle of these regulations and with the action which the government has taken. The member who preceded me just now was discussing the passing of the unlawful association legislation in Canada. She referred to the fact that in 1919 the Conservative government at that time passed unlawful association legislation and installed it in the Criminal Code as Section 98.

Some 17 years later, in 1936, a Liberal government removed that unlawful association section from the Criminal Code. What the previous speaker failed to avert to was the fact that it was precisely because this provision was made an amendment to the Criminal Code rather than a temporary emergency measure that it lasted for 17 years. The problem with unlawful association legislation is that after the crisis period is over, it tends to remain on the statute books and its interpretation is extended to apply to situations for which it was never intended, and sometimes very unfairly so. This does not mean that such legislation is not very essential at moments of crisis to deal with particular problems which exist at that time. The essence of the distinction is simply that this legislation should be in effect for as short a time as is necessary to cope with the specific problem for which it is intended, and it should not remain indefinitely on the statute books of Canada. That is precisely the way in which this measure works.

The real test of the government's intention will be how the exceptional powers which are granted by these

regulations are used. I think it well to underline that the exceptional powers which the government has actually taken are not the full scope of the powers which would have been available to the government under the War Measures Act. The government could under that act, if the situation had warranted, have requested regulations of a much wider nature than it did. It has not done so and has already in this way, by drawing the regulations as narrowly as it thought advisable, indicated its good faith. I believe that the test of the government's intention, and that the test of what the government is here doing, will be the way in which these powers are exercised in the succeeding weeks and months. Unlike the opposition, I am not prepared to make a judgment before the evidence is at hand. I propose to wait to see the future fate of these regulations and their enforcement, before I make a judgment as to whether or not the powers which the government has assumed are undue.

There are legitimate concerns both about the wording and the consequences of the assumption of these awesome powers by the government. Some of these questions have been raised by members of the opposition. I disagree with some of their arguments, even while recognizing the legitimacy of the concern they have expressed.

The predominant tone of this debate has been political. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) expressed the view that the government in power must be prepared to answer for the crisis situation. The most remarkable speech along this line, and I very much regret he is not with us in the House at the moment, was made by the leader of the NDP, the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas).

This hon. member made not one but two speeches at the same time. First, he made a statesman's speech in which he said there was no room in Canada for violence. He said, as reported at page 197 of *Hansard*:

> —we believe that to allow any group to dictate terms to the democratic, elected government of this country is to invite anarchy and chaos in Canada.

He put himself and his party on record as opposing that. He then went on to make his second speech, his contrary and political speech. After having recognized the problem and the way to deal with it, he in effect, denied the government the effective means of dealing with it. This might have been tenable if his chief argument had been that the government should have proceeded by way of statute rather than by way of regulation. He did make that objection, but the main thrust of his political, second speech was that the government and the Prime Minister personally were responsible for this crisis.

The hon. member recited all the ills of the province of Quebec with no recognition of the special kind of threat we face in the FLQ, the threat to infiltrate our way of life by whatever means may be conveniently at hand for the use of this desperate organization.

I must admit I am reading the remarks of the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands in light of the explanation of his remarks given by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis). The hon. member for York South seemed to feel there had been some difficulty in understanding the remarks his leader had made and he, therefore, said he would try to repeat what had been said using different words so we could more clearly understand them. That hon. member put the matter more clearly. He said:

> What is happening to Quebec is a result of the policies of this government and is a result of the inflexible attitude of the Prime Minister, which he is continually incorporating in his policies.

The situation in Quebec, he says, results from this government and this Prime Minister. What utter rot for the hon. member to parade before this House. He accused the government of repression and even challenged us to indicate where in the world what he called repression had been useful in dealing with problems of this kind. There are many examples which indicate that the judicious and limited use of force by a legitimate government has succeeded not only in protecting the people of the country but in eliminating a subversive threat that was being made by a particular group. I need mention only such countries as Kenya, Malaysia and the Philippines. In each of those countries, the government had to cope with subversive attacks on their duly constituted authority. If the hon. member does not think those countries are sufficiently western, let us look at France. As we know, General de Gaulle, who knew how to use force when it was necessary, faced down those in France who would have destroyed that country and put her into chaos.

There is a case for legitimate use of force in a democratic country. The hon. member for York South was right in stating that traditional revolution cannot succeed without popular support. He did not use the word "traditional", I put in that word. The point is that this is not traditional revolution, this is criminal war. The FLQ is not trying to win Quebec by battle in the field or, still less, unfortunately, by persuasion. It is trying to win Quebec by terror.

Last night a 27 year old girl from nearby Hull was seized in front of her house about seven o'clock by a group of men. She was carried off, was tortured throughout the night and was released in the early hours of the morning with the letters FLQ scratched across her, and with the message that the FLQ was prepared now to escalate the war not only to women but also to children. These are the methods of the FLQ. These are not the methods of a democratic group. They are the methods of a group which is determined to gain power by terror and tyranny. I am astonished that the hon. member for York South did not see fit to make such distinctions. I am astonished he did not recognize the difference between open violence and hidden violence. The violence we face in Quebec is not of the type that results from the escalation of feelings on the picket line, with which he is familiar. It is not the result of somebody performing a legitimate function who suddenly finds that his emotions get beyond his control to the extent that he breaks the peace. This is not that kind of violence. This is hidden and systematic violence.

In an interview on the CBC some months ago, we saw two FLQ members who had been trained in the Middle

East. These are not the methods of democratic men or even of men who are prepared to fight openly in the streets. These are the methods of hidden violence. I am astonished that the hon. member for York South did not make a distinction between limited and unlimited violence. In Quebec we have seen murder and the threat of murder. We have seen kidnapping and the threat of kidnapping. We have heard of threats to destroy the communication and transportation system of Canada. I am above all astonished that the hon. member for York South did not make a distinction between violence which is proportionate to social ills and violence such as this which is completely out of proportion to any social ills.

Does any hon. member of this House sincerely believe, even if we accept the fancy hypothesis about the Lapalme workers, that if those workers were given back their jobs the FLQ would disappear and violence cease in Quebec? Does anyone think that if there should be no unemployment in Quebec this would solve the problem? This violence is not proportionate to the social ills which exist in Quebec. It is violence of a kind which, as I said, is hidden, is unlimited and is totally out of proportion to the social ills which exist in the society.

• (2:50 p.m.)

I have spent many years fighting for civil liberties in Canada. I have been a director of the Civil Liberties Association and its chairman. It is precisely because I believe I understand what civil liberties are all about that I support the government's action.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacGuigan: It is an action which is directed toward preserving civil liberties and freedom generally in this country. There is no freedom in anarchy; there is no freedom in violence. There is no freedom in terror. There is freedom only in law. Let us have that law so that we may have our freedom.

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, we have just heard the words of a man who is supposedly learned in the law, a former dean of law and a young man supposedly of some ability. If I were that man with the background I would anticipate I should have and should be displaying to the people of Canada I would think that the words spoken should stick in my throat, because what he said was that whenever freedom is threatened you give the government the power of dictatorship so that it can protect your freedom.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Coates: I am against government by dictatorship. That is what the War Measures Act is. I am opposed to it. Somebody said, how did we get elected. Mr. Speaker, members of this House were elected by the democratic process which is not in effect in Canada today.

An hon. Member: Nonsense.

An hon. Member: Why are we wasting our time listening to you?

[Mr. MacGuigan.]

Mr. Coates: Whether you do or do not listen to me, my friend, does not really make any difference, because if your Prime Minister decides that I should be incarcerated for the next 90 days then I can be in that jail for 90 days whether I am a member of the FLQ or anything else. That is what the War Measures Act and the regulations associated with it provide. It is just as simple as that.

The members in this House are very touchy, Mr. Speaker, and well they should be. It is not just the 30 or so men sitting on the treasury benches but all 158 members of the Liberal party who have decided, and will decide just as long as the Prime Minister wants them to, that this government will have the power of a dictatorship, an oligarchy, the power to take away their freedom and liberty. So, they may well be touchy.

Yesterday and today, members of this chamber have been provided with a rare display, a display the equal of which I have not seen since June 1968, a display in which cabinet ministers, including the Prime Minister, stand up in this chamber in an effort to defend themselves. We have not been treated this way before, and there is a very good reason. The Prime Minister and his cabinet ministers know just how extreme the measures that have been taken are. They know how far they have gone and they are endeavouring to justify action that is far in excess of anything that has ever been done in this country in its 103-year history, except in time of war, and to do what?

An hon. Member: To save Canada.

Mr. Coates: Somebody says "To save Canada". Are we in Canada at the present time in a state of civil war?

An hon. Member: Almost.

Mr. Coates: The gentleman says "almost".

An hon. Member: Like the Tory party.

Mr. Coates: Now, the gentleman becomes facetious.

An hon. Member: Tell us about the leadership convention.

Mr. Coates: Well, my friend, it is indeed a very high level of intellect that is evidenced by the remarks of some of the backbenchers of the Liberal party. It is no wonder we in the opposition must speak out for freedom in this country when there is a bunch of asses like those speaking out from the back benches of the Liberal party at the present time.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. The Chair would like to bring to the attention of hon. members that the hon. member for Cumberland-Colchester North (Mr. Coates) has the floor. At the same time, I wish to remind the hon. member that the language used in this House should be on the highest level.

Mr. Nowlan: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that your ruling was quite correct, with all respect. Asses do not speak out. Asses just bray, as we have seen.

• (3:00 p.m.)

Mr. Coates: If anybody is deeply hurt, I can always change the word to "jackasses," "donkeys," "oxen," or something that is at least as appropriate and indicates the degree of esteem in which these members should be held by the Canadian people for the great contribution they have made up till now. We have heard members who support the government suggest that Canada is either in the throes of a civil war or on the verge of it. If that is the case, why have the people of Canada not been told, because I am sure one does not overnight get to the point of being involved in a civil war. Why has the government not taken action before now to prevent such a situation developing?

My hon. friends suggest that we are on the verge of a civil war. To my knowledge this situation has been in existence in this country since at least 1963. Until now people have not been kidnapped, but they have been killed and maimed, properties have been destroyed and threats have been made over and over again against the state, against the province of Quebec and against people. Nothing new has occurred, except that a British diplomat and a Quebec cabinet minister have been kidnapped. It is terrible to think that this has occurred, but it is just a continuation and an escalation of what has been going on since 1963, a period of seven years.

If during that period of time this government had thought we were approaching a civil war, should it not have taken steps to produce legislation that would have given it the power to stamp out once and for all insurrection in this country, instead of announcing at 4 a.m. that Canada is to have its liberty and freedom set aside? And our liberty and freedom is to be set aside not just for today or tomorrow, not just for this week or next week but for 6½ months at least while the government moves in whatever way it decides to move to eliminate the problem as it sees it.

An hon. Member: Brilliant!

Mr. Coates: We heard the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) speak yesterday. He made a brilliant speech, but he should have because no man in this country, including the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), bears greater responsibility than the Minister of Justice. He is the guardian, not only of the law but of the liberty and freedom of the individual. If we as individuals in this nation cannot depend on him to jealously guard our freedom, we do not have much hope.

Let us go back, not to 1963 but to June of 1968 at which time I and all hon. members of the House were involved in an election campaign. At that time I was led to believe—I have read and listened to the Liberal propaganda—that the problems facing Canada between 1963 and 1968 would disappear immediately, overnight with the election of Pierre Elliot Trudeau as Prime Minister of Canada; that the just society would come into effect and that regional economic disparity would be eliminated immediately.

Mr. Cafik: How stupid can you get.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Coates: The Canadian electorate were stupid to believe that Pierre Elliott Trudeau would produce that situation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I would ask the hon. gentleman to resume his seat. Is the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik) rising on a question of privilege?

Mr. Cafik: I was rising to ask if I could ask the hon. member a question.

Mr. Coates: If the hon. member wishes to ask a question, he can do so when I have finished my speech. We were told that with the election of a prime minister from the province of Quebec we would have no serious problems in the days ahead, because who better could talk to the people of Quebec than someone from their province, and who better could show them that federalism was the way of life for all Canadians to follow? What has happened? After less than 2½ years in office we have heard this Prime Minister say that he does not have the answers, there is no just society and he does not even want to use that slogan any more because the just society is not working out.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Coates: The jackasses are still braying in the background.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Coates: What we have now, rather than a just society, is an unjust society that infringes upon our liberty and freedom, liberty and freedom which we are told is being eliminated for a reason which a great many Canadians feel is proper. I do not say for one moment that the action taken by the Prime Minister is unpopular in the country. Indeed, last night I listened to Premiers from coast to coast saying that it was a reasonable action on the part of the government. They had not even had an opportunity to look at the regulations passed under the War Measures Act, yet they were saying they believed it was a reasonable action. When they look at the regulations and see that, among other things, they provide as follows, I wonder what their reaction will be:

> 8. In any prosecution for an offence under these Regulations, evidence that any person
>
> (a) attended any meeting of the unlawful association,
>
> (b) spoke publicly in advocacy for the unlawful association, or
>
> (c) communicated statements of the unlawful association as a representative or professed representative of the unlawful association is, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, proof that he is a member of the unlawful association.
>
> 9. (1) a peace officer may arrest without warrant (a) a person who he has reason to suspect is a member of the unlawful association;

• (3:10 p.m.)

A police officer may, after arresting an individual, incarcerate him in jail for a period of 90 days. The hon.

member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan) suggests that this may be too severe. He says that members of the opposition have been asked by the Prime Minister to make suggestions regarding the type of legislation that should be produced. But although the Prime Minister says that, he is unwilling to give us the facts about the seriousness of the situation. In the absence of documentation on the seriousness of the situation we are supposed to propose legislation for the government's consideration. How ridiculous could anything become? Mr. Speaker, it is the government's responsibility to produce legislation based on the facts that it has and outlining the degree of power it feels it should have. We are saying that nothing we know indicates that the government had to go to the extreme that it did in order to secure the power it has today.

Let us consider the country to our south, which is much bigger than Canada, with ten times as many people. It has all kinds of difficulties because of organizations like the FLQ. It has dozens of organizations like the FLQ which are bent on the destruction of that country, bent on the destruction of its system of government, just as the FLQ is bent on the destruction of our system of government. But that government has not announced that civil war exists in the United States. It has not proclaimed that the President of the United States should be made a dictator. It has logically and systematically asked its legislative bodies to increase the power of the President so that he may be better able to protect the individual through law and order. How much more reasonable it would have been had our government, when it knew the seriousness of the situation existing in the province of Quebec, moved to take the same steps, to produce the same kind of legislation that would have given the Prime Minister the type of power that the President of the United States achieved through the legislative process?

All Canadians have been asked by the Prime Minister to accept his decision, to agree to the elimination of liberty and freedom so far as the regulations passed under the War Measures Act are concerned. I watched the Prime Minister last night on television, as I am sure most Canadians did. He did a tremendous job in explaining his position; there is no argument about that. As a matter of fact, I think that even Barbra Streisand would have been proud of him last night because he acted so well. But, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is a Jekyll and Hyde. I recall seeing the Prime Minister in this House of Commons yesterday, when he was listening to a former prime minister outlining the documentation that had been presented to a committee of this House by the mayor and chairman of the executive committee of the city of Montreal. When he had finished gesturing, making fun of a former prime minister, he had this to say as recorded at page 204 of *Hansard*:

> Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out to the hon. member that I was very willing to listen to him but if he intends to read nonsense in this way—

The "nonsense" that the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) was reading happened to be the evidence that had been placed before a special committee of this House inquiring into the activities of the Company of Young Canadians. That was the Prime Minister we saw in action in the House of Commons. He was a far different fellow from the individual who appeared on television last night pleading with the people of Canada, at his pleading best, to bear with him during the period in which liberty and freedom were to be set aside so that he could wipe out the insurgents in the province of Quebec. That is just one of the many examples of the type of Prime Minister we have.

I remember when he was Minister of Justice and he rose in this House and told members of the opposition, "We are the masters of the House." I remember very well when as Prime Minister he said on July 25, 1969, as recorded at page 11635 of *Hansard:*

> The opposition seems to think it has nothing else to do but talk. They say: If there is a problem, we will talk. If there is a difficulty, we will talk about it. If the government is going too slowly, we will talk about it. If there is a real problem in some part of Canada, we will talk about it. That is all they have to do. They do not have to govern—

An hon. Member: Amen.

Mr. Coates:

> —they have only to talk. The best place in which to talk, if they want a quorum is, of course, Parliament. When they get home, when they get out of Parliament, when they are 50 yards from Parliament Hill, they are no longer hon. members—they are just nobodies—

An hon. Member: Shame!

Mr. Coates: Mr. Speaker, that is the Prime Minister who is asking the people of Canada to go along with him. If he says that Members of Parliament, who represent the 21 million people in this country, are nobodies, then what are the Canadians in the street whom the members of this House represent?

An hon. Member: Somebodies.

Mr. Coates: I wonder just how high is the Prime Minister's regard for the ordinary man in the street, if a Member of Parliament is a nobody. Yet he is the man who says, "Bear with me, my friends. I will be a benevolent dictator for 6½ months, or I will then tell you how much longer I will be a benevolent dictator." The Prime Minister allowed a situation to develop in the province of Quebec. He saw it developing even before he became a Member of Parliament. He saw it developing when he was in this House as Minister of Justice and then as Prime Minister. Then suddenly, at four o'clock in the morning, he said, "Today I assume new and greater powers; greater powers than any man has ever held in the history of this country." He took those powers unto himself.

• (3:20 p.m.)

Last night he put on sackcloth and ashes. He told us a fine story. No doubt Canadians were touched by his performance. If that had been the performance of the

Prime Minister day in and day out, I would say it was well and good. But that is not the kind of performance the right hon. gentleman puts on for the members of the House, who protect our freedom and liberty. He laughs at us; he gets up in the middle of our speeches and walks out; he sits down and hoots at us when we ask him legitimate questions; he stands up and says, "If you are going to heckle me, I am not going to talk to you; I am going to take my doll home and play."

An hon. Member: That is pretty childish.

Mr. Aiken: It is childish.

Mr. Coates: That is the kind of Prime Minister we have. That is not the man who put on such a performance last night on television. They are different men; they are Jekyll and Hyde. I do not know which of these two men wields the greatest power that has ever been assumed by any individual in this country.

An hon. Member: Mr. Hyde does.

Mr. Coates: I am afraid that instead of Dr. Jekyll, it is Mr. Hyde.

An hon. Member: Are you Barnum, or Bailey?

Mr. Coates: I will take the hon. member into the circus, because he is the biggest clown you will ever see.

An hon. Member: There's a sucker born every minute.

Mr. Coates: The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) had this to say yesterday about the government's action, as reported at page 195 of *Hansard*:

> The War Measures Act provides for the possibility of very sweeping interference with what we ordinarily consider to be the civil rights and liberties of Canadians. It is true that the government has presented and adopted regulations which do not invoke all the powers of the War Measures Act but, the War Measures Act having been invoked, there certainly are many additional powers in reserve which the government could utilize by regulation at any time. Furthermore, the extensive powers described in the regulations are to be in effect until April 30, 1971, a very considerable length of time. These powers apply, of course, throughout the country.

It is my belief, Mr. Speaker—I want to make this abundantly clear—that it was not necessary for the government at 4 a.m. yesterday to go to the extreme of invoking the War Measures Act. But now this has been done, now that the government has taken this action, now that this law is in effect, I say the government ought to move forward and produce for this House specific legislation giving the power necessary to combat the FLQ and any other subversive organization in this country. The legislation should be in effect for whatever period the government may deem necessary. But I say that whatever reason there was for invoking the War Measures Act, the inherent value of using that legislation has now gone.

Surely, the most significant reason the government can put forward for adopting an act giving it such sweeping powers as the right of immediate arrest is that surprise was needed to round up the insurgents. The government did not want to take the chance of their doing any more damage. Now that the element of surprise has gone, why does the government say, "We want this power for an additional six months and we are not even willing to consider giving it up before then"?

Why cannot the government, if it knows the facts, come to this House with them. It says it knows the facts and on the basis of those facts it has invoked the War Measures Act. If that is the case, surely the government must know what is required by way of special criminal law that would allow it to deal with the problems in Quebec. If that is the case, why does the government not bring legislation before us immediately so that we may consider and discuss it in this chamber which is the embodiment of freedom, liberty and the democratic institutions of this country.

The government produced the regulations it wanted, all-embracing as they are, in the short period of time that was available to it. Therefore, why cannot it bring forward special legislation that would give it the same powers but would not give the Prime Minister and the cabinet the additional, all-embracing power that abridges the liberty of every Canadian, which liberty may be eliminated if that be the wish of the federal government and the attorney general of any province. Why cannot the government make that move now, instead of 6½ months from now? Why cannot it now produce the legislation which it feels is required in order to stamp out the FLQ and other terrorist organizations in the province of Quebec?

Because I believe the power that has been assumed by this government is far greater than it need be and will bring more danger than good to the future of our nation, I wish to amend the motion to read as follows:

> The House approves the action of the government in invoking the powers of the War Measures Act to meet the state of apprehended insurrection in the province of Quebec as communicated to the Prime Minister by the government of Quebec and the civic authorities of Montreal and further approves the orders and regulations tabled today by the Prime Minister on the clear understanding that the proclamation invoking the powers as contained in the regulations will be revoked on or before October 30, 1970, unless a resolution authorizing their extension beyond the date specified has been approved by the House.

Mr. Bell: Let the government get around that one.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I would ask the hon. member to send a copy of his amended motion to the Chair.

Mr. Dubé: May we also have a copy of it, Mr. Speaker?

• (3:30 p.m.)

Mr. Paul St. Pierre (Coast Chilcotin): Mr. Speaker, I introduce my remarks by pointing out to the House that in my part of the country laws are not the most important element of our lives. In Coast Chilcotin we prefer fewer laws, not more. There are a great many who hanker for the good old days when laws were few and

simple. As one old-timer expressed it, in those days we did not have many laws in this country and the few we had, the people broke. Arising out of this, Mr. Speaker, I have an impulse of sympathy for those in the opposition who have been opposing this drastic measure taken by the government.

Whatever my impulse may be, Mr. Speaker, I feel bound to follow as best as I am able the fundamental law of common sense. In common sense, this government had no choice except to act as it did. It had a duty to protect six million good citizens of Quebec from a few hundred terrorists. The government had to move swiftly. It could not afford the luxury of prior public debate about its plans.

If there was any way that this government could have announced its intentions days before taking action and still have rounded up any suspects when a new law was finally passed, I have not heard a single member of the opposition explain it to my satisfaction.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. St. Pierre: I have no hesitation in fully supporting the measure, Mr. Speaker, much as I and other members of this House dislike it. If this were all I had to say, there would not be much reason for being on my feet. All the reasons in favour of this move have been given fully and very eloquently by speakers who have preceded me and there is not much point in my repeating them. But there is another aspect to the situation.

We in this House are discussing democracy. Democracy is closely bound with the whole question of the introduction of this measure. This is a time to ask ourselves: How well is this operation proceeding on Parliament Hill? How well does it serve the nation? To what extent should we respond to the mood of the people? To what extent should we react to the strengths and weaknesses of the democratic system? In the few minutes available to me I should like to deal with just one of the operations on Parliament Hill.

There is an operation here which I suggest is not fulfilling its function. Its members are supposedly appointed for merit. All too often I suspect they drift into that body as a reward for long service. They are appointed, Mr. Speaker, not elected. Not for them, the true test of democracy, the test of the ballot-box. They in fact very often claim that their voice is the voice of the Canadian public, but they never put it to the test of the vote. Of course, there are some good men among them—clever, brilliant, distinguished men.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will realize there is a motion before the House which, to my understanding, does not cover the subject upon which the hon. member now seems to be embarking. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) seems to be mesmerized by the hon. member's comments, and perhaps a few others. I suggest that the hon. member is straying some distance from the matter now before the House for consideration.

Mr. St. Pierre: I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that many preceding speakers have dealt at great length with the question of whether democracy is working properly in this country. I am merely following on the path that they have opened.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the War Measures Act has been proclaimed, which makes it possible for the government to bring in other orders to do anything that it wants, perhaps the hon. member will suggest that an order be brought in abolishing the other place. I think we should allow him to develop his case.

Mr. St. Pierre: I was saying, Mr. Speaker, that these appointed persons very frequently claim to speak for the public of Canada. However, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre misunderstands my meaning. He appears to think that I am discussing the Canadian Senate. I am discussing the parliamentary press gallery.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Red is my face, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. St. Pierre: It is perhaps the largest collection of singular, incurious reporters ever gathered in a single place. I stress the word "reporters". In the newspaper business a good reporter is the noblest work of God, a man who can get facts, get them right, often in spite of strenuous opposition, gain them if necessary by subterfuge, but get the facts. Place the significant facts in front of the reporter. This is the one man on which the entire industry depends. He is more than an editor, editorial writer, publisher or columnist. He is more than all of them together—because the reporter digs out facts. Without him, none of the others would have any material with which to work.

Something seems to happen, even to good reporters, when they enter the parliamentary press gallery. All too often they turn into pundits and are never again good for anything.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I must confess, if it is in order for the Chair to make confessions, that I had the same misunderstanding as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. If the words of the hon. member had referred to the other place and were out of order, they are equally out of order with regard to the fourth estate. The hon. member should in due course indicate how the remarks which he is making are related to the motion before the House.

Mr. St. Pierre: I can only repeat what I have already said, Mr. Speaker. The operation of the press is a fundamental part of democracy, and I suggest to hon. members that what we are discussing in this debate on the War Measures Act is the essence of democracy. Unless there is a functioning press, we cannot have democracy.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. St. Pierre: I would draw the attention of the House to the pundits. Certainly we have plenty of them. Every morning they get up and put their fingers on the pulse of the Canadian public. They have never been elected, but somehow they know exactly what the public is thinking and they inform us of the success or failure of this or that government motion, what the feelings of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) are, or what sort of power play is operating within this or that party.

We get that familiar Parliament Hill news story in which significant facts are as scarce as a piece of pork in a can of beans. Of course, the pundits are never defeated. They never stand for election, and they are never defeated. In recent months they explained to us how the Social Credit government was going to lose the election in British Columbia, how Wilson was going to win the election in Britain, and how Mr. Smith was going to win the election in Nova Scotia.

Failure does not bother them, because a pundit is a man who can predict what is going to happen tomorrow, the next day, next month or next year and is never at a loss to explain why it did not happen. They are entertaining fellows; their writings are often witty and certainly highly enjoyable. But, Mr. Speaker, where have all the reporters gone? Where are the men who can give the Canadian public the plain, unvarnished facts about what goes on on Parliament Hill?

Where is the respect which the parliamentary press gallery should claim from members of this House? It does not command it, from my observation, from what I can sense of the feelings of Members of Parliament after two years here, which is not a long time but I have taken care to try to sense their feelings. The feelings toward the parliamentary press gallery are equal measures of fear and contempt. Members fear the gallery because the press is for many members the only consistent means of contact with the constituency at home. This is why I say it is vital to the process of democracy. A bad press for a member can be devastatingly damaging. The contempt arises for the reasons I have already listed.

It was interesting in the course of this debate to observe the reaction of the House to the attack on the French language CBC made by the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette). He has made it before. Yesterday I made a particular point of scanning the House while the hon. member for Témiscamingue was launching his familiar attack. In the time I had available I observed that every French-speaking Canadian member of this House, in all parties, applauded his words. This, surely, is a serious matter.

I cannot discuss French language television because I do not see it. In fact, I very rarely see English language television; on the few occasions that I do, I have usually found the reporting rather tendentious. But there is no doubt, I suggest, as to the mood of this House concerning the services of the CBC, and I do not think it will be good enough for the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) to continue to shrug his shoulders and say the matter is out of his hands.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. St. Pierre: I return to that part of the media I observe more closely, that is, the newspapers. I am not enjoying making this speech, because the gallery contains some very able and hardworking newspapermen and I feel a temptation to single them out by name. This would scarcely be fair because by force of circumstances I have come to be acquainted with the work of some of them and not of others, and to name one or two while ignoring others would be unfair. But I should not fail to exempt one organization from my criticism, and that is the Canadian Press. I suggest we do not give enough recognition to that organization, Mr. Speaker. Hour after hour, day after day in this House we look up, and of the some 130 men in the press gallery one only is there—the Canadian Press reporter.

The general public does not realize that members of the gallery seldom attend the House except for the brief circus of the question period. From my own observation, the Canadian Press still clings to the principle of objective reporting and the reporting of fact. It was drilled into that organization by a very fine newspaper man named Gil Purcell. However, there is another fact about the Canadian Press that most hon. members in this House may not know. It is a co-operative news-gathering agency whose funds are provided by a number of newspapers; and with their typical parsimonious and niggardly attitude, the Canadian publishers starve it.

The Canadian Press does not have enough men here to staff the many jobs they are doing or could be doing so well for us. The publishers, I submit, bear the responsibility for much of this breakdown in communication between Parliament and the people of Canada. The publishers should get down here and take a look at what is going on. They should know, some of them, that what they are providing here is a gaggle of old hens who cluck around in the parliamentary restaurant over a few grains of gossip. The Canadian public deserves better.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. St. Pierre: They should send down here some young, eager and curious men. Reporters, Mr. Speaker, are what we need, not somebody with a degree in political science and an exaggerated sense of his own omniscience. I suggest they should come from the police beat, which is one of the hardest in the newspaper business because policemen do not provide facts freely or easily. It is a great beat for gathering news and a fine training ground for reporters.

I blame the editors. Sitting hundreds or thousands of miles from Parliament Hill, they take it upon themselves to decide what is happening down here. Time and time again they send a reporter down here and say, "Go your own lick. Get in deep and find the stories." Two days after, the correspondent's phone is ringing. The editor

says: "Get the local angle on this. We need a follow-up on that. Why weren't you at this or that press conference?" Most of the time these editors can get everything they need along these lines from the Canadian Press. But when an editor gets what he calls his "own man" in Ottawa, he cannot seem to rest unless he is poking, prodding and chivvying him around.

Of course, the introduction of a number of crackerjack reporters into the press gallery will not be an unalloyed joy to the government. But it would be very healthy for the government. Active reporters would find out secrets and print them, and that is how it should be. What is needed, if the Canadian public is to get the factual information it should be getting from Parliament Hill, is new blood in the press gallery. I thank hon. members for their attention.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Georges Valade (Sainte-Marie): Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I should like to congratulate the hon. member who spoke before me for the courage and the audacity he has shown in saying in a loud voice what several hon. members have been thinking for many years. He touched upon a subject which I wanted to bring up myself during my remarks. Although his speech did not deal solely with the subject matter under consideration, namely the passage of measures intended to remedy the difficult situation in Quebec, he said some things which should make us think and should remind the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) that it is his responsibility to see to it that his department exercize more stringent control over the C.B.C. which, in the past few days namely, has given too much publicity to the FLQ anarchists, much more than it has ever granted hon. members.

Therefore, I congratulate again the member who has the expertise since he is of the trade, I am told, and who is aware that the criticisms of his government bring out some deficiencies of this Liberal government which otherwise would not be noticed by the public. However, he should also remember that in 1962, 1963, 1965 and 1968, we, the Conservatives, especially those from Quebec, have been the victims of a partisan and blind press which was seeking to show but one side instead of stressing the quality of the candidates.

Mr. Speaker, I will have the opportunity of dealing with this question on another occasion. I should like now to deal with the subject under discussion. What is strange is the fact that we are expressing our opinions on the emergency measures to be taken in order to end this emergency.

In the circumstances, it seems rather cynical or ironical that today we should discuss the survival of democracy in Canada.

This is the first opportunity provided us by the government to take advantage of democracy. Since the government took office, the opposition has never been able to outline its views and have them accepted, partly if not totally. Even if the amendments proposed by the opposition were good, the government would reject them. Today, for the first time, we are enjoying complete freedom to discuss an important matter.

Yesterday, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), for whom I have great admiration and much personal friendship, told us in his speech that the House should sit long enough to allow all hon. members to express their opinions on the war measures.

He even suggested that the government was ready to move that the House should sit until all hon. members had stated their views.

This is the first time that we see the government recognize that it must set an example of democracy, if it wants to impose it by force on Canada, and especially on Quebec. I hope that this will be a lesson to the government and that it will realize that democrary is not a one-way proposition or concession, in short that democracy really exist only when all members of society have the same rights, the same privileges and the same possibilities to represent their fellow-citizens.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Of course we could quote several examples showing that this government has never respected this democracy of which he proclaims itself the sole defender.

Mr. Speaker, we have been living through some dark and painful hours in Quebec. Some hon. members have expressed their opinions in an honest, conscientious and responsible way. As for those who do not agree with me, I respect their opinion and I hope that they will respect mine. Nobody in this House is in a better position to judge the seriousness of the situation than the hon. members from Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish for a moment to excuse the way the government has acted, but in the circumstances the authorities did not have any other means available to thwart the organized offensive prepared perhaps by the Company of Young Canadians which has been financed by the federal government for several years. The members of the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs have found out that a great many members of the Company of Young Canadians were activists, anarchists who, with the financial means provided by the government, had been able to spread their hate and prepare disorder and revolt.

I wittingly refrain from answering certain political provocations coming from some government members answer these considerations. In the interest of all Canadians, we should limit ourselves to the careful study of the question and try to understand that there is an explosive situation in Quebec and everywhere in Canada, if it admitted that Quebec is a part of Canada, and that the authorities had not only the moral but the political obligation to intervene—according to the information given to us by the government—upon request not from the Quebec Liberal party but from the government of the province of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, if the government had refused to meet this urgent request from the authorities of the province of Quebec, it would have simply refused to recognize the authority or the right of a provincial government to take the line of action required to protect the people. I believe that in the circumstances, the federal authorities had to comply with the request of the government of Quebec.

Besides, Mr. Speaker, we, in our party, feel that the government could have prevented such events through amendments to the Criminal Code or other appropriate measures likely to achieve the same purposes. The thing is to know whether the government had enough time to pass such a legislation considering that the situation was deteriorating at an alarming speed.

• (4:00 p.m.)

One must have lived under that tension, and worried about one's security and that of one's family to understand the situation and appraise the importance of the decision taken by the government. I feel that we should objectively ask ourselves: What was the situation in Quebec 15 days ago, 7 days ago, a couple of days ago?

The government and the people of Quebec as well as the Canadian government were given the ultimatum by a group of revolutionaries to accede to its requests in order to spare the lives of two innocent people. The alternative was not easy for the governments, and I feel that a sense of responsibility was needed to meet the challenge as the governments of Quebec and Ottawa did. They also had to ask themselves whether there were other means at their disposal. I feel that, under the circumstances, there were none.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, my colleague the member for Cumberland-Colchester North (Mr. Coates), proposed the kind of amendment that will surely ease whatever concern some people might have if the emergency measures were to be maintained over a long period of time.

I trust the government will seriously consider this amendment. Obviously, the measure set before the house smacks of dictatorship and interference with fundamental civil liberties. There is the danger of too strict a control of the state over the individual. That is why we, of the Progressive Conservative Party, have cause for concern if the government intends to apply these emergency measures over too long a period. That is why my colleague moved this amendment. I hope the government will indicate to us that it does not intend to use these extraordinary powers to inflict its whims upon the people.

That is what my colleague was trying to point out earlier.

I would have voted against the measures proposed by the government, but if I have decided, along with some of my colleagues, to support the government, it is because were we to refuse our full support to the government for the implementation of the measures taken, we would be supplying additional weapons to the FLQ, which would use that argument to denounce the autocracy, the interference and the authoritarianism of governments. I would not want to take that chance, because radio, television and the press have already given them too much publicity.

Mr. Marcel Roy (Laval): Say that to your leader.

Mr. Valade: Mr. Speaker, I could easily answer the hon. member for Laval and tell him some government members disagree with the government on that point.

An hon. Member: Name them.

Mr. Valade: Ask them.

An hon. Member: Name them.

Mr. Valade: Here is proof that some government members are not being serious about such an important question. And, had I wished to answer, I would have been side-tracked by government members—

An hon. Member: Name them.

Mr. Valade: —and we would fail to discuss the subject matter and the importance of the question. I do not intend to digress right now, but I shall do so some other time. This is a serious matter, and I feel it is not the proper time to make jokes.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) once said: Enough of this nonsense. Today, it is not nonsense we are discussing but the very serious situation that now exists in Canada. Some 10,000 policemen and a great number of troops are now posted all over Montreal, and specially outside the homes of all diplomats and officials of municipal, provincial and federal governments. That is an indication of a state of things so serious that we cannot afford to wander off into frolic and nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, the information function of the press was discussed earlier. I am among those in the House who are entitled to complain of the lack of objective information supplied by parliamentary reporters with a few exceptions, as our Liberal colleague who spoke before me stated.

Quebec newspapers almost totally lack objective information as regards members of the opposition and here is proof. During the month of november 1969, I asked the government to think seriously of the situation which existed in that province and I said, as recorded on page 453 of *Hansard*:

> Mr. Speaker, to close one's eyes and to pretend that things will settle with time is to sit on an erupting volcano.
>
> For too long the Prime Minister of Canada has ignored or made light of the many warnings that were given to him, both in this House and outside. When tolerance, Mr. Speaker, turns to flabbiness, when liberalism becomes licence and political dogma obliterates authority, sweeping reforms are needed to prevent a disaster.

The government answered that we could not foresee that the situation would degenerate into this critical state. This is not true. We were talking about it in the House last year and the newspapers never mentioned our interventions. Were they bent on hiding our warnings to the government? Was what we were saying too serious for them to find the "sensationalism" needed for their

headlines? I do not know. Owing to the lack of objective press coverage the people of Quebec were kept too long in the dark about the work of their representatives in the House of Commons. This is why extremists use these pretexts to rouse the population by saying: Why continue to be loyal and faithful to a central government that is not interested in our problems? They are right in reacting this way, considering the lack of information. The correspondents are not telling our people of Quebec what their members of Parliament are doing in the House of Commons. I would like them to report not only on those members who do address the House. We all know that our work day begins at 9 o'clock in the morning and ends at 11 o'clock at night, four or five days a week. When has a correspondent told the population what the job of a member of Parliament actually consists of? Parliamentary correspondents have written only about the pay increase the members will eventually get and sure enough this topic did make the headlines!

It was a sensational topic for newspapermen. But when a member stands up and tells the government: be cautious, pass legislation to avoid tragedy, find solutions to economic problems, to disparities, bring in legislation to remedy the situation, reporters do not even mention it.

We have sat on committees, we have worked 12 to 15 hours a day in certain cases. Occasionally, there was one newspaperman, but most of the time there was none.

It is not surprising that we see a clash in Quebec and I am not in any way condoning the extremists for having taken advantage of the situation. But if we have this explosive situation today, someone is responsible. The responsibilities should not only be laid at the door of governments and members, of provincial and federal politicians, of city councillors, but also at the door of the press, radio and television as well as of every Canadian citizen.

If we have come to the point where a member must return home accompanied by a soldier, it is that we are leaning over the abyss and that we must take the necessary action to protect the lives of the citizens, the lives of those who are respectful of law and democracy.

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said yesterday, and I quote:

• (4:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Those people of the FLQ have utter contempt for the rights of others.

[*Translation*]

I agree with the Prime Minister in that regard. However, I ask the Secretary of State the following question: Is it true that those people refuse to respect the citizens' rights? Why, in the last few years has the Secretary of State let the state radio and television systems be systematically invaded, to be used for revolutionary purposes in Quebec?

We have often urged the minister to appeal to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation so that Algerian, German or Cuban revolutionaries would stop corrupting the minds of our young people and inciting distressed workers to revolt and protest. At that time, he gave us the stock answer: As a minister, I am only the CBC's spokesman. If that is so, then let us make the necessary amendments. After all, it is certainly not an unassailable fortress, unless it is the headquarters of the FLQ.

Something must be done. We must stop burying our heads in sand and ignoring the existence of corruption and attacks on public figures, governments and traditions, the instigator of which is the CBC for which the Canadian people pay millions of dollars each year.

Here is something worse still: Recently, a CBC commentator, who had been sent to the Press Gallery, was airing his views on the hon. members. According to him, all hon. members—apparently he did not want to spare any—especially the French-speaking members from Quebec, are not worth much. He told someone: no hon. member from Quebec has any ability. I shall not name him because I would not want to put him in a position where the authorities would consider that he is being persecuted by politicians.

It rests upon the CBC to see that its employees are objective and do not show partiality, depending on circumstances, their whims and their moods.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to give proof of what I state because it is well known that I always say what I think, in spite of the dissatisfaction that it might cause in news circles.

In August last, some politicians criticized the travels of the Prime Minister abroad, the country being in a difficult economic situation, and the CBC broadcast these charges. It was a newscast and not a public affairs or information program since it began with these words: "You will be hearing now a commentary from our correspondent in Ottawa". The correspondent in Ottawa said on the air that the Conservative opposition, for want of serious arguments, had criticized the Prime Minister for his travels abroad, and he added that he knew that the Prime Minister, when travelling, took a lot of paperwork with him, because he was a glutton for work. I do not intend to discuss the working habits of the Prime Minister, because when he is on a business trip, he has work to do surely. But that a newsman should take advantage of a news bulletin to make a personal remark with a political impact, that is altering the news. It is an abuse of his position, since this position comes under governmental authority.

Mr. Speaker, I felt it was my duty to make these remarks, since a Liberal member has made similar ones before I did. There is at this time in the province of Quebec a dangerous situation because the life of two men hangs on the emergency measures proposed by the government, as well as on the investigations and searches that are being conducted.

But it is our duty, as public men, to eliminate some situations, otherwise Quebec will cease to be a part of Canada.

Last year I attempted to bring some problems to the attention of the authorities. The government did not heed my warnings. Today I have an opportunity to submit to

the government some remarks on the fundamental freedoms of the individual. When public men, elected by the people to represent them, are denied such freedom, how can it be granted to the population as a whole?

Those, to my mind, are contradictions to be found in the government's attitude. If we adopt emergency measures merely to deal with such an explosive situation, those measures should be followed up by legislation to correct the anomalies that exist in the economic and social fields as well as in the news media, especially when a government agency financed from taxpayers' money is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the government and my colleagues will understand that I am bound to vote in favour of the emergency measures. It must be understood that when the survival of freedom, of the Quebec people and of all Canadians is at stake, there is no room here for political disputes since the general welfare must come first.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my remarks have not hurt anyone. At least, this was not the intent of my contribution. I hope that the newsmen, who might be hurt by my remarks and those of the previous speaker, will understand that after 12 years in this House, we can no longer keep silent about this situation. Those people should understand that we are not trying to control or censor the news media. Far from it. But more often than not we are ourselves censored and intimidated by those people, their behaviour, their lack of objectivity and information.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Alexandre Cyr (Gaspé): Since the beginning of this debate on the motion concerning the enforcement of the War Measures Act, too many members of the opposition and journalists have taken the Right Honourable Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his cabinet to task, accusing them of depriving the Canadian people of their liberties.

When a minority takes advantage of the great freedom we have to undermine our parliamentary institutions, we are duty bound to grant those who are responsible for the protection of society emergency powers in order to maintain law and order.

Mr. Speaker, we shall preserve and improve our civilization provided it is realized that it does not result from a combination of mysterious and elusive elements, from a blind and senseless fate. All of us contribute to make it every day by our actions.

In a well-organized democracy, society must be directed towards progress by the authority. Therefore it must have the support of all the citizens which it will have to co-ordinate in a well-adjusted entity, which respecting the indefeasible rights of everyone to live in honest liberty. The best formula to lead us to this ideal is democracy, that is government of the people, by the people and for the people. It constitutes a political state in which sovereignty belongs to all the citizens, without distinction of birth, wealth and ability.

Canadian society is presently endowed with one of the best forms of government ever found. Does the public know it? Does the youth understand it? Is civic training an element expressly desired in education? Are the means of communication, press, radio, television positive enough to show and have appreciated the good side of life in Canada, in its true sense?

Never in the history of mankind has life been as good as it has been these last years. However, in spite of the ever increasing rate of progress, discontent, criminal activities, rebellion and even revolution on an organized scale seem to gain wider acceptance from day to day.

The FLQ which has made the headlines in Quebec for several years now has set up a revolutionary program which is well organized all across the "belle province" and besides ammunitions and dynamite, this group can boast of weapon at its disposal, the most effective, the information media.

In recent years, the Gaspé area has seemed to lose its calmness during summer, particularly since the information media, with the CBC in the lead, have presented a new colourful description of the *Maison du Pêcheur* at Percé and of its occupants as well.

During the summer holidays the *Maison du Pêcheur* is the meeting place of protesters and anarchists of the province of Quebec and their sympathizers. Persons like Pauline Julien and Pierre Vallières visited those young anarchists at that Percé training school last summer. That is part of an overall plan, a well-organized system, as the hon. Minister for Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) pointed out to the House yesterday.

When the activists at the *Maison du Pêcheur* occupied private hunting and fishing grounds in the Gaspé area last summer, that was part of the program of revolutionary activities in Quebec whereby private fishing grounds in the province were to be visited during 1970.

The population of the Grande-Rivière area became indignant at the temporary occupation of that peaceful club whose members leave more than $50,000 in salaries and other income to that municipality. Furthermore, that club protects the reproduction of salmon in the Gaspé peninsula.

The goal of the activists at *La Maison du Pêcheur* was to prevent the people of the Gaspé area from fishing in that river, because they have many other fishing spots. Indeed, that river contains hardly 200 salmons. The activists were looking only for a certain publicity over the CBC and in the newspapers of the fair province. They attained their goal. And the police succeeded in getting them out of the club which they occupied only when they told them: If you do not get out, we will use force and to take you to jail. And as soon as they were told: "We are bringing you in", they got out smiling. That is where they wanted to go, in order to allow their lawyer, Mr. Robert Lemieux of Montreal, to be able to go to Percé. As to the latter, he enjoyed free publicity over the CBC network and in all the other news media.

However, with regard to what happened in the Gaspé peninsula last summer, especially, in connection with

La Maison du Pêcheur, the action taken by the Corporation des Enseignants du Québec was the last straw. They helped Lemieux and the anarchists by providing $100 bail for each of the prisoners, several of whom already had a criminal record.

The circular letters distributed in the Gaspé peninsula last summer by the activists from *La Maison du Pêcheur* bear a close resemblance to the FLQ manifesto published after the kidnapping of diplomat James Richard Cross. Those people are therefore members of or fellow-travellers of the very same revolutionary organization that we are declaring illegal in order to protect the freedom of the honest citizens of the Gaspé peninsula, as well as those of the cities of Montreal and Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, history teaches us that small active groups can destroy democracy and replace it by a rule of terror.

We are happy in Canada compared to people in other countries, but to be happy is not enough. It is essential to know it and to think about it to realize what happiness truly is.

Each night, we take time out to think about that, reading newspapers, listening to the news and to the discussion of problems over radio and television. Unfortunately, as many previous speakers remarked, most of the time we hear about what the government has not done, about the ills of our society: crime, accidents, bankruptcies and class struggle. This gives rise in the individual to a deep feeling of insecurity and discontent. Young people do not have enough experience to consider the other point of view. They feel that they are being exploited, and that they live in a world where everything should be changed and overthrown.

Since the media are practically within everyone's reach, too often the most bitter Canadians use them to pour out their bitterness into the rather peaceful soul of the quiet majority of the working and honest people in this country.

Disturbance and disorder are more sensational than order and well-organized work, and it seems that it is this disturbance and disorder which is mainly covered by several of our radio and television stations, including the C.B.C.

A revolution is the product of immature minds which have skipped some stages in their development, and for want of taking the necessary time to mature, their only hope lies in destruction, in the belief that a new, perfect and calm order will crop up by itself without their building it.

Does Parliament at times give the people a true image of democracy? The government, elected by the majority, must be respected and even supported by the minority which did not select it. The right to express one's opposition to some government bill is indefeasible, but it must be done with a showing of respect for the authority lawfully elected, without ever interfering with the efficiency of its work. It is permissible to alert public opinion but never to thrust oneself upon it, motivated by personal interest in definance of truth and order.

Mr. Speaker, Canada and particularly Quebec are living through difficult times and the governments need the support of all political forces to save their institutions. Through our actions, we will inspire confidence to our young people who have been poisoned too often by the destructive ideals *à la* Michel Chartrand.

Allow me to quote an editorial aired by CJRC, Ottawa, on the present situation. I quote:

> We find comfort in the calm and the sense of measure of the local population who make allowances and consider these measures as necessary to avoid the worst. This is a plea to students. Doubtless impressed by recent events and inclined to participate in this social upheaval and follow like sheep the reactionaries who have no other purpose than the destruction of society, the majority of students are mature enough not to believe all they are told and to refrain from engaging in a symbolic crusade that can only lead to disaster.
>
> We are amazed to note, for instance, that some agitators are trying to prompt the students of the area to walk off following the arrests made during the night. Chartrand's arraignment was long overdue, because far too long he has been spewing his insults, his harsh and dirty words. He preaches nothing but revolution and anarchy.
>
> The students must realize that what is going on in Quebec is not a game, a cruisade; it is no longer a mere contestation: It is even worse, and you must stand and be counted not in support of those trained revolutionaries, but to show your good sense.
>
> You do not want to be governed some day by Chartrand, Vallières and other so-called patriots of the same ilk. Patriotism for those loud-mouths is anarchy.
>
> So, students, wake up and unite to protect what will be yours later: a democratic society where freedom is not trampled upon, but in which everybody must participate.
>
> Open your eyes, we are writing history. Do not think it is a game and reject from your midst the undesirable ones.

Canada belongs to Canadians, but Canadians must work for Canada. We are living in a huge country, but there must be no place in it for revolutionaries and anarchists.

The government must patiently and wisely safeguard the freedom of the community by restricting the liberty of those who want to destroy it.

It is dangerous to argue no end and to use the most sensible arguments with people who no longer speak the same language.

Society belongs first to those who work, who honestly pay their taxes, to those who express sincerely their views through a reasoned vote and who respect and support authority to whom they have delegated their administrative powers.

We must first ensure that society is successful for those people and ensure their happiness as well as the happiness of their families. People in the Gaspé peninsula, which I represent, wish to live in a society where the elected governments are respected. They expect those governments not to sacrifice society to a small bunch of revolutionaries who want to assume power at gunpoint.

• (4:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, during the time I have been here, which covers six Parliaments, I have, I fear, made a good many speeches. Never have I spoken with less joy, with more pain and distress, than I bring to my engagement in this very serious discussion. Indeed, I would say that I couple immense sorrow with considerable fear.

The strain upon members of this House has been great. It has been much greater on those who lead the country. We all know the immense stress which surrounds the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his associates, and even that is very much less than the awful anxiety which those who belong to Mr. Cross and Mr. Laporte have been bearing and enduring for far too long. Then, today, we have another sad postscript with the loss of a young Canadian, a member of the Armed Forces.

This is an important discussion and it is interesting, I think, to recall that we are now purely in a deliberative role rather than a legislative role because the impact of that which we are discussing has already been felt. The operation is in effect, and we are here not legislating in the sense that we are passing any law. We are seeking to appraise an action, a very important action, a very serious and unprecedented action already undertaken.

Tom Paine, many years ago, spoke of his age as "times that try men's souls," and we in public life in recent years might well say the same thing about this period in Canada. I verily believe that this House and this country are passing through fires which will leave such a mark upon our country and its institutions that they will never be quite the same again. I never thought that on a beautiful autumn Saturday I would be with my colleagues discussing in peacetime, or what we call peacetime, the question of the approval of the invocation of the War Measures Act in a situation wherein there has been no foreign invasion of this country.

• (4:40 p.m.)

We delude ourselves, Mr. Speaker, if we do not acknowledge that because of the terrible events of recent weeks, months and years Canada stands a little less tall than once it stood. In such times, and I have seen evidence of this in the debate, it is hard even for reasonable men to maintain a reasoned, reasonable and deliberative approach to public questions. These virtues are all the more essential to a steady deliberation of public questions because of the stresses and strains of the society around us and the easy inducements to quick, emotional responses to very serious matters. Already in this debate things have happened occasionally which I find regrettable. I had hoped that no one would seriously suggest, in trying to score debating points, that any one in this House, in this atmosphere of anxiety and tension, wants anything but the termination of the terror and the eradication of the terrorists in the FLQ just as quickly as possible. To suggest otherwise is, I think, shameless and regrettable. Let it not be suggested that any member cares less about the terrible travail of the people of Quebec than does any other member. I have no friends in the FLQ and no former friends in the FLQ.

I am happy that at long last some measures are being taken against these people. I hope they will be efficacious. But it is unworthy for anyone to suggest, however subtly, that any group or any individual is soft on these unworthy and unwholesome residents of this land and on those whose actions have brought us to this dread state of crisis. What we are trying to evaluate at present is the efficacy and propriety of various steps taken in respect thereof. But as to the desire and the need to rid the land of these diabolically active and evil men, there is no question; nor should anyone state that there is. Nor is it really helpful in these difficult times, when people are sorting out what they think are best approaches, for anyone to use designations such as, "bleeding hearts", or "weak kneed" or "timid". We are all terribly traumatized by the tragedy. I do not describe as weak-livered people those who, like the Premier of Saskatchewan, suggest, while recognizing as we all must the sanctity of human life, that perhaps throwing a few goons out of the country once and for all was a price that he would consider paying if he were in Premier Bourassa's shoes.

I think what is essentially the problem in this serious question, and since other members have advanced their points of view I will put my views in an abbreviated form, is that one might designate the government's handling of this situation very simply as, "Too much too late". The question which must be answered, and I think it is incumbent upon those in charge of the nation's affairs to answer it, is this: was there any other way of dealing with the situation, other than the suspension of the civil rights of Canadians, as is the case. There is no point I think, sir, in our discussing whether in fact there has been a suspension of civil rights. Of course, there has been a suspension of civil rights. Many people say that this is fine and that is their point of view. I have a feeling that many who applaud this particular exercise are, as the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) pointed out this morning, rejoicing that something is being done—and God help us, it is time that something was done. But it is our duty at this time to examine the nature of the action. Perhaps I ought to call it an extreme reaction.

People approve some action being taken. I think the whole country, except the possible victims of the action, is at one on this. But has it yet been demonstrated to us that this was the best, that this was the only solution? Many people in Canada are not, thank God, too familiar with the War Measures Act. I am sure that many people who have proclaimed their delight have not had the opportunity to read the regulations and probably are far from familiar with the War Measures Act. I am glad of that. I am glad that it is many, many years since this very, very serious piece of legislation has been operative, in this land in peace.

I am not going to indulge in a series of tirades or bring forward a catalogue of criticisms. That will not help much and it is not essentially in my nature so to do. Nevertheless, I think there is a terrible onus on the Prime Minister and his associates in two respects: they will have

to answer to the people of this country for what they are doing now; but more so, I think, they will have to answer for what was not done for so long.

I heard the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) this morning, with his usual eloquence and sincerity, talk about some of the problems he has faced and the violations taking place around his home and office. Those are terrible. We have heard about these things for many, many months and years. One cannot help asking, not even the most charitable, why was so much allowed to happen without the state taking retribution by utilizing the powers of the police and the courts in their municipal, provincial and national emanations. The right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) yesterday, and my colleague for Red Deer today, catalogued, I think powerfully, masterfully and fairly the situation in respect of that particular aspect of the case. The public will ask, as it must, why this was not done. After this first operation is over, the public will have to know something more about the government's various operations in what I hope is the final phase of the crisis. This information must be forthcoming. There is a major responsibility on the government in this connection.

The Minister of Labour told us this morning to read between the lines of the letters from Montreal and Quebec City. I have done that and I have not been able to learn the answer. There is no denying that these regulations offer a panoply of powers. It is the essence of any constitutional democracy that any emergency action be limited as much as possible to that which stimulated the action, and that the suspension of normal constitutional procedures be limited as narrowly in time as possible. Just the opposite happens when governments take unto themselves a plenitude of powers and when there is a lengthy period of suspension of the normal course of constitutional processes.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Professor D. E. Smith, an authority who has studied the Canadian constitution, recently wrote an article in the *Canadian Historical Review*. I quote:

> Constitutional governments cannot ignore this temporary concentration of power, for as long as it lasts it forms a threat to the constitutional order. It is essential, therefore, that the threat be removed as quickly as possible. And this can be best accomplished by establishing rules for the initiation and exercise of emergency powers. Emergency powers should be initiated only for the defence of constitutional government and they should be devoted solely to ending the crisis. Any other use of extraordinary powers by the executive would destroy the distinctive feature of constitutionalism—the restraint of arbitrary political power.

I hope that if this debate accomplishes anything, it will reinforce the urgency of finding these other measures and means which have been suggested by the Leader of the Opposition and spokesmen for other parties in reference to the provision of legislation which more narrowly and precisely, and just as effectively, accomplishes the ends. It will then not be necessary for Canadians to have their state, their country, their nation operate under this very drastic and extreme legislation designed for use on the rarest possible occasions. I hope that something new will be found as soon as possible.

The indication which came from all parties would presage its rapid translation into legislation. The suggestion that we are debating the end as well as the means would no longer be an essential part of our operation. There are always uncertainties when the state leaders have to operate under emergency situations.

I was disturbed when I read an excellent editorial in this morning's *Globe and Mail*. I am not suggesting that the editorial disapproves of the action, but it does underline something. I quote from the editorial:

> There is a more immediate responsibility—to make certain that the powers the Government has taken are not abused. That they are used only for the purpose stated, to combat those who would use violence to destroy our society. That they are not used to inhibit old enemies or hamper legitimate political opposition. We must be told who is arrested, when they are arrested, why they are arrested and when they will be tried and for what offences. We must be certain that every soldier on civil duty in Quebec is essential to public order.

If there is opportunity for wrongdoing, intentional or otherwise, then all guardians of freedom should be concerned. I was interested to read the report of the raid on the home of Dr. Lebel in Hull yesterday. One item that impressed me was, and I quote:

> Police took Parti Quebecois literature from her room.

Wrong as I think the Party Quebecois is, surely they are not criminals for publishing these documents. This is the kind of danger that may arise.

Mr. Langlois: They also took the phone book. Come on, don't be silly.

Mr. Macquarrie: Pardon me, while I instruct this gentleman. The rule is when one wishes to address this House, he rises, gets acknowledgement from the Speaker and makes a speech.

Mr. Langlois: We all know that.

Mr. Macquarrie: Rudeness is never a substitute for ability. The fact that literature not of a terrorist nature was seized is something which should cause people to be concerned. Mistakes do happen. There may be people who do not have their instructions precise. This is why the continuation of such broad vehicles which permit mistakes is not something we should applaud. That is why we are suggesting these things be made more precise, direct and less restrictive. There are many questions.

I noted with interest the exchange between the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner). These questions will arise if this broad opportunity exists for long. The hon. member asked the minister, what about communists?

Some months ago I saw a most unsavoury group of people on the lawn of Parliament Hill. They were called Maoists. It strikes me that they would exactly fit the

terms of the regulations because they do not believe in overthrowing this form of government by persuasion, gentle or otherwise. Are the students who belong to this group also to be apprehended and dealt with under these regulations? This is something the public should know. I did not think they were very wholesome people. However, if you take them, what do you do with the other types who also suggest changes by violent means?

It would be very easy for one to deliver himself of his views on the FLQ, to apply adjective upon adjective, to heap opprobrium upon opprobrium and every word he would say would be sincere because they deserve all the opprobrium one can think of and then go on to say hear, hear; go, ahead, bravo.

But it is incumbent upon us to calmly, coolly and carefully reflect as to whether this is the best measure and whether it contains dangers which would be harmful to the state. We have to ask ourselves whether stamping out that which should be stamped out by this particular method might result in injuries of other kinds to other people who do not deserve this heavy weaponry of the state. I hope that this emergency, and the consequence invoking of the War Measures Act, will have a much shorter duration than set forth in the regulations.

I will rejoice when the day arrives when the executive is able to say that the immediate need for this has been removed and we will now resort to something else. I invite them to do that as quickly as they can.

The War Measures Act and all it implies has now been in operation for some little time. I fervently hope that what the government set out to do will be achieved. I do not like the situation. I want to terminate it as soon as possible. However, while it is in operation I am sure all decent Canadians wish that it will accomplish its goals, so that terror and anarchy, too long dealt with without efficacy and I am afraid at times without strength, will be brought to an end.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. Ross Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, so much has been said during the past few days that it is certainly not my intention to speak at any great length. What happened the night before last was, of course, that the government decided to make use of the War Measures Act. The government has been accused of doing this in a dictatorial fashion, and the necessity of taking such action at all has been questioned. Some opposition members have said that there was nothing democratic about the action taken.

Let us consider the facts for a few minutes. There is a great deal of difference between sitting to the left of Mr. Speaker, in opposition, and sitting to the right of Mr. Speaker, with the responsibility of governing. Many years ago the War Measures Act was passed in this House by members sitting in the seats which we now occupy. So it was passed democratically. I was not here, of course, and I do not suppose anyone here today was present on that occasion. But the act was certainly passed in a democratic way by Members of Parliament then living and sitting in these hallowed seats. It was not designed to be used specifically during wartime; it could be applied at any time should the government of the day feel circumstances were such as to justify its being put into force.

Much has been made by members of the opposition of the fact that this is the first time the War Measures Act has ever been proclaimed while the nation was not at war. It has been proclaimed only twice, once during the second world war and once during the first world war. When those proclamations were made, they were made to help protect us from the people we were fighting thousands of miles away. This is the first time in Canadian history that we have faced the possibility of being shot by fellow Canadians. I am sure this is just as much an act of insurrection as those which took place during the war with Germany, Japan, or whatever country it might be.

Parliament passed the War Measures Act in a democratic way, right here in this House of Commons. What could be more democratic than what happened in June of 1968? It is high time those who sit to the left of you, Mr. Speaker, realized that in June, 1968, the people of Canada did not just vote for the Liberals; they voted against the Tories and decided that this government should accept the responsibility for taking action should a crisis arise. A crisis certainly arose the night before last. Is there anyone in this House who would deny it? When property is being bombed, when bullets go through the houses of certain members, when people in Quebec say they are afraid to walk down the street, how much more serious a crisis do we need?

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the government has acted most democratically. It did not need to bring this matter to debate in the House of Commons. It could have carried on with the normal business before us; it could have continued the debate on the Speech from the Throne. Instead, immediately after the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) had told us what he had done, he gave an opportunity to all of us to discuss the situation and the measures taken. How much more democratic a procedure could be desired?

When I listen to some of the opposition members—I emphasize the word "some" because there are a number who are genuinely worried about what might happen—I realize that some of them have played politics from the word go.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whicher: I know this is not a time to tell stories, but I cannot help recalling the one about the three people who were discussing which was the oldest profession in the world. A doctor said it must be the medical profession because we read in Genesis that God took a rib from Adam; so there must have been a doctor there. An engineer pointed out that even earlier in Genesis we read that God created the world from chaos; so there must

have been an engineer there. The politician said, "Where do you think the chaos came from?"

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Whicher: It has come in the last few days from the opposition parties in this chamber.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whicher: The deputy leader of the New Democratic Party appeared to have little regard for Liberal backbenchers. It was all right for us, he said; we would have to support the government whatever the circumstances. Mr. Speaker, what is wrong with being a backbencher in the Liberal party? Anybody could be a frontbencher in the NDP because there are so few of them. I would much prefer to be a backbencher in the Liberal party in a situation such as this, than be a frontbencher in some of the other parties.

The government has acted with a great deal of responsibility. Perhaps some hon. members do not agree with me. The strongest Tory in Canada today is Premier John Robarts of Ontario. Let members of the official opposition ask him what he thinks about it. The strongest member of the New Democratic Party today is Ed Schreyer, Premier of Manitoba. I invite members of the NDP to ask him what he thinks about it. And he was a colleague of hon. members sitting to my left not so many months ago.

The duty of governing makes people responsible. It is all very well to be petty; it is especially easy if one comes from out west or from Nova Scotia, knowing nothing of what goes on in Quebec. I like to think I know what is going on there because I have been a close friend of many in my party who live in the province of Quebec. They let us know what is going on in that province. It is too bad that some of my Conservative friends have apparently not listened as closely to some of their colleagues from the province of Quebec. Sound advice would be given to them by some of these fellows who know very well what is going on.

They should read the speech delivered only a few moments ago by a Conservative member from Quebec. It was a fine speech. Conservative members who had the opportunity to hear it should put a copy of it on the desks of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) and the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) first thing tomorrow morning. They should pay attention to the spirit of the speech, not just to the words. Let them read the speech delivered by the hon. member for Sainte-Marie (Mr. Valade). Let them listen to the speech which will be delivered in a few minutes by my good friends who sits only two seats from me. It will be a good speech because he is putting Canada ahead of politics.

Mr. Ricard: Not like you.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Mr. Whicher: A lot has been said in the past few days about the terrible things that have happened in the province of Quebec. There have been bombings and kidnappings, and people are asking whether the next thing will be shootings. My friends in the New Democratic Party have said that the action taken by the government is going too far; that we should have introduced legislation. I ask rhetorically: What would have happened had we brought in legislation and discussed it for five or six days? Where would the 254 people who are traitors to Canada, members of the FLQ now in jail, be had we wasted five or six days before we passed legislation? They would be scattered underground across the country, disseminating their poison either through their pen or voice.

We are facing a serious situation. We believe in Canada, and Quebec is part of Canada. We cannot get along without Quebec. The boys in Quebec are not only fighting for their rights; they are fighting for ours. Thank heaven we have a Prime Minister who appreciates what is going on in that great province. Somehow or other he will bring things together. When the crisis is over we can carry on as a peace-loving nation, as we have for many years past, and go on to that greatness that is bound to be Canada's.

I listened to the deputy leader of the New Democratic Party the other day criticize those of us who are proud to call ourselves Liberal Backbenchers. In this regard I bring the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald) into the discussion, since he chastised the government this morning. I remember a year ago when these people said we were not doing our duty as far as Biafra was concerned. We were told that millions of people would be killed; that genocide would be committed; that the whole of Biafra was starving to death. Certain people in that country were trying to divide the country of Nigeria, in the same way as politically certain people are trying to divide Canada today; and we are not going to stand for it.

The deputy leader of the New Democratic Party, who I am sorry is not here today, is a brilliant man and has been well trained. Yesterday he said that the Spiro Agnews of the United States were throwing their poison around. I most humbly inform him that many members of this chamber are not nearly as afraid of the Spiro Agnews of the United States as they are of the David Lewises of Canada. I remember the hon. member proudly stating, "I will put my reputation on the table above that of anyone in this chamber. I have been fighting communism for years and years". That may well be true, but many of us who occupy the backbenches of the Liberal party have been doing exactly the same thing.

I remember that a great American, Joseph Kennedy, who had a wonderful family, said it was not the $400 million that he had made that was important; it was his family. As far as fighting communism is concerned, the bogey that the hon. member raised, I am willing to put my reputation on the table along with his, and dozens of others in the House would do exactly the same. How would you like it, Mr. Speaker, if the leader of the Conservative party were Prime Minister of Canada today? How long do you think Canada would last? Or if

the leader of the New Democratic Party were Prime Minister of Canada today, how long do you think Canada would last? I say it would last about ten minutes. I would sooner have my good friend, the leader of the Créditistes as Prime Minister and gamble on him.

We are lucky in our choice of Prime Minister—and in saying that I am certainly not waiting for any call. When I first came to Ottawa after long experience in the legislature of the province of Ontario, I was not a Trudeau man. I did everything in my power to see that he did not become leader of the Liberal party. But having been here for a couple of years and seen the sincerity and brilliance of the man, the quietness with which he does business, I say we should all thank God that he is Prime Minister of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whicher: He is one of the few men who can hold Canada together.

Mr. Aiken: Why are we in this mess, if he is so damned good?

Mr. Whicher: If I were a Tory, I would not talk about a mess. They have three leaders and do not know which to choose. That would be enough to bother anybody. Talk about acts of insurrection! It is a wonder they have not invoked the War Measures Act in their own caucus.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Whicher: I do not wish to take further time, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure my Tory friends will applaud me for saying that. I want to end on a serious note. Having talked to my friends from the great province of Quebec, I know of the serious difficulties confronting that province, indeed the whole country. I also know this measure was not invoked lightly. I have every confidence that legislation will be brought before the House, if not next week then the week following. The War Measures Act will not be the law of the country and legislation more limited in scope to look after the present crisis will be put before Parliament. I hope that instead of taking four or five days discussing it, members of the opposition will pass it quickly.

Mr. McGrath: It has been passed since four o'clock Friday morning.

Mr. Mahoney: He is talking about the proposed legislation.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I bring to the attention of hon. members that the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) still has the floor.

Mr. Whicher: Contrary to what some of the front-benchers in the New Democratic Party and the Conservative party may think, we Liberal backbenchers do have a little say about what goes on around here. We certainly express our views. We are as interested in civil liberty as anybody else. Dozens of members of the Liberal party had many years of war experience, as did other members. In a situation like this it is possible that innocent people will be taken to jail, and that is indeed very unfortunate. But we are just as interested in their liberty as other hon. members. This is why I am confident that the government will bring in new legislation a little better suited to the present crisis than the War Measures Act.

I have many friends from Quebec, some of them who speak both languages well. In view of the crisis we are facing, I want to close on this note. I do not know whether hon. members are familiar with the works of a great English poet who many years ago wrote a poem which I think is apropos the present situation. I am sure the Prime Minister will know this poem, because I think he is acting in the way Rudyard Kipling described in the first two lines of the poem "If":

• (5:20 p.m.)

If you can keep your head when all about you
Are losing theirs and blaming it on you,—

The Prime Minister is keeping his head and will continue to do so whether or not all about him lose theirs. We are in good hands.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, as a Canadian and a Quebecer, I would like at this time to express some very objective and personal opinions in the course of this most important debate, in view of the consequences of the measure now under discussion. Of course, as a member of an opposition party, I have responsibilities but these are not necessarily of a nature to compel me to oppose this measure now before the House.

My first responsibility does not consist only in participating to debates on various legislative measures, but it includes as well compelling the government to take action when I feel that the legislation being examined is necessary for society. However, it is also my duty to oppose the passage of a legislation which might go against the interests of Quebec or Canada.

Belonging to a political group is not conducive to an end, it is a means. As a chosen representative in the last election, I am entitled to express my opinions and my constituents expect that I do so freely and objectively. They do insist that I protect not only the interests of my constituency but those of my province and my country as well.

Therefore, I shall carefully refrain from political partisanship in the course of such an important debate. I shall carefully leave aside certain arguments which can be discussed at the proper time.

I did not think that so soon after being elected I would have the opportunity to take part in the passing of such an important measure. In the name of the majority of the people of Quebec, in the name of the French Canadian nation and of its future, I do not have the right to give in to partisan considerations.

I did not hesitate to say, when I was elected, that I would first of all represent my province in Parliament.

It is my duty not to miss any opportunity to defend the interests of my province which are, really, those of Canada.

The speeches of some of my colleagues have left me with a feeling of disappointment. They took advantage of this debate to make points that reeked of partisanship.

The leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Douglas) does not shy away from doing just that, upbraiding the people responsible for the atmosphere which has in the end brought about the problem which we must face now.

The leader of the Ralliement créditiste (Mr. Caouette) has charged the leaders of the opposition parties with partisan politics but could not refrain from ending his speech with a manifesto which, if carried out, would in his estimation bring about a settlement, but I doubt that it would be effective.

When such an important problem is discussed it is wrong to waste time since the enemy is still free. In fact, the enemy is upon us.

Of course I have not always been in agreement with the measures moved by the government in this House. Nevertheless I feel that I was able to support the wise ones tending directly to the preservation of the interests of Quebec and Canada.

I have listened with attention to the speech made yesterday by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and I greatly appreciated it. I take the liberty of also mentioning the one made last night by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). I must admit that the latter has, in a very dignified manner, drawn a clear picture of the present situation. If all my colleagues in the House followed this speech very closely, I must say, in all fairness, that it is because the Prime Minister explained plainly and objectively the situation prevailing in Quebec and in Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. La Salle: I am not saying this to win the applause of the government members. I have said that I am not always in agreement with the government's proposals, but I believe that I am brave enough to support the adoption of measures that I believe adequate and necessary. In my view, the Prime Minister's speech yesterday gave the best possible description of the situation we are facing at the present time. We wonder why the government acted with such haste in this matter. We have been told that the city of Montreal through its representatives and the province of Quebec through the prime minister officially applied to the federal government. I certainly would not have supported the government if they had refused help and assistance. I do not question the veracity of the facts submitted by Messrs. Bourassa and Drapeau.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Last year, Mr. Saulnier painted a dark picture of the situation and of the FLQ.

We all know that today unfortunately the young people of Quebec are led by hot-heads. I am not saying that they belong to the FLQ or support it.

They were left to do as they pleased, which is unfortunate. They succeeded in securing election to associations which seem very prestigious to all Canadians.

Mr. Saulnier was certainly right. But I do not believe this is the proper time to blame the government, delay adoption of the measure now before us, or panic about what we have been told. However, certain reasons led a very small part of the people to support movements like the FLQ. But I will give the benefit of doubt to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, to the provincial police and to other police authorities who probably thought that it was not yet time to act immediately.

The fact that they waited for some time allowed us to get rid of a greater number of revolutionaries. The experts among the police force know much more than we do about it and I wonder if, precisely, we are not passing unfair judgment. As I would rather not worry about what seems to be indecision from the government, I reserve myself the right to discuss that in due time. I shall not hesitate in doing so if it ever becomes necessary.

Like several hon. members, I wonder whether the legislation is not too strict.

From what the Minister of Justice said yesterday, I understood that it might be amended and that the enforcement of the act could be suspended if it was deemed that the emergency situation warranted it. I am still convinced that emergency measures should be passed. Needless to say that I shall not hesitate to vote for the measure now before us.

Some hon. Members: Hear, Hear.

Mr. La Salle: Last Thursday, I had prepared a press release because I felt the government had to take action. I did not have to send it out Friday morning, since the government's action met my views completely.

Nevertheless, I should like to read it. It dealt in particular with the detention of two hostages, in this case Messrs. Laporte and Cross. It is clear that this situation will be coming to an end soon.

It appears on the one hand that our governments must exercise a certain flexibility in this matter and on the other hand, that we must protect the moral authority of the state and the democratic institutions because they have to be safeguarded.

In my opinion, yielding to all the FLQ's demands would be equal to the worst kind of prostitution. Nothing would be settled and the outlaw's would certainly do it again. We would therefore accept to become conditionned to an anarchic dimension. Whether we admit it or not, we are dealing with a group of terrorists who are leaving our governments no other alternative but a final confrontation.

The lives of these hostages require that our governments take all the necessary measures to avoid the worst but any settlement that would guarantee the liberation of Messrs. Cross and Laporte while permitting these people to proceed with their subversive action, would certainly entail disastrous consequences for the Quebec economy.

The statement by Ontario Premier Robarts, which has been termed inflammatory in the circumstances, is none the less very realistic, because I believe that Mr. Robarts considered it was impossible to yield to the terrorists' demands.

The FLQ has granted several extensions of time, but our governments will have to set a final deadline in this matter. It is urgent therefore that our governments devise some machinery such as legislation carrying very severe penalties for any extremist movement; they must not hesitate to bring in troops as soon as an insurrection is in the offing. I was saying those very words last Thursday night, Mr. Speaker.

To conclude, I shall say that people are extremely concerned about the establishment of a police state whose prime duty would be to restore order in Quebec.

To those who are concerned about the presence of policemen in the province of Quebec, I say that I would rather be near a police officer than near two terrorists. I think there is no need to remind the people that it has cost daily, for these past few days, approximately $500,000 for the protection of our institutions.

I know it is high time for our governments to act in order to restore a climate of trust which will ensure the political and economic stability in the province of Quebec.

We can and we wish to continue discussing that measure. The government could also be blamed on many other counts. I do not say that the measure under study is perfect but considering the situation we are facing and the concern among the people in Quebec, the government must without hesitation assume its responsibilities.

The possible independence of the province has been discussed, but I feel Quebec is still part of Canada. Most Quebecers want to remain within Canada.

According to the arguments of some of our colleagues, we should withdraw from the scene and leave Quebec the full responsibility for the situation. The members from the province of Quebec did not hesitate to support any government when serious problems cropped up in other parts of the country. Must I promise to support the members from the other provinces if a problem arose there? I feel that the members from Quebec will not hesitate to support their federal colleagues to solve, partly or completely, a problem that may exist outside Quebec.

This allows me to appeal to the openmindedness and good will of all members, to help the province of Quebec to get rid of a minority that worries its people and can spread the problem elsewhere in Canada.

According to the speeches of some members, the rest of the country is being penalized because of the problem in Quebec. Nothing proves that the movement does not exist elsewhere in Canada. If you refer to the document Mr. Saulnier presented last year, you will see that the movement was not necessarily limited to the province of Quebec. This is one reason why all the members should be responsive to the problem, and should work in order that this measure might allow us to get rid of this radical and harmful movement whose object is the destruction of our democratic institutions.

I would not say that this measure penalizes the rest of the country. I doubt that the Canadians who are not aware of the problem, who are not disturbed by the FLQ, are inconvenienced by the presence of policemen or soldiers.

• (5:40 p.m.)

I do not believe that anybody in my parish is or has been annoyed by police, even though the War Measures Act has been in force since four o'clock on Friday morning.

I have the clear impression that those who feel uneasy because of the presence of a policeman have something on their conscience.

The job of the police is not to bother innocent people. We try to adopt a measure and I intend to support it, because I believe it is necessary under present circumstances.

I say it once again, it has not been established that this measure will still be necessary six months from now. It is quite clear that the House will be able to propose new measures when the one now in force will no longer be encessary. We will then be able to ask and even force the government to revoke it.

I do not believe that the government will refuse to revoke this measure if it is proven that it is no longer necessary.

I do not believe either that a government would be ingenuous enough to assure itself all the protection it is presently granted, if this should not prove necessary.

And, for this reason, I will continue to believe not only that this measure is necessary, but that it will result in the annihilation of a movement which is obviously not wanted either in Quebec or in other parts of Canada.

There has been a tendency to accuse the government too easily of having been too slow in acting and I think this is true. The necessary measures probably were not taken. The lesson may be a tough one but its effects will prompt us to quicker action in the future.

On the other hand, and in all objectiveness, I must say that members of the New Democratic party have blamed the government for going too fast. I wonder exactly what they want. The government goes too fast or it is too slow in taking action. I am still convinced that conclusive evidence was needed. It was uncovered a few days ago and on its strength the government had to do something.

In my opinion, the motion before the House should not only be examined further but passed while too many people in Quebec seem to be giving way to dejection.

Some have referred to social order and to problems due to unemployment. Those things maintain a revolutionary atmosphere. I will have the opportunity to talk about it some other time. I shall not fail then to ask the government to act quickly in order to solve problems. I do not think that now is the time. I shall appeal to the French Canadian people and seize the opportunity to discuss the theory that the present system has not been able to bring the French Canadian people what they expected of federalism.

I often say that in the last 10 years we have made giant steps. A review of the 100 years of Confederation shows that I am one of those who have reason to be disappointed.

Considering the developments of the last ten years and the statements made by some French Canadians in various walks of life, in politics or business, I see no reason to get discouraged.

Considering the open-mindedness of our colleagues in other provinces, I have every reason to be hopeful for the future. I wish to remind the French-Canadian nation in Quebec that it should not get discouraged but should trust the representatives it has chosen.

Whatever my political affiliation, I believe that it is my duty, as an opposition member, to take part in the nation's business. I wish to do it objectively, opposing some measures if I am deeply convinced that they go against the interests of the French-Canadian nation of which I am a representative in this House.

As so many other hon. members, I make it a point to look after the interests of Quebec and those of Cannada. The liberation of Quebec cannot but help the liberation of Canada. And as much as my Ontario colleague, I hope that we shall build together a marvelous Canada, in the framework of well-organized Confederation.

That is how I see the possibility for greater happiness for the French-Canadian nation, the population of the province of Quebec and that of the other provinces. There is no doubt that the indecision of the Canadian government when the constitution was discussed did not do much to give hope to the people of Quebec. The government should seriously consider the amendments which are being sought to the constitution. I ask the government to consider particularly the briefs presented by the premiers of Quebec in the last 10 years. The subject matter of those briefs is identical, because the needs and aspirations of Quebec have not changed. Furthermore, the peaceful means of Quebec have not changed, except that the province has been infiltrated by a movement of which we are trying to rid ourselves by an act which, in my opinion, is perfectly justified, and that is why I will not hesitate to approve it. I therefore appeal to other hon. members to do the same in the interest of Canada.

[Mr. La Salle.]

This measure does not provide exclusively for the protection of the province of Quebec, but also of Canada as a whole. There is no evidence that such a movement does not have supporters in other provinces where it will carry out its operations. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to note that all hon. members have been allowed to express their opinions freely. It made it possible for me to understand how few are those who really understand Quebec's problems. The most unbiased speeches made in this House have allowed our colleagues of the other provinces to understand Quebec's aspirations which do not run counter to those of Canada.

The government was obliged to take an embarrassing measure but it was necessary. When the nation is threatened, there is reason for concern and this is how I feel now. When I say that a majority does not want to be crushed by a slim minority in Quebec, this is a fact.

The sacrifices made by the French Canadians from Quebec have been rewarded with some degree of success. I said earlier that in the last ten years, the province of Quebec asserted itself by peaceful, democratic means. I might disturb the peace of mind of certain members by saying that to my great pleasure, the Canadian government includes an unprecedented French Canadian representation. If some day we were in power, I would wish for a French Canadian representation as numerous and as competent as the one we see today in the cabinet.

Considering all the sacrifices willingly accepted by Quebecers, I believe that we are in the process of asserting ourselves in Canada and of proving to the English-speaking majority that we are willing to co-operate in the building of a magnificent country.

Some rays of hope seem to be appearing on the horizon; on the other hand, the FLQ, by its evil actions, can but reduce this hope to dust. That is why I am asking the people of Quebec and all members, wherever their electoral district is located, to consider the importance of this measure, so that the province of Quebec may continue to grow and to strive towards the same objective: that of a Canada at peace.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I ask why a less stringent measure was not proposed. At this moment, two hostages are in the hands of the kidnappers, and it has been proved that an amicable arrangement would have been equivalent, for the government, to a rejection of basic principles, and the hostages would not have been freed for all that.

It is foolish to believe that this action was unnecessary. I say this quite objectively. My intention is not to save the face of the government; but I think that, in all conscience, I must be objective about such a serious matter. Whatever my colleagues may think, I shall be convinced that I have said not only what I had in mind but also what I ought to say in these circumstances.

Last night, I heard on television the leader of the Parti Québecois, Mr. Lévesque, who was very concerned about the arrest of some PQ members in the province of Quebec. Let us not imagine that at present, the police merely arrest members of the Parti Québecois. Such a

suggestion is untrue. It may be assumed that, in the province of Quebec, the members of the FLQ support the PQ but it would be wrong to believe that PQ members are also members of the FLQ.

I am deeply convinced that the purpose of this measure is not to embarrass members of the PQ who work towards an ideal that I respect, namely, the independence of Quebec. This option is premature. I am not saying that it is impossible that the independence of Quebec will ever be achieved.

Therefore, the hon. members should keep in mind the willingness and the work to be achieved by the committee on the constitution whose task will consist in considering the granting to Quebec of some legitimate supplementary powers. In so doing, the majority of Quebecers will enjoy a federalism that will respect the needs of the French-Canadian people of Quebec.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I will say that I felt it was my duty to take part in this debate as the elected member of a very typical Quebec constituency and that I had to voice my opinions.

Needless to say I am deeply convinced in supporting this measure. It is my sincere belief that I am protecting the interests of my people, of my province and at the same time those of Canada.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (5:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, like the hon. member who sits close to me, the hon. member for Hillsborough, I have been in this House for some length of time and, so far as I know for some time before my own participation in the business of this House, parliament has never been asked to deal with or express an opinion about such a fundamentally important matter as that which we are talking about right now. We are dealing, in one sense, with the lives of two individuals, Mr. Cross and Mr. Laporte, and in another sense we are dealing with the fundamental liberties of Canadians all across the land.

Endorsement is being sought, in a moral sense not a legalistic, authoritarian sense, for action that has been taken. We are being asked to endorse some action that I believe very clearly could contribute to an escalation of the difficulties and could result in pockets of civil war taking place in Canada. Because if we are to believe the declarations made by the various members of the cabinet concerning the seriousness of the situation, and couple that with our knowledge through newspaper accounts of the terrorists activities over the past seven or eight years, then we know those activities are not going to stop with the arrest of 100, 200, 300 or many more people.

This situation is not going to end with the finding of the dynamite and of the weapons that have been stolen from armouries as well as elsewhere. As long as that psychotic feeling exists among such groups of people, and apparently they are extremely well organized and proficient in their activities having gained a certain expertise far in excess of what existed in 1963, 1964 and 1965, that activity is not going to desist but is going to increase. That is why it is a very crucial thing that we are being asked to consider and endorse.

I listened, and was greatly impressed, by part of what the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) had to say today because one thing he mentioned, to which apparently many of his colleagues in his own party did not listen, was that we should be engaged in a type of debate which does not involve the catcalls, the hoots and hollers, that usually take place when differences of opinion are expressed. It is a sorry situation when individuals in any part of the House, expressing their views out of the depths of their own sincerity, are ridiculed and slandered, as was the case in the speech of the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher). The greatest tribute one can give to that speech is to ignore it. It is unfortunate that those assumptions of the Minister of Labour were not listened to, because we are dealing with a serious situation. From the point of view of the Minister of Labour, it is unfortunate that he had to rely on the opinions of Dr. Forsey in order to buttress his position. If there were four sides to any question Dr. Forsey would, in the time I have known him, be on all four sides of it himself.

• (6:00 p.m.)

Mr. Perrault: Do not attack someone when he cannot defend himself.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I should appreciate it if my hon. friend from Burnaby-Seymour would keep his mouth shut.

Mr. Perrault: Do not attack someone here who cannot defend himself.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I am perfectly willing to repeat what I said about Dr. Forsey outside the House, to his face.

An hon. Member: It is Senator Forsey now, is it not?

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I say to the newly appointed Parliamentary Secretary that he ought to look into his own mind, and at some of the things he has said. They are not very pleasant, are they?

An hon. Member: Don't be that way, Frank.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I say here, and I will say outside, that I do not value very highly Dr. Forsey's opinions because so many times I have seen him adopt whatever views seemed to be convenient for the moment. I do not say that unkindly.

Mr. Peters: We were paying his salary, too; at least, we had some interest in it.

Mr. Perrault: Does the hon. member have any charges to make?

Mr. Peters: No, we do not have any charges.

Mr. Perrault: There is no unity in the hon. member's party.

Mr. Peters: I have known Dr. Forsey for many years and what my colleague has said is perfectly true.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Skeena has the floor.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): The point I am trying to get across is that concern for the well-being of Canada does not rest exclusively with any one member, and that applies even to Parliamentary Secretaries. Disdainful thoughts should not be expressed simply because one happens to have a particular view about one matter that is as fundamental and basic as this. We are initially concerned about the safe return of Mr. Cross and Mr. Laporte. We are also concerned about retrieving the explosives, guns, ammunitions and other weaponry in the hands of members of the FLQ as well as other insurrectionists.

One aspect that puts a different colour on this matter and is a cause of some wonderment is this: I think the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), and the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith), on the basis of their knowledge of the criminal law and the way in which the police work, will tend to agree with what I am about to say. If the members of what I loosely call the underworld had abducted Mr. Cross, Mr. Laporte or anyone else for that matter, it would have been only a matter of a few days before the police would have discovered the criminals. The police use informers to obtain information about activities in the underworld. The police operate on the basis of approaching informers and making deals. In return for information on certain major crimes, they tend to lessen the impact on the individual and charge him with a lesser crime. They do that for the individual who is giving them information. On the basis of information received, they are able to discover where certain criminals are, where stolen goods are, and the like. This fact gives one reason for wonderment.

What has caused the breakdown of the normal and efficient activities of police forces engaged in obtaining information about activities such as we are discussing? This failure, I suppose, more than anything else indicates that the abductors are a highly organized group of insurrectionists and that they think differently from criminals whether in Montreal, Vancouver or anywhere else. We do not know, actually, whether Mr. Cross and Mr. Laporte are even in the country at the moment. Certainly, this is a cause for wonderment.

On the other hand, recent events suggest, perhaps, that the authorities know where Mr. Cross and Mr. Laporte are. They certainly suggest that there may be some substantiation for the impression given by Premier Thatcher that the authorities know who committed the abduction. I notice the Minister of Justice looking quizzically at me. May I say that I am not responsible for what appears in the newspapers. I am only alluding to what Premier Thatcher is alleged to have said. Premier Thatcher is reported as having said that, he spoke to a federal cabinet minister who told him the federal government knew who the abductors were. The Minister of Justice shakes his head. I am sorry; I am misinterpreting what the shake of a head means. In any event, Premier Thatcher has said this. Whether he knows what he is talking about in this situation is impossible for one to say. But it seems to me that there is something a bit fishy in the activities of the highly organized police forces. There is something fishy about the fact that neither the police in Montreal nor the Quebec Provincial Police have given any indication as to whether Mr. Cross and Mr. Laporte are still in the country, still in Quebec, or still alive. That is a situation about which we have to be concerned.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand), the Minister of Labour and others have said that the government had certain information which necessitated its taking the action it took. This information demanded the invocation of the War Measures Act. Parliament is being asked to participate now with the government and to endorse that action. We are being asked to do that on the basis of a simple declaration; we are asked to have faith in what the government says was the correct course of action. We do not know about that, because no one has indicated yet what that information was or the extent to which the situation was serious. It seems to me that, since the Prime Minister and the government had reason to believe such a terrible situation existed that it necessitated taking such extraordinary measures as removing the civil liberties of all Canadians in this country, and not just of members and supporters of the FLQ, and since the government has asked Parliament to participate in its decision, the government ought to have taken certain selected members of the other parties of the House into its confidence, and revealed to them this information.

But that course of action was not taken. The government simply requests us to have faith in it. It says, "We know what we are doing, and all will be well." I do not think that is good enough. We should not be approached on such an important matter on that basis. I might add as an aside, to put the matter into perspective, that the decision to invoke the War Measures Act was taken—and I think this is essentially correct—on the basis of a provision within the Bill of Rights itself. When the Bill of Rights was introduced into Parliament by the Conservatives, when they were the government, that party asked Parliament to amend the War Measures Act and to include it within the Bill of Rights. Parliament did that unanimously.

• (6:10 p.m.)

Under that section of the Bill of Rights introduced by the Conservative government, the government of today has taken this action. It is rather odd to hear the person who was prime minister at that time, who had authority to take protective measures, if he wanted, with respect to the War Measures Act, complain about the action being taken under a measure for which he himself laid the groundwork. That is really an aside; it has nothing to do with the consequences of the decision we are being asked to make.

We should consider some of the factors which have contributed to the situation in the province of Quebec.

Many have made great declarations about Canada, perhaps more than any other country, being a place where freedom of speech, action and movement are taken for granted. They are part of our heritage. They are part of what we understand as we grow up. This carries with it, without fear of consequence, the right to dissent, petition, complain, object, demonstrate, appear on Parliament Hill with placards, picket this place and in that way disseminate information throughout the land. Many people take advantage of that freedom. We should not be misled into thinking this is all that constitutes democracy in our nation. What is the point of dissenting, complaining about a difficult situation and asking for redress or solutions to problems when no one listens, when government refuses to act on complaints or chooses to disregard their legitimacy? People develop frustrations. All across this country there are groups which feel they have a legitimate complaint against the government for what it has done or has not done. The government has ignored or disregarded those legitimate claims and these groups have become frustrated. There is a sense of hopelessness. This, to an extent, probably happens in Quebec as it does elsewhere.

A case in point comes to mind with respect to the Eskimo people in the province of Quebec. With one voice they have insisted that they do not want to have their rights and jurisdiction transferred to the province of Quebec. They have said this on more than one occasion, yet the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien), who is responsible to them, has completely ignored the unanimous opinion of these people and is continuing with Quebec negotiations regarding the transfer. Surely, frustration and hopelessness will come out of that situation. If it continues, these people will conclude that they must take some other course of action instead of simply expressing their views to a government which will pay no attention to them.

With the death of Maurice Duplessis there came into Quebec a new concept of freedom of political thought, political hope and freedom for the people to advance from the shackles that the Duplessis government had put on that province for a long time. Out of this situation came what we call the separatist feeling, the desire for political individuality within the bounds of the province and a desire for specific recognition of the political unit called the province of Quebec. Some people in political life exploited that feeling for political purposes. One was Jean Lesage, former Premier of Quebec; another was my friend from Témiscamingue, the leader of the Ralliement Créditiste.

Mr. Peters: Témiscamingue, Quebec.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I tried to make the proper pronunciation so that it would not offend my colleague from Ontario, the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters). The Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) also exploited that attitude and feeling. In fact, he referred to the people in Quebec as his separatist brethren. That is rather an affectionate term to apply. Exploitation and recognition of that feeling in Quebec was abandoned before and during the time Jean Lesage was Premier of Quebec. He realized that it was dangerous to continue playing games with the separatist feeling. He abandoned it because it was getting out of hand.

Once these people—and they are not confined to those I have mentioned—gave up the idea of trying to establish some sort of political alliance for votes, the people who had been exploited naturally felt frustrated and sought another avenue. I do not know to what extent the members of the FLQ were party to the separatist development in Quebec eight, ten or fifteen years ago.

Mr. Pelletier: Obviously you do not know much about that matter.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I am glad the Secretary of State has finally said something in this debate, instead of just sitting embarrassed in his seat. I said, quite candidly, that was something I did not know. How much clearer could I be? I am not trying to be shallow or to play games. I make no connection between the FLQ and the Parti Quebecois or any other political party. The fact is that elements within the FLQ have a psychosis; they are not concerned with taking the reasonable approach to anything.

I do not know if anybody knows whether the hope for political support of the growing feeling of separatism in Quebec resulted in the FLQ. This is a distinct possibility. This is one way in which groups develop their objection to society, first by frustration, second by exploitation and third by finding no avenue for their situation. I think the recent unconscionable strike by the police force of Montreal contributed to the present breakdown. If the police, the people who are supposed to protect our rights and positions, abandon their cloak of protection and do not really care what happens to individuals and property, it contributes to the growing disenchantment that exists in that province.

The intrusion the other night by Premier Robarts contributed to the situation. His intrusion and comments resulted in Claude Ryan, Louis Leberge, René Levesque, and I do not know who else, combining their voices and saying to the government: Give in to the demands of the abductors. That did not contribute to the situation in a very helpful way. I am sure Premier Robarts has enough problems with the Mafia, the police force and union movements in the province. He should have been overly cautious about what he said.

• (6:20 p.m.)

I have great doubt about what is the correct course of action. The Prime Minister asks us to trust him. There may be some in the House who will do so. But there are members of the cabinet who would not, I am sure, be trusted by other members of the cabinet in terms of asking them to take their word for something. The Prime Minister rose in the House, made the statement he did and read certain letters. It was difficult for me. It is easier to grasp the meaning of something one reads oneself than it is when someone translates it. This is my own

problem for not being bilingual. It was easier for me to grasp what was involved after reading *Hansard* today and listening to the Prime Minister on television last night.

Admittedly, there was a need for surprise; I do not gainsay this.

The fact that the government has refused up until now to take action under the Criminal Code in respect of additional authority for the police force is really beside the point. The government felt there was need for surprise; there was need not to telegraph the punch to those who would be picked up. I agree with this wholeheartedly; I have no hesitation in supporting that contention. The element of surprise has ended and everybody knows that the police forces are on their way and are searching hither and yon.

The effect of the War Measures Act has been felt. Everybody knows it is there and that the police and the army are out to ferret-out everyone they can, and they will make mistakes in doing it. But I think it is unfair to the people of Canada for the government to come here and ask us, on the basis of trust only, to endorse the concept of trampling on human rights and freedoms, to suspend the operation of the Bill of Rights—for how little that means in itself—to invade the privacy of people, to lock people in jail upon suspicion or because of the feeling of an individual police officer or somebody in the army. It is unfair for the government to come to Parliament and ask us to participate in that decision on the basis of trust alone. Members of this House might not hesitate one bit if they knew fully what was involved, but I do not think it can be done on the basis of the Prime Minister asking us to trust him, when he does not show any trust for Parliament.

I think, quite frankly, that Premier Bourassa was pretty incompetent in this field, understandably so because he has been Premier of Quebec for only a short period. I think he was frightened and that he panicked. He was not sure what to do, if anything, to cope with the situation, regardless of the degree of competence of the police forces under the authority of his government. He wrote a letter to the Prime Minister. That letter was tabled. I should like to read one short excerpt from it to show what was asked for by Mr. Bourasssa. He did not ask for something which might be considered reasonable, and I am sure that letter was very carefully drafted after consultation with the Prime Minister. It did not come as a bolt out of the blue, as a one-sided piece of correspondence. It is a co-operative, or collaborative letter to put a point across. He asked for authority and power far beyond even that which exists at the moment. Referring to emergency powers, he said:

> I request particularly that such powers encompass the authority to apprehend and keep in custody individuals who the Attorney General of Quebec has valid reasons to believe are determined to overthrow the government through violence and illegal means.

This, to me, does not carry with it the right to court procedures, appeals and the other things about which the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) talked the other day.

This gives me more reason to think that Premier Bourassa in a moment of panic and fright wanted thoroughly authoritarian and dictatorial powers to do what he liked, to lodge people in jail and let them rot there whether or not they were guilty of anything. So far, that plea, as I read the regulations, has been resisted. But it does seem—and this part of the message did not get through the other day—that the letter and, I am sure, the other letters which the Prime Minister of Canada received, were written with his knowledge and consent, which gives an entirely different dimension to the situation.

The Prime Minister said in the House yesterday, and repeated in his television broadcast last night, that legislation is to be developed and presented which will be less broad in its scope than that which is authorized under the War Measures Act. To me, this implies that the legislation will be in the area of criminal law; that it will be part of the Criminal Code regardless of the restrictions, unless they are unique ones. But at the moment no indication has been given that the legislation will be any different from simple criminal law, and if that is the case it will leave the liberties of the Canadian people in the hands of the police or the army to be determined.

I, for one, do not want the liberties and the rights of any Canadian to be left in the hands of policemen or army personnel. I say this because the police forces and the army of this nation are not taught to concern themselves with apprehending criminals and others who break the law. They are not concerned with justice or other humanitarian aspects of our society. Frankly, I would prefer to have the War Measures Act than similar authority given under the criminal law to the attorney general of any province or to the police force.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I think the cabinet, not this cabinet particularly but any cabinet, any elected body, any government—because we have inculcated within us a concept about democracy and rights: perhaps we do not treat them properly sometimes, but the total concept is there—could be better trusted to show concern about the rights and freedoms of Canadians than any police force in the nation.

One would have to look at the legislation, naturally, to see what it contained, but we have experience of the way in which the Prime Minister thinks and should take that into consideration. I am not talking about the Minister of Justice, because knowing him I am sure he was very reluctant in cabinet the other morning to agree with the war measures provision. The Minister of Justice has a tremendous concern about the humanities, much more concern than the Prime Minister, who is a theoretician, a technician and a mechanic when it comes to dealing with the human rights of people. But generally speaking, with an understanding of the way in which the Prime Minister operates, thinks and treats human beings, even Parliamentary Secretaries, I am, at the moment, not disposed to vote for any specific legislation in this field but, rather, to leave it the way it is.

• (6:30 p.m.)

The moment we put this authority into the Criminal Code, it becomes part of the criminal law. We have enough trouble in this nation with blanket search warrants—they are not called search but writs of assistance—which the police forces are entitled to use in certain circumstances. I do not know what those circumstances are, but I think they include smuggling, customs infractions and narcotics offences, among others. Even those blanket powers of search and arrest give us quite enough concern, without giving the police forces the right to invade privacy and restrict the liberty of people. My concern arises simply as a result of the distorted attitude that a policeman may have toward whether or not a certain thing is happening in a certain house.

When the vote comes on Monday, I am not sure as of this moment whether I shall vote for or against the motion. It is a matter that requires a great deal of reflection. The first reason for invoking the War Measures Act has come and gone—the element of surprise. Surprise is not needed any longer because everybody knows what has happened. If that were the only question, we could revoke the War Measures Act right now.

Authority to search, arrest and detain may still be required. There are two factors involved here. One of the most important from the humanitarian point of view is the lives of Mr. Cross and Mr. Laporte. Those two individuals are vitally important in the scheme of things. If some time before the expiration of ten days when, under the Bill of Rights, ten members can put down a motion to revoke the measure taken, these two gentlemen are found alive—I hope that is the case—that need for the War Measures Act also disappears. Indeed, if they are found dead—and that would be sad and regrettable—the need disappears. However, let us not speculate about that; it is a matter in the minds of everyone.

If we are able to locate the two tons or 20 tons, whichever it is of dynamite that is being driven around in a truck somewhere, plus all the other dynamite and guns that the former Minister of National Defence, Paul Hellyer, permitted to be stolen from his armouries a few years ago without showing any great concern—incidentally, I did not notice any French Canadian members getting very excited about that at the time—then once more the need for certain measures taken under the act disappears. I submit that in asking that the measure be in effect from now until the end of April the Prime Minister either has no faith, or very little, in the army, the RCMP and our police forces and their ability to tackle the problem during that time, or he wants this extended power because it is nice to have it.

There are a number of questions that must be answered and which in my own mind I have not answered. Some of them I have, but on balance a number of things have to be answered by each individual member. It is not a question whether or not I support what the government has done or whether I trust the Prime Minister. I have my own view about his capabilities and his concern for the well-being of individuals and humanitarian concepts in Canada. We are dealing with the much broader question that I described earlier, namely, to what extent we are going to participate in adding to, if nothing else, pockets of civil war in Canada.

The Minister of Justice has an intimate knowledge of just what is happening, but this knowledge has not been transmitted beyond the cabinet. I think that at least in a selective sense in terms of secrecy, the opposition should know what is going on in general. Because there is a distinct possibility of further outbreaks taking place here and there, the Minister of Justice knows that he cannot handle the problem by authoritarianism alone.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member's time has expired, but he can continue with the consent of the House. Does the House give unanimous consent to letting the hon. member continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): For a moment or two, Mr. Speaker, I want to list some of the thoughts I have. The Prime Minister is asking, for a period beyond the ten days permitted under the Bill of Rights, for absolute dictatorial, authoritarian power to do whatever the government pleases without any check or balance against it. The government says there is a check and balance at election time, but that is two years away. People have short memories, and in addition the Liberal party has a great propaganda machine. I am talking about granting authoritarian, dictatorial powers at this time. The government wants Parliament to trust it on the basis that it knows what it is doing, that it knows the situation. On the other hand, the government is not willing to take Parliament into its confidence, to trust Parliament. As I have said, no one has any edge on concern over anybody else in the matter of rights, freedoms and the well-being of Canadians.

The government wants to bring in a new law. As I have said, I am not disposed to let individual rights and freedoms rest in the hands of any police force in this nation. The place for protecting such rights and freedoms is Parliament, because Parliament consists of people who have some sense of responsibility. Police forces do not have the feeling for rights and freedoms that we have, because they are not trained to have that feeling.

The other consideration is this. The government knew that this insurrectionist movement in Quebec was being developed, and knew for many years. For at least four or five years the government knew it was growing, that training camps were being set up to turn people into experts on demolition, army activities and guerrilla warfare of the sort that takes place in other countries but never here. The government had available to it certain criminal procedures in this regard, but they either failed to follow them or ignored them.

The Prime Minister of Canada—admittedly, this is a political consideration—was elected a couple of years ago, as he said and as we thought, to bring unity to

Canada. All that has happened has been an increase in insurrectionist activities in one province in particular. There has been an increase in bombings, murders, bank robberies and all the other activities that may or may not be connected with the FLQ but which result therefrom. Hence, we are on the verge of disunity.

As was mentioned yesterday, the government has contributed immeasurably to social unrest by taking an indifferent attitude to the economic situation that exists throughout the nation. The government has stated it is a good thing to have 6 or 7 per cent, or whatever is the figure, unemployment in this country because unemployment is needed to keep inflation in check. There has been no indication whatever, not even a hope expressed, that the continuance in force of the War Measures Act will in any way detract from the development of the terrorist movement of the FLQ or a group by any other name in Canada. There has been no indication that the government is interested in bringing about a much better economic and social situation in Canada to deal with those who are underprivileged and poor. These are problems that plague my mind.

• (6:40 p.m.)

At the moment, I am tempted to vote for the measure when it comes up on Monday, but I really do not know. If I do that, I hope at the moment of voting those over exuberant Liberals do not think I am endorsing the Liberal party or the government, because it is my own conscience that is involved.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. In fact, I should be quite frank and say I have two points of order, but I shall raise them one at a time. My first point of order has to do with the hours of sitting for today. I know it is quite clear from the order agreed to yesterday that when we resumed the sitting at two o'clock this afternoon we were to continue to sit without a break until we finished this debate. I wonder, particularly to give the *Hansard* people a bit of a break, whether there would not be agreement to suspend the sitting from now until eight o'clock.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: My understanding is that we are to sit through. My understanding also is that there have been discussions about the matter. If there is agreement that we should suspend the sitting I am certain the Chair would go along with that, but I heard negative sounds from the right of the Speaker's chair. If it is the wish of hon. members, of course, there is no difficulty.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is no agreement.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on another point of order, and perhaps I shall be a little more successful on this one. Earlier today, I had the pleasure of commending those at the table for the excellent way in which they had reduced to writing what we agreed to yesterday with regard to today's sitting. Perhaps that is my justification for now drawing attention to what I think is a rather serious error in *Votes and Proceedings* for yesterday having to do in fact with the very motion we are now discussing.

If you will look at the motion as now recorded in *Votes and Proceedings,* which after all is the official record of the House, you will find that toward the end of it in column two on page 27 of *Votes and Proceedings* for yesterday the wording is:

—that the proclamation invoking the powers as contained in the regulations will be invoked on or before April 30, 1971 unless a resolution authorizing their extension beyond the date specified has been approved by the House.

In *Hansard* that word was "revoked", not "invoked". Even the little bit of French I know permits me to say that in French the words at that place in the sentence are «sera révoquée». I suggest that if the printing I have is the printing that everyone else has there is an error that ought to be corrected.

Mr. Speaker: The advice I have received from the table at the present time is that this is obviously a misprinting, that the record is wrong and should be corrected. Of course, it is correct in the French text which reads:

[*Translation*]

—the proclamation invoking the powers as contained in the regulations will be revoked on or before April 30, 1971,—

[*English*]

From my understanding of French, I think that obviously would be the correct wording. There is a serious mistake in the English text. It should be "revoked on or before April 30, 1971". Perhaps, with the agreement of hon. members, the necessary correction will be made in the official documents of the House.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. P. M. Mahoney (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, it is a particular pleasure to follow immediately a member of the House who has not firmly made up his mind on an issue. This is probably unique in this debate, and possibly even unique in the general experience in this chamber. It is indeed a pleasure to have a chance hopefully to reconfirm or reinforce the tentative intention of the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) to vote in favour of this motion.

I should like also to allude to the remarks made earlier by the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle). A very few months ago I had occasion, upon a matter of considerable personal conscience and feeling, to determine that I had to vote against the line of my party and against the majority of the members of my party. I sympathize with the hon. member, as I know it is a difficult decision he has had to make. I am sure his colleagues, as well as other members of the House, will appreciate the amount of soul-searching, and indeed the degree of courage,

which the hon. member has exercised in reaching this determination.

The hon. member for Skeena, in remarks he suggested were not exactly germane to the main topic of his speech, said that the reason we are debating this particular resolution today can be related to amendments made to the Bill of Rights. That is not precisely the case. The reason we are debating this resolution is the result of the anxiety of the government to have this subject debated and considered in this House and in the nation at the earliest possible moment. Had the government chosen to follow the letter of the law, as required in the Bill of Rights, it could have waited 15 days to table the Order in Council in the House of Commons and then, on motion of 10 members, a convenient date for the debate would have been selected. However, this course was followed on the initiative of the government, that is, seeking the unanimous consent of the House for a special debate. I think this is a significant fact and one that ought not to be ignored. The government has taken this course, and we are debating this not because the government was obliged to follow that course, but because it wanted the debate at the earliest possible moment.

I think there is common agreement amongst all sides of the House on a number of issues. Many people have spent a great deal of time reiterating these. Certainly, we have nothing but the utmost sympathy for the families of Mr. Cross and the hon. Mr. Laporte, and for them as individuals in this particularly trying time. We do hope that whatever action has been taken or will be taken will result in their safe release and return.

We are all in agreement I think that Canada, and the province of Quebec particularly, are faced with a very perilous situation. We have the assessment of the federal government, voiced by a number of members of the treasury benches, and most particularly the emphatic assessment of the very knowledgeable Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand). We also have the provincial assessment as set out in Prime Minister Bourassa's letter to the Prime Minister which appears as an appendix to yesterday's *Hansard*. We likewise have the assessment of the city of Montreal and the director of the Montreal police department. We have also had the assessments of numerous backbenchers on both sides of this House who are familiar with this situation.

I will not attempt to catalogue those from this side of the House who have spoken from their personal knowledge of the situation that exists. However, I would say that I have watched this debate throughout and I have noted the silence with which hon. members of the official opposition from the province of Quebec have greeted the speeches of their colleagues. It is indeed regrettable that in their caucus they could not have convinced their fellow party members that the situation is as it is, and that the reaction must have been as they have indicated.

The hon. member for Ste. Hyacinthe (Mr. Ricard) has not spoken in this debate, but I think he probably will. His other three colleagues, the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Asselin), the hon. member for Sainte-Marie (Mr. Valade) and the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) have all spoken, and certainly one would find difficulty in relating the content of their remarks to the speeches by their leader, and the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), or indeed any of the other members of their caucus.

• (6:50 p.m.)

I think we are all agreed, too, that the government has taken a grave step. This has been admitted by the Prime Minister, by the Minister of Justice and by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion among others. There is no question of the seriousness of the step or that it was taken reluctantly. There is no question that information is not generally available to those on this side of the House who are not on the treasury bench any more than to those on the other side or to the general public, on which we are able to assess the government's decision to take this step. We can only accept that this government has been a responsible government, and that its record in the matter of civil rights is such that this is not something it would have done without the deepest soul-searching and without, as the hon. member for Skeena who spoke immediately before me pointed out, hedging very substantially in respect of the request for emergency powers that came from the government of Quebec and the city of Montreal. So, I think those of us on the backbenches on this side of the House must share the apprehension of all people who do not have the opportunity to know fully the facts that have been the basis for this decision.

We share that apprehension, but we also share the consensus, which is overwhelming throughout this nation, that it was a right decision. We share the opinion of the nation that this is not an act this government would be disposed to permit to continue beyond the time that is absolutely necessary. I believe there is general consensus on all sides of the House that the existing powers under the Criminal Code were inadequate. This appears to have been admitted every place. People ask: Why was action not taken on the evidence given by Mr. Saulnier before the Broadcasting Committee a year ago. Of course, the administration of justice is a provincial function. If Mr. Saulnier had the evidence he alleged he had, and the evidence which the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert read, I ask why did not the police force of the city of Montreal or the Quebec provincial police start the prosecution? The federal government had no right to exercise police powers competent to deal with the matter in the circumstances. It is as simple as that. If the evidence existed, and if in fact prosecution was desirable at that time, then indeed the onus was on municipal and provincial authorities to exercise their jurisdiction. They had not only the right but the obligation to do so.

Another area of disagreement here is something that was summed up by the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) in four words, "Too much too late". The timing certainly has been challenged. Perhaps 100 years from now some historian, with access to all the information, may be able to second-guess that assessment and say that it should have been done a week ago, a month ago, a day ago or a day, a week or a month from

now. We here are only human. I am sure the members of the cabinet would admit to humanity, particularly in this grave situation.

There has also been disagreement on the method of obtaining the extra police powers. It has been suggested that the Criminal Code be amended. I am not too clear whether the people who have been suggesting amendment of the Criminal Code have been suggesting a general amendment to cope with situations now and forever more or a particular amendment which would deal with the situation as it is now. If it is to be a general amendment, I would tend to view it with the same degree of apprehension that the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) and the hon. member for Skeena viewed the history of section 98 of the Criminal Code which remained in that piece of legislation for almost two decades. Are we to have a provision in the Criminal Code that is conceived in crisis circumstances with which we have to live indefinitely? I hope the circumstances in Canada will not require any such thing.

On the other hand, if there is to be a particular piece of legislation amending the Criminal Code, can we count on it that this is the last and only time such a situation will exist in Canada? I think the experience in other parts of the world would tend to render that judgment rather sanguine and foolish on the part of the government. I would ask members opposite who have urged the amending of the Criminal Code to consider seriously, on the basis of the information they have regarding this crisis, whether they would be prepared to rush through amendments to the Criminal Code that would establish police powers that were not clearly necessary. I, on this side, would not be prepared to do so. I would want to examine that very carefully. I would think they would also want to examine it very carefully.

The other item on which there has been disagreement is the length of time provided in the proclamation for which the War Measures Act would be in effect. This, again, must be related to the magnitude of the problem as conceived by the government. It cannot be related to anything else. If it had been more serious and more deeprooted in their assessment, perhaps they would have suggested a year. If it had been less deeprooted, perhaps they would have suggested a shorter period. Surely, a decision concerning the length of time this act will remain in force is a substantive decision, the same as the other substantive provisions in these regulations, such as the decision to invoke the War Measures Act as it relates to arrest and custody and not, for example, to censorship.

The length of time the act will be in force in this particular case is not a procedural or peripheral item at all. It is an item of substance. There has also been, I believe, a great deal of gross overstatement concerning the effect of this proclamation. Certainly, nothing I say here is intended or designed to in any way minimize the fact that this was a very serious and very grave move made in response to a very serious and grave situation. Nevertheless, it has been suggested that this amounts to a suspension of civil liberties or a suspension of the constitution, whatever that means, in Canada. Much has been made of the suggestion that it was a law passed in the night and that Parliament was unable to comment on it. Parliament commented on the War Measures Act when it was passed. Parliament decided at that time, in a democratic manner in accordance with the rules of the House of Commons, that the government would have the power to do these things, in specified circumstances.

There is no merit in the suggestion that Parliament should have had an opportunity to debate this decision or comment on it before it was made. Within seven hours of the time it was made, we were given an opportunity here to commence debating its merits. That is more than the government was required to do under the law. The government brought it before us at the earliest possible moment.

Now, I should like to refer to the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald). It would seem that it is not necessary for one to be an old Tory any more in order to start preparing one's memoirs. I cannot but think that the speech given by the hon. member for Egmont last night and today must have been directed to posterity rather than to the situation today. It will read beautifully when his book comes out. But the suggestion that he is one of 264 Canadians still free to speak his mind rather overdramatizes the situation. I am one of them, too, and I do not feel I am that exclusive, I do not feel as exclusive as the millions of people in Quebec who are living in fear and who are not free to speak their minds. There are 17 million or 18 million Canadians in other parts of Canada who are free to speak their minds and will continue to be free to speak their minds.

• (7:00 p.m.)

The only advantage that the hon. member for Egmont has, as far as I can see, as a result of his status as a Member of Parliament is that he is not only free to speak his mind, a thing that most of us would wish to do, but he is also free, if he wishes, to advocate the use of force in the commission of an offence as a means of accomplishing a governmental change in Canada. If that is a freedom he prizes, he is welcome to it but every other Canadian shares the other freedoms to do everything except that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Mahoney: Some of the areas of disagreement of which I have spoken up to now involve value judgments, and I know that disagreements on these are honestly formed and honestly taken. However, there has been considerable disagreement on exactly what the government has done in proclaiming the War Measures Act and in enacting the regulations. These are questions of fact, not of judgment. Incidentally, the Ottawa *Citizen* did us a service yesterday by publishing the War Measures Act in full. It is unfortunate that they printed it unamended and did not include the change the Bill of Rights made a few years ago. Nevertheless, that is not particularly relevant to the discussion because the other sections of the War Measures Act are the ones that spell out the powers of the government in this situation.

The powers of the Governor in Council are set out in sections 3, 4 and 5 of the War Measures Act. Section 5 is not applicable to the case because it refers to the deportation of enemy aliens, and regrettably our enemies in this case are not aliens.

Mr. Forrestall: Are you sure of that?

Mr. Mahoney: However, section 4 provides the penalties and sets the limits on them, a maximum of $5,000 and or five years in prison, and the government in drafting its regulations has chosen to go to the maximum in that respect.

So, we are concerned with the various items enumerated in section 3 of the War Measures Act which allows the government to pass regulations dealing with censorship and the control and suppression of publications, writings, maps, plans, photographs, communications and means of communication. The government has chosen to deal in its regulations with communications and means of communication. The government has not chosen to attempt to deal with censorship, in the broadest sense of the word, or with the suppression of publications, etc.

Subsection (b) deals with arrest, detention, exclusion and deportation. The government in its regulations has dealt with arrest and detention; it has not exercised any power of exclusion or deportation. Subsection (c) deals with the control of the harbours, ports and territorial waters of Canada and the movements of vessels. The regulations are silent on that one. Subsection (d) deals with transportation by land, air or water and the control of the transport of persons and things. The regulations are silent on that one. Subsection (e) deals with trading, exportation, importation, production and manufacture. The regulations are silent on that. Subsection (f) deals with appropriation, control, forfeiture and disposition of property and of the use thereof. To the extent that this relates to the people in the FLQ or any other association advocating the use of force and the commission of crime as a means or as an aid in accomplishing a governmental change in Canada, the government has applied it. Certainly there are some provisions therein regarding forfeiture and the disposition of property, but it has to be property which can be used as evidence.

So, really, the government has shown, I think, a very vigorous restraint and a great discretion in the application of the items under the War Measures Act which it felt were necessary to deal with the situation. This was dealt with at some length by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan), but I think it bears repetition.

Under the regulations themselves, section 1 is the short title and section 2 is the definitions. I have not heard anyone complaining about them. Section 3 designates the FLQ as an unlawful association, and also designates any group of persons or association that advocates use of force or the commission of crime as a means of or as an aid in accomplishing governmental change within Canada as an unlawful association. Does anyone in this chamber take exception to that in the circumstances?

Section 4 (a) to (f) of the regulations defines various criminal activities of overt members or supporters of the FLQ, the unlawful association. Does anyone in this chamber take exception to that? Section 4 (g) is not exclusive to the FLQ. It deals with a person who advocates, promotes, or engages in the use of force or the commission of criminal offences as a means of accomplishing a governmental change within Canada, and it provides that such a person is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years. Does anyone take exception to that?

Section 5 deals with accessories after the fact, people who, knowing or having reasonable cause to believe that another person is guilty of an offence under these regulations, or under Section 4 to which I have just alluded, and gives that other person any assistance with intent thereby to prevent, hinder or interfere with the apprehension, trial or punishment of that person for that offence, is subject to the same penalty. Does anyone take exception to that?

Section 6 creates a like offence with a like penalty for any person who knowingly permits the unlawful association of the FLQ or any branch or combination or any assemblage of persons who are gathered to advance their idea of overthrowing the government of Canada by violence or the commission of crime. Anyone who permits them to have a meeting and to congregate in a building which he controls is also guilty of the offence. Does anyone here take exception to that?

Section 7 provides that a person taken into custody for this type of offence can be held without bail pending trial unless the attorney general of the province consents to his release on bail. It further provides that once that person has been held for 90 days from the time he was first detained, he must be brought before a judge. This has been the subject of some comment and I would not, myself, be disposed, on the basis of what I know, to either strongly urge that the 90 days be maintained or that they be reduced. It seems to me that a shorter period of time might reasonably be expected in this case. However, again I do not know, and none of us here, except those on the Treasury benches know for sure, the basis on which these substantive decisions have been taken.

In section 8, again we are faced with a provision that shifts the onus of proof from the Crown to the accused. I think this provision gave the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville some trouble. Frankly, it does not give me that much trouble. People who have openly consorted with the FLQ and openly acted as their representatives, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, are deemed to be members of the FLQ. I think that Mr. Lemieux, if that is all he has done, is all right. He was retained in a professional capacity and with the full knowledge of the lawful authorities. I do not think this provision was designed to catch him or anyone whose relations with the FLQ have been lawful. But surely evidence in these cases is in the possession of the person who is charged. The reasons for his consorting or communicating with them is something that he can readily put forward and thus shift the onus of proof back to the Crown.

Section 9 of the regulations deals with arrests without warrant, and further provides that the arraignment and charge after arrest must take place within seven days, subject to the right of the provincial attorney general to extend that period for a further 21 days. This is a serious infringement of civil rights. Whether or not it is justified in the circumstances, again is something that only future disclosure of the grounds on which this decision was made by the government will permit people like myself, who do not have access to the full information, to judge.

• (7:10 p.m.)

Section 10 provides for search without warrant. I do not think anyone can take exception to that one in the circumstances. Section 11 deals with retention of evidence, and section 12 provides that regular criminal procedure applies to the prosecution of these people, except as specifically altered by the regulations. That is a saving provision and I think again that under the circumstances and, with the knowledge we have, it is one that can be fully supported.

The government has admitted that this proclamation of the War Measures Act has given it more power than is needed in the circumstances. But it has also taken the minimum possible amount of power under that statute. It is the only statute that it had available to it. Hon. members opposite have said, "You should have done something else." What else could have been done other than amend the Criminal Code, and how many hon. members opposite would have been prepared to agree to the type of amendments to the Criminal Code that would be necessary, and for the debate on them to take place in short order? How would they have been better prepared for such a debate than for this one in which they are asked to endorse the proclamation of the War Measures Act? How would they have known a great deal more about the facts of the case?

We have seen some considerable confusion on the other side of the House. Some people have said that we have given unlimited power to the Prime Minister. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson), and most of the other Conservative party speakers, have objected to the action on that ground. Members of the New Democratic Party read the act and the regulations more carefully, and said we are giving unlimited power to the provincial attorneys general.

Whatever it is, Mr. Speaker, I contend that we are not giving unlimited power to anyone, but this does not denigrate from the fact that a serious curtailment of civil rights is taking place. The hon. member for Coast Chilcotin (Mr. St. Pierre) complained to some extent about the work of the press. However bad it may be in his opinion, or in anybody else's opinion, I am glad that it is the press and not the Conservative party that is communicating to the public the situation under this particular act.

I would like to speak now along this same line on another subject. I have not always been entirely in sympathy with the various agencies for which the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) reports to Parliament. Allegations were made by the leader of the Ralliement Créditiste and by others, in and out of this House—the hon. member for Sainte-Marie (Mr. Valade) also spoke on this subject—suggesting that the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and in particular its French language network, has in fact been harbouring people who have been active participants in the FLQ.

The Broadcasting Act passed by this House of Commons in 1968 provides among other things that the national broadcasting service, the CBC, should:

> contribute to the development of national unity and provide for a continuing expression of Canadian identity;

I would be most reluctant to see any move taken in this House to give the government the opportunity of dictating to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. I think that the Secretary of State is regrettably stuck with the very unsatisfactory job of reporting to this House of Commons for a highly contentious organization, and really all he can do is report. It would be out of the question, it would be a more serious move in the long run than the government has taken in invoking the War Measures Act, to require that a political officer of this government should have any direction over the policies and affairs of the CBC.

The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Mr. Speaker, consists of a board of directors. The board of directors is composed of a president and 14 other directors appointed by the Governor in Council. These directors spend a great deal of time flying back and forth across the country in the first class sections of Air Canada aircraft. Perhaps instead of junketing off to Yellowknife as they did some time ago, and to Halifax within the last month, they might just sit down and appraise just what is going on in their corporation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mahoney: This is where the responsibility lies to see just what is happening in the CBC, without involving political officers, cabinet ministers in the government, in a situation in which the government has no right to be involved. If the board of directors of the CBC—I am challenging them today—will just look at what it is doing, and stop taking the snow-job they are getting from that high-priced bunch of assistant vice-presidents that they have over there—

Mr. Bell: What about the minister?

Mr. Mahoney: —then I think there is some hope that the CBC may return to fulfilling the objectives Parliament conceived for it in the Broadcasting Act.

The government has to govern. Another thing that has been largely forgotten in this debate by the people opposite is the fact that the government is accountable. The government has taken a very grave move. It will be accountable to the electorate for that move, not only for what it has done to date but for how it conducts itself as long as the War Measures Act is in force. I think I can assure this House that hon. members on this side, as well

as hon. members opposite, are going to be scrutinizing with great care the way this country is run under the provisions of that act as long as the government deems it necessary to maintain it in force.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mahoney: I said earlier that the government has a fine record, the Prime Minister has a fine record and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) has a fine record in the area of civil liberties. Members of the Liberal party are as alert to civil liberties as other members of this Parliament and as members of any political party anywhere.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, the measure before us today is undoubtedly the most important ever to come before the Parliament of this country since the Second World War. Consequently, all of us here charged with the responsibility of representing the people of Canada must search our souls and consciences and ponder upon the action we are about to take. The vote on this measure, Mr. Speaker, without a doubt will be the most important vote ever taken by this House.

We meet this day and night in an air of crisis in Canada, at a time when our government has seen fit to impose the stringent provisions of the War Measures Act. We in this House have a particular responsibility to our constituents at this time. I think it is only right that this debate should continue today. I think it is only right that each member should have a chance to have his say because the measure before us is so important and is so broad in its impact that it places in suspension the constitutional rights and civil liberties of every man, woman and child in the country.

Hence, I feel it incumbent upon me to rise to my feet and speak, as do other hon. members and as did those who preceded me, because this measure affects everyone. It affects my constituents. It adversely affects the constituents of the hon. member for Calgary South (Mr. Mahoney) who just took his seat. It affects us all. So, it is only right that we should be here meeting in this extraordinary session and that we should stay here, all night if necessary, to explain our views and the way that we are reacting to this momentous measure.

• (7:20 p.m.)

Sir, this is an unprecedented measure on the part of the government. No government ought to bring in such a measure without, at the same time, giving the representatives of the people a chance to express their views. I think it is fair to suggest that before Parliament concurs in the measure, it ought to extract certain conditions from the government. I am not any more happy about this move, now that I have heard what the hon. member for Calgary South (Mr. Mahoney) had to say, than I was a few minutes before he spoke, even though he took great pains to explain to us the regulations the government has proclaimed under the War Measures Act and the provisions of the act with respect to which the regulations now in effect remain silent. What concerns me is that the government can, at any time, change the regulations. The government can, at its discretion, bring in new regulations. It is asking us now to support a move that would give it carte blanche over our constitutional rights for six months.

I support the view that this is a most critical and emergent situation. This is a great crisis for our country. One would have to be blind not to see that. May I also say this, sir: there were signs from which we could see this coming. I will not repeat what has already been said by the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Douglas, Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands) and others who have preceded me. It was obvious to me that the government was preparing itself for this move. They were, if you like, setting the stage when they decided it was necessary in their collective opinion to bring troops in full battledress to Parliament Hill and to the cities of Ottawa and Montreal. I knew then that the government was preparing Canada for this drastic move. The government was setting the stage for the proclamation of the War Measures Act.

At that time I thought the government was overplaying its hand. I thought then, and I still think in restrospect, that the government was over-reacting. It was over-dramatizing the situation. It is only in the light of the proclamation of the War Measures Act that the dramatic move on the part of the government in bringing in troops makes any sense, in my view. There is always a great danger of over-reacting. This is something about which we should be very vigilant. That is what concerns me at the present time, although I do not diminish in any way the seriousness of the situation facing our country.

When we arrive at a moment when our constitutional and civil liberties have to be suspended, then I believe that we in this Parliament should take on the onerous responsibility of examining carefully the actions of the government and probing into the reasons for that action. This, hopefully, is the reason for this debate. Perhaps before it concludes a little light will be shed on the matter.

It has been said, and I think this bears repetition, that the government obviously had information at its disposal which it has not seen fit to make public. It had to have information at its disposal on which to base its decision. Surely, sir, no government would make such a move as this, no government would take upon itself such a responsibility, without having facts at hand which would clearly, in the collective opinion of government members, warrant the taking of such a move.

The government of course needed the element of surprise, and I subscribe to that view. Considering the situation that exists in Montreal, and considering the communications from that city and the government of Quebec that were sent to the Prime Minister, I can understand the government's position. I sympathize with the government; I can certainly rationalize the moves that took place yesterday morning. The element of surprise was obviously very important, hence explaining

why the act was proclaimed at four o'clock in the morning. It appears that the element of surprise within the context of this extraordinary move has had its effect. I have read in the press and heard in the House about the wholesale arrests that have been made. Mr. Speaker, the government is responsible to the people of Canada; it must take and is prepared, I am sure, to take full responsibility for its actions. Having imposed the stringent and extreme War Measures Act on us, it follows that the government had the responsibility of placing before Parliament in the time that had been bought, legislation which would take the place of the War Measures Act now in force. I think that is a reasonable expectation. I also feel that many of us are rather surprised the government has not, up to this time, made such a move.

The government has said that it will consider bringing in new legislation. On the basis of this vague undertaking, it asks Parliament to endorse this measure which would give it broad and sweeping powers until April 30 next. I think that is an unreasonable position for the government to take. I appeal to the government to reconsider that position before the vote takes place. We all wish to take a responsible attitude towards this measure. Indeed, we sympathize with the position in which the government finds itself. Nevertheless, in my view the government has made an unreasonable request of Parliament. It has asked Parliament to provide it with these sweeping powers unconditionally. As I say, that is an unreasonable position for the government to take.

• (7:30 p.m.)

The government should have placed before Parliament legislation to give it the powers it so desperately needed under the War Measures Act, legislation that would have addressed itself more particularly to the crisis in the province of Quebec. Instead, we must continue to operate with our constitutional rights suspended, not only in Quebec but all across this country. That is the position we are in at the present time. This measure applies to every province and region of Canada from Newfoundland to British Columbia. I am sure once that aspect of this measure is fully appreciated by the people of Canada, they will react. At that time the government will be in a very awkward position to explain why it has found it necessary to ask for these broad, sweeping powers for such a long period of time.

I feel that the amendment placed before this House by the hon. member for Cumberland-Colchester North (Mr. Coates) is reasonable. It merely suggests to the government that it be granted these powers under the War Measures Act until October 31, 1970, instead of April 30, 1971. In the two weeks before the end of October, the government would have ample opportunity to give careful and studied consideration to whatever legislative means it feels would be effective in giving it the powers it now has under this measure to deal with insurrection and the crisis in the province of Quebec.

The members of this House, as the elected representatives of the people of Canada, have a tremendous and onerous responsibility. It is probably the most momentous responsibility we shall ever have. Certainly, we have to exercise that responsibility. In my view this can be done in two ways. First, I suggest that we should exercise vigilance. We should be very vigilant of this government to make sure they do not abuse the powers they now have. We must watch carefully to ensure that these powers are exercised in the way in which they have been spelled out in the regulations presented to Parliament by the government. That is our responsibility as long as the War Measures Act is in effect.

Our second responsibility, which is concomitant with the first, is that while being vigilant over the use of these powers by the government we must at the same time continually press the government to introduce legislation that will replace this measure. These are the responsibilities that we now have. We must exercise them.

I find no problem in supporting the amendment before the House. However, I find it difficult to support the resolution asking Parliament to concur in granting these powers to the government for a period of six months. As we meet in this moment of crisis, I think it is only fair for us to expect the government to be reasonable. The government should not force us into a position where we have to take an extreme stand. I think most hon. members want to support the government. If the government wants to be reasonable, it will meet the provisions set out in the amendment. In my view, two weeks is ample time to prepare the necessary legislative measure to give the government the power it now has, but it must be specific and narrower in its application.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, at the very beginning of my remarks, I would like, though quite briefly, to extend to the families of Messrs. Laporte and Cross the assurance of our prayers. I also wish, that during this debate they will feel reassured because our thoughts are with them and their suffering is ours.

I now sincerely appeal to the kidnappers. I ask them to admit they have failed and to hand back their hostages, never forgetting that the safe-conducts offered by the political authorities are still valid. Let them remember that the French-speaking people of Quebec would never forgive them the death of Messrs. Cross and Laporte.

This should start them thinking, but I know they could not care less since they have already rejected the democratic process. Let them remember however that the people will have their day and when they do even those who are seeking today drastic political changes in the institutions of the province of Quebec through democratic means will, in the long run, be the first to feel the disastrous effects of the changes they seek.

To govern is to choose. Democracy is freedom for people to choose. The people of Quebec, of Montreal and of Canada have made their choice. Until proof to the contrary is available, the various governments are taking their power from those same Montrealers, those same Quebecers and those same Canadians. The exercise of

power therefore rests with them. The present crisis probably reflects the inadequacy of our legislation, since it has been necessary to resort to the War Measures Act and the relevant regulations.

• (7:40 p.m.)

I therefore urge the government to call without delay a meeting of all political leaders in order that a series of measures likely to bring the present crisis under control may be introduced in the House. After all, in the eyes of the whole world, Canada is now on a war footing and this, I believe, is detrimental to the Canadian image and to the present situation.

I urge the government to repeal the proclamation of the War Measures Act with the least possible delay in the circumstances. However, whatever new legislation may be voted by the House should include interim provisions covering those already arrested, those to be arrested, and against whom a complaint will have been lodged. For these, the rigour of this act in order to maintain law and order in Canada, would continue to be exercised until their trial.

My reluctance to vote for the passage of such an act is in no way different from that of the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand), the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier), the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and several others. But the State must ensure for all its citizens peace, security and welfare.

There is fear in several quarters. I understand that. Our Quebecers, whatever their origins: French, British, Jewish, American, Greek, Italian or any other, are fearful. I want to reassure the people who are going through an extremely difficult period. The government has the situation under control and will keep it so because it has the support, up to this day, of the majority of the Canadian people and of almost all the people of Quebec.

If those who now hold these powers know how to use them without ill using them, the Canadian people will keep on supporting them.

The people of Quebec who have to live in a different way today, are, of course, the ones who have to fear the brunt of the action we are discussing today and this, more than all other Canadians. Let them understand clearly and also the police force that enjoy considerable powers, that the government is not embarking on a witch hunt. It is not a particular provincial party which is the object of the measure, nor its 600,000 members, but in fact those who pursue terrorist aims. Any abuse shall therefore be very severely repudiated.

It is not the government which is seeking violence but those who wish to overthrow the established order. Any action is aimed at them first and foremost. It is the duty of the government to pursue them to the confines of the province of Quebec and everywhere in Canada. It is against them and nobody else that the law applies in full.

I easily understand the indecision of the leader of the Progressive Conservatives (Mr. Stanfield) who still seems to pursue a double policy: he is neither for nor against the present measures. In view of the situation, these look quite reasonable to me.

With regard to the usual message of virtue of the New Democratic party members, I just want to say this: I remember when I attended the founding convention of the New Democratic party. In order to avoid the splintering of the new-born party, in a desperate move, one night, the two-nation theory was accepted so as to prevent Mr. Michel Chartrand from going out slamming the doors and returning to the province of Quebec.

Unfortunately, we needed a crisis to make Canadians realize how much we need to stay united and that, whatever language we speak, we have probably the same aspirations while remaining different. It is said that crises bring people closer. I hope that these events will be an obvious example that there is in Canada people with different goals but who nevertheless live together.

I wish that the crisis we are going through will make the hon. members and all other Canadians reflect on the nature of Canada, and on what are the Maritime provinces which suffer much more than the province of Quebec from the recession that might exist, and the provincial, municipal and federal authorities who work as hard as possible to get rid of it.

Before concluding my remarks, I should like to appeal energetically to the youth of the province of Quebec and ask them when they will start to think.

I am asking those young people when they will stop supporting the cause of those who want only one thing: to use them to attain objectives which are not theirs.

Young people must be completely free in preparing for their future, but they must think about the economic and social consequences that any move they will make in the next days will be reflected in their own future. They are the ones who will pay for the risks they will take and the aftermath of the present crisis.

Our young people should look around and compare their situation with that which prevails in other countries. They should compare their freedom with the freedom that exists in other countries and they will see that the real happiness to which we all aspire is relative.

Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat that no one in this House, is happy about having to vote for these exceptional measures. Unfortunately, they are necessary in view of the uncommon crisis we are going through. That is what we must understand.

I want to repeat, for the guidance of the people of Quebec, that they are not seeking peace those who, perhaps through means other than ours, want to bring about otherwise a political system. No one in this House, is pointing a finger at any particular political party.

As for the leader of the Parti québecois, he claims there is no longer any government in the province of Quebec, probably in the secret hope that the people might appeal to his good services. I say, there is a government in the province of Quebec, that of the Hon. Robert Bourassa. There is, at city hall in Montreal, a

municipal government now headed by Messrs. Drapeau and Saulnier. The Canadian government is ably led by the Right Hon. Prime Minister. Those authorities, legally chosen by the electors of Quebec, the city of Montreal and Canada must assume their responsibilities.

I cannot understand that in such circumstances the debate should last for so long, nor what are the reasons inducing our colleagues to oppose the measures. Are they as reluctant as we are or more so to adopt the measure before the House. If so, I should like to hear it, but I have carefully listened to their numerous interventions and nothing has been said along those lines. I thought that the members of the opposition, particularly those of the Progressive Conservative party, considered this a heinous measure. Up to now, I have found nothing in their speeches that would convince me that it is.

I call on them, and I urge them to listen, because their constituents are beginning to want to know more. There is no partisanship involved here. At the present time, there exists a crisis in Quebec whose effects seem ignored in many areas of Canada. The government had to resort to extraordinarily drastic measures because he had no other choice. When there is only one way to face a difficulty, one has the choice of taking it or not. If one does not, one can become the target of the harshest criticism. People would be saying without any hesitation: You had a means at your disposal, and you failed to resort to it.

In my opinion, it is imperative in such a crisis to support the government, because under democratic principles any measure considered improper could be revoked later on, if the government has really misused the powers it has been granted. If the government goes too far, I am sure that the people will have no mercy for the municipal government, and for the provincial government as well who will have appealed to the federal government; and I am sure that it will be even more unmerciful for the federal government because it could have rejected the pleas of the provincial and municipal governments.

And the people who have chosen these governments will be able, at time of the municipal, provincial or federal election, to express their disagreement through the democratic process. But it does not seem to be the case at the moment. This is why, under the circumstances and subject to my previous explanation, I think that the political leaders should meet as soon as possible in order to bring before us new legislation. Under the circumstances and however unbelievable as it may seem, it would be a sign of cowardness to deny our support to the government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (7:50 p.m.)

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, I will admit that I am somewhat reluctant to speak following the comments of my hon. friend, the member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme) who was complaining about the length of this debate.

[Mr. Prud'homme.]

I thought, Mr. Speaker, that there was an understanding among the leaders of the different parties to the effect that any member wishing to express his opinions on the matter under discussion should be entitled to freely do so. However, it was only this afternoon that some members from Quebec asked me to state my opinion on the subject now under discussion.

I would like to remind the members of this House that, with my participation to this debate, every Progressive Conservative member from Quebec will have participated in this discussion whereas several Liberal members, through fear perhaps, refuse to voice their opinion before this House.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Ricard: I say to the hon. members from the province of Quebec who act as if they were martyrs to rise and speak so that they may frankly express their opinions instead of making constant interruptions during our observations. For goodness' sake, they should recognize us the same right they exercise so freely.

Mr. Speaker, the government has no lesson to teach us. If need be, we could trust the government, provided its past were not so much at variance with its present conduct. It must be kept in mind that its actions have been rather questionable: it has reversed its position on the matters of nuclear arms and the omnibus bill. Many members voted against their conscience. At a first free vote, they followed the dictates of their conscience, but when the measure was brought forward by the government, they voted as their leader told them to.

An hon. Member: Order.

Mr. Ricard: That is the kind of interruption they can make. They are not able to exercise their rights and to express their views here. Once again I say that they should let those who want to speak do so in a moderate way.

An hon. Member: The War Measures Act.

Mr. Ricard: The hon. member for Calgary South (Mr. Mahoney) is shouting: "The War Measures Act".

[*English*]

The hon. member for Calgary South (Mr. Mahoney) is one of those who chided me and invited me to take part in this debate. I am doing so. He has been trying since the commencement of this debate to lead us astray. I tell him that I have seen others attempt this, and this is not the night that he will lead me astray.

[*Translation*]

There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that we are presently going through a very difficult period of our history, especially in Quebec. The very life of peaceful people is threatened. Two kidnappings have taken place, a short while ago. Following the example of the hon. member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme), I should also like to extend my sympathy to those who have been stricken.

The Cross and Laporte families can be sure of our deep-felt sympathy.

Such a chaos cannot last much longer in the province of Quebec. The authorities are responsible for restoring law and order. It is up to the municipal, provincial and federal authorities to enforce the law.

The Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) told us that at the request of the authorities of the city of Montreal and of the province of Quebec, assistance had been given to remedy a situation which threatened the lives of the citizens.

Early Thursday morning if I remember correctly—

An hon. Member: Friday morning—

Mr. Ricard: —Friday, after consultations with his cabinet, the Prime Minister decided to apply the war measures. From his own admission, there are in these measures many more powers than needed by the government to deal with this situation.

We are asked to approve this measure and the government side blames us for not seeing things in exactly the same way as they do. It is the duty of the members of the opposition to find out what they are asked to do, in the best interest of the population of Canada and, in particular, of the province of Quebec and of Montreal.

Mr. Speaker, considering the position occupied in the House by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield). I would have thought that he could have been given additional information by the Prime Minister. However, I am inclined to think that whatever additional information the Leader of the Opposition may have received, it was of trifling importance as compared to what we have in our possession.

Apparently, the right hon. Prime Minister has decided that the Leader of the Opposition should get all the information he needs from the newspapers rather than to trust him with information which in circumstances as serious as the ones we are now living would have been useful not merely to the leader of the opposition himself but also to all the members of the opposition and hence to the entire nation.

Mr. Speaker, I said it was our privilege and our right to criticize the government and to see that the measures it proposes are the best. Then we are not the only ones to wonder about the "full power" which the liberal government is now asking.

I have in hand an editorial from Mr. Claude Ryan of *Le Devoir,* who surely may be considered as an unprejudiced man, as—

An hon. Member: You are saying it.

Mr. Ricard: The Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) has always that benevolence of his. I think he admitted that while he was talking to union members in order to incite them to strike. I think that he is used to it and cannot change. He just told me that I did not know what I was saying. He once told me: You are not telling the truth and he has a peculiar way—

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): —to say stupidly stupid things.

Mr. Ricard: —of making himself known.

He misused his rights when he was making speeches to the workers to stir them against their bosses.

Mr. Boulanger: Those are Ricard-style lies. This is you to a T. You are preparing your election, the same as when you are doing door-to-door canvassing.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, the interjection of the hon. member for Mercier gives us an idea of the kind of freedom and democracy these people want to give us. I listened to all the speeches made in this House and I did not interrupt anybody. I listened to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) as well as as to the hon. member for Saint-Jacques (Mr. Guilbault).

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): We listen to you too.

Mr. Ricard: In short, I have listened religiously to all those who spoke on this subject because it is only polite to do so. I shall ask for the same politeness. I know that it might be asking a lot from the hon. member for Mercier; I believe that courtesy is beyond his reach and that he would not even recognize it if he met it.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I should like first to remind hon. members that the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe has the floor. As for him, I would remind him that he must address himself to the Chair.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker I am under the impression that this is what I was doing.

In any event, to return to Mr. Ryan's editorial, I should like to quote this passage:

> Faced with an unprecedented situation that no similar government in the Atlantic world has had to face experienced yet, the government of Mr. Bourassa had to demonstrate that it has the highest respect for life. It had also to find a formula that would constitute a first step towards the rehabilitation in the democratic process of elements temporarily outside it where methods of action are concerned, but whose political and social convictions match those of thousands of their fellow-citizens.
>
> This double challenge was very exacting. It forced the government not to yield to pressures requesting a more impressive deployment of strength. It forced it to put considerations of pride and power in second place. It forced it to give a beginning of recognition to a movement whose objectives one may dispute and of whose methods one may disapprove, but that exist nonetheless. It was a hard, difficult and thankless approach. It was nevertheless the most generous and, in the long term, the most positive.

We are not alone in questioning what is being asked of us. We are, I hope, all in favour of the return to order. We will certainly support any measure for the purpose of

restoring order, but at the same time we have a responsibility to the people and we want to acquit ourselves of this duty to the best of our ability.

And Mr. Ryan's closing paragraph reads as follows:

We regret the choice that was made, for that purpose, of the framework of the War Measures Act, which has a potential scope completely out of proportion to the problem the authorities are now facing. We also regret that action under the War Measures Act should already have been initiated in a spirit and according to methods which invite the worst apprehensions. However, we can but assert anew the right of a democracy to defend itself and its duty to judge harshly those who injustly jeopardize the freedom and life of their fellow citizens, and to restrain them.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member talking about the FLQ or about the government?

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, I have read some excerpts from an editorial in order to show that there are others besides the opposition members who are wondering about this. If the minister had listened to my speech, it would probably not have been necessary for him to interrupt me once again.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will allow me, I would like to ask him what he means when he alludes to people who threaten the lives of citizens. Does that concern the members of the government or the FLQ?

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to explain all the article to the minister. If he will read it himself, he will draw his own conclusions, as I did myself.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the crisis through which we are going will be stopped as quickly as possible. However, I cannot let this opprotunity go by without recalling that this uneasiness has very deep roots. If we really want to solve that problem, we will have to grapple with the causes of the uneasiness which is grieving us now.

Nobody is ignorant of the fact that for many years the representatives of the government of the province of Quebec who succeeded each other came here to demand rights and went back home empty-handed. That has bred in the mind of the population insatisfaction and apathy towards the central government. That is one of the causes of the present uneasiness.

I would also like to take this opportunity to appeal to all my English-speaking fellow citizens, both in the House of Commons and outside, so that they make an additional effort in order to understand the aspirations of the people of Quebec.

They do not want any favours. They do not want to be treated like poor relatives. The province of Quebec is only asking for complete respect of its rights and prerogatives.

We, from the province of Quebec, want to be full-fledged Canadians and this is why I plead with my Quebec colleagues so that together we may build a better Canada in which our children will have to live. Unless there is total understanding and agreement between the components of the Canadian nation, we will continuously be faced with emergencies such as this one. I am confident that my English speaking fellow citizens will also want to do their share for the good of the Canadian people.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (8:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to express my views on the resolution now before the House. Although I come from the province of British Columbia in the extreme west of Canada, I feel we too should speak on the current crisis which affects primarily a province in the eastern part of our nation. I believe I should officially place on record my views and my position on the action taken by the government yesterday when it invoked, by Order in Council, the War Measures Act and in effect suspended the Canadian Constitution, the Bill of Rights and the civil liberties of over 21 million Canadians.

At the outset let me say that I am totally and unrelentingly opposed to the terrorist activities of the FLQ. Their bombings, kidnappings and attempted blackmail of our democratically constituted federal and provincial institutions are methods which are alien and abhorrent to our Canadian way of life. I fully endorse the stand of our federal administration in its refusal to bow to the blackmail demands of the FLQ. I believe no democratic government could long survive if blackmail, threats, bombings and violence became the order of the day. Terrorist activities to achieve social reform cannot be tolerated in Canada. The FLQ terrorists cannot justify their actions on any moral, political or humanitarian grounds, because in our nation we allow them freedom of expression and of organization to plead for all the social changes demanded by them.

I fervently hope that the kidnapped victims, Mr. Cross and Mr. Laporte, will be released to their families unharmed. Any move made by the federal government, apart from submitting to base blackmail, should be pursued with vigour and, I trust, success.

I wish briefly to discuss the action taken by the federal government yesterday when it invoked the War Measures Act to meet the crisis in the province of Quebec. I realize the tenseness and seriousness of the situation in that province, and particularly in the city of Montreal. I recognize the need for immediate and substantial assistance to meet the crisis there. But in my frank opinion the suspension of the constitutional rights of 21 million Canadians was not the manner in which this crisis should have been handled. It is too late for us to have a voice as to whether the War Measures Act should have been invoked or not, because it is already here. It became law by Order in Council at 4 a.m. yesterday. It did not have the consent of the elected members of this House.

It is rather shocking for one to realize that measures of this nature can be brought in by Order in Council. One

can go to bed at night, wake up in the morning and find that his constitutional rights as a Canadian have gone and that he has been subjected to a new act. This worries me, although I realize that in certain circumstances legislation of this type must be on the statute books. I believe, however, that additional powers could and would have been granted by this House to meet the crisis in Quebec without the need in peacetime to take the unprecedented step of invoking the War Measures Act and depriving every Canadian of his or her rights and privileges under the constitution.

• (8:20 p.m.)

The question I want to put here is—and it has worried me considerably since I first heard of the action which the government had taken and which I think is an indication of the lack of leadership in this nation—is what do we do when a crisis dealing with the very existence of government in Canada hits this nation or this Parliament. I will tell you what is happening here. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his cabinet devised a policy. On several occasions, I believe, they called the leaders of various parties into the office and indicated to them what they were doing, but they did not seek the advice of the opposition parties in this House. I say that in a national crisis of this nature there should be no party politics in Canada. We should have a national policy and a program laid down, not by one party but by all parties collectively. What worries me is that if this crisis is as serious as the members on the Treasury bench tell us it is, and the government has indicated that this is so by taking the unprecedented step in peacetime of invoking the War Measures Act, then the leaders of the opposition parties should have been brought into the picture to help advise on a policy that would be accepted from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

I am apprehensive that if a major international crisis took place tomorrow that the same type of treatment might be accorded the opposition parties by the government. If it did, I would say that this is not the sign of good leadership and it is not the sign that we have a statesman in control of the government of Canada. This is where I fault the government.

We are not given all the facts. Cabinet ministers have hinted that there is other evidence which members of this House have not received. I want to tell them that it is about time they learned to give to all members in the House, including the members of the opposition, all the facts, regardless of the consequences. We too should sit down and assess the picture with all the facts at our command and, I hope, in an impartial manner. It has been this aspect that has worried me more than anything as I heard the speeches from members on the government benches and on the opposition side. If there is a crisis—as I believe there is although I do not know whether it is national in scope—then surely we are part of the democratic process and just as proud to uphold democracy in this country as are the members of any other party.

I would like to say just a few words more. We have had lots of material written in the newspapers about the FLQ which has been outlawed. A number of members of that organization were rounded up in a surprise move which started early yesterday. I have here a report from the Ottawa *Journal* which, I believe, must have been a reprint from the Montreal *Gazette*. It is rather surprising to find that a confidential RCMP report which the *Gazette* apparently obtained this past Thursday says there are 22 active cells of the terrorist Front de Libération du Québec in the province, with a total membership of 130 persons. The newspaper says that the report estimates the FLQ has another 2,000 members not actively engaged in the work being carried out by the cells. Then, the story goes on to say that there are 130 activists in Montreal or in Quebec, and this covers the whole of the province. We are told that ostensibly the War Measures Act is needed to corral 130 active members of the FLQ who are known to the RCMP.

I realize the need for giving additional powers to the police to deal with the bombings and the blastings which must be stopped. We must give them the power to curb these terrorists. But if this is the extent of the activists in the cities of Montreal and in Quebec, it seems to me that perhaps clamping the War Measures Act on the whole of Canada was a move that might well have received second thought from the government. I am not trying to underestimate the damage that these people can do. I am not for one second trying to tell anyone that there is not a real problem in the province of Quebec, because there is. Whether it is the municipal, provincial or the federal government that is threatened, we must move and not hesitate to move quickly to make certain that democracy remains alive in this nation.

The thing that worries me is that I see several other groups mentioned in this report, and this is information which I do not have. In this apparently confidential RCMP report there is mention of the members of the Jewish Defence League, and a group known as the Student Anti-Pollutionists. I do not have information on these groups. I think the government should level with the members of the House of Commons. Are the members of these other organizations also classed as terrorists in this crisis? I think all members of the House would like to have an answer to this, and frankly I feel that we have a right to know.

I am not going to say much more but there are one or two more points I would like to make. I have watched and read in the last two days the results of the moves which the government has made. I have been astonished and upset to see that perhaps we made the wrong move; perhaps we should have taken a little more time to assess the results of what might have come out of the invocation of the War Measures Act.

When I see headlines in the paper to the effect that the statement of the FLQ aims is being cheered by 3,000 students, and I hear reports on the radio of rallies in many parts of Quebec and other provinces of students and others who are protesting, not only the move against the FLQ but the invocation of the War Measures Act; it upsets me immensely. I am led to wonder how wise has been the advice to the politicians who drafted the moves

and brought about the situation in which we currently find ourselves.

• (8:30 p.m.)

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I think we all learn lessons from history. I know I have learned a lot this last two or three days. There is no use ducking our heads in the sand and saying the crisis in Quebec does not stem from some of the social ills in that province. I am not going to stand here and blame this government for specific troubles which we have had, for example in Montreal, but I am going to tell you that politicians of all stripes down through the years have neglected the basic social reform problems that must be corrected.

You can say what you like, discontent can fester and fester over the years, based on bad housing, based on unemployment, based on a host of other social ills. We have to do something about correcting what I think is one of the basic problems not only in this country but in every country in the world. We must face up to this, and as elected members of this House we have to do a lot more thinking and decide to mend our ways.

In closing, I say that the War Measures Act is in effect. There is nothing I can do at the present time to stop its use. But I say to the government: you have talked about bringing in legislation which will take care of the situation, and which will give you an opportunity to withdraw the War Measures Act and carry on under that other legislation. I urge the government to do this with the utmost speed. Do not let us allow the War Measures Act to remain in force in this country in peacetime one day longer than is necessary. As one who really believes in civil liberties it hurts me to see us forced into this situation. The surprise element is over. If that is what you wanted with the War Measures Act you have had it. Let us get on with the job this coming Monday of removing the War Measures Act from current enforcement in this nation.

Mr. Joseph-Philippe Guay (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, instead of doing as many of the other hon. members of the House have done, that is expressing a personal opinion—

[*Translation*]

—I thought that it might be advisable to get in touch with the people in my riding and ask them for their opinion. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I have received several telephone calls from people who gave me their opinion. All those people support the position taken by the government to settle the problem before it spreads elsewhere in Canada. The necessary measures have to be taken so that innocent people will not fall victims of criminals.

French-speaking Manitobans as well as all other Manitobans, particularly those of my constituency, are aware of the problems and fair claims of Quebecers.

However, we believe that FLQ extremists do not represent the interests of Quebecers, only their own. They are nothing but revolutionaries, trained in Maoist and Castrist camps.

We hope that Quebecers will rectify a situation that could reflect on the province of Quebec as well as on the rest of Canada.

Canadians and especially Quebecers wish to help the government restore order, justice and civil rights by democratic means.

[*English*]

I was very pleased indeed, Mr. Speaker, when someone mentioned this afternoon the number of premiers of the various provinces who have supported the policy of the government. I am more than pleased that the Premier of Manitoba, even though he is not of the same political persuasion as mine, went on record positively, like other Manitobans, particularly those in my area, to the effect that he was in accord with the government policy.

We in Manitoba realize that these measures are drastic but we also realize that they are temporary. Perhaps this crisis will teach us a lesson and will awaken us to the problems of Quebec and of the nation as a whole. Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that the result of the crisis will be to bind us together even more, and create better understanding amongst Canadians.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, there is very little left that can be said on the merits of this subject.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Forrestall: I am pleased that the members on the government benches agree with that. Each of us in his own way is trying to interpret what has happened, not only for the benefit of his constituents but for his own benefit. We are in a bit of a dilemma; we are in a quandary. These are very bad times in Canada. It is an awful thing to have to say, Mr. Speaker, but I hope that they are bad enough to warrant the drastic action that has been taken. God help us if they are not. In that case, what we have done would be far worse than what we are told is happening now.

• (8.40 p.m.)

The people I represent in the Dartmouth area and along the eastern shore of Nova Scotia are as concerned as I am about what has happened. I hold no brief for the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) but I do not in any way question the legitimacy of his action. I am in no position to question the urgency of his action. On those two grounds I can only support him; I have no hesitation in saying that. Indeed, I am repeating what my leader has already said.

Any action deemed necessary to rid the country of the forces of evil at work in Quebec is justified. But it is only justified if the situation is as serious as we are led to believe. My greatest fear, apart from my fear for the lives of people in public life in Quebec, is that between

40 and 50 per cent of the people living in Canada have never before seen this law invoked and they may not know its import. I am talking about the War Measures Act; it has not been invoked since the last world war. I wonder how many of our young people are aware of the seriousness of that which has been done in the last few hours.

I am concerned for the well-being of the country and of all Canadians. I want to put a few questions on the record, in the hope that answers will be forthcoming. The first question is the one asked by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), who opened the debate on behalf of the opposition. It is this: Why are we not working right now on legislation to amend the Criminal Code of Canada? If, in the opinion of the government, amending the Criminal Code would not meet the situation in Quebec, why have we not been told this? If it would, why has not somebody told us that the law officers of the Crown are at work preparing the type of legislation the House and country demands in order to preserve freedom?

The Canadian people would like to have answers to these specific questions. I hope the Prime Minister or a member of the government will answer them at the earliest possible moment. I think we in the House and the country as a whole are entitled to answers. I think it is regrettable that the Prime Minister did not take into his confidence other privy councillors. I am referring to the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), former Prime Minister of this country, and former Prime Minister Pearson. He should also have taken into his confidence the Leader of the Opposition, the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Douglas) and the leader of the Créditistes (Mr. Caouette). These men are honourable Canadians. They ought to have been trusted with the essential details which were the basis for the government's invocation of the War Measures Act. If this had been done, there would not be any serious question in the country about the matter.

Everybody trusts the Prime Minister; I am sure of that. I am not reflecting on him in any way; indeed, he has my sympathy. His task in the last few hours has been onerous. I think it will become even more onerous as time goes on. I believe he could have removed a tremendous burden from his shoulders if he had taken one step—that of advising the leaders of the parties, in the fullest manner possible, of the specific details of the plan submitted by the director of the Quebec provincial police to Premier Bourassa, to the mayor and the executive of the city of Montreal and, through them, to the federal government. The details of that plan may well have convinced the leaders of the parties that there was complete justification for the government's action. As matters now stand, we do not know that there was complete justification. We can only assume there was.

I am very curious as to the time the government first considered the necessity or advisability, as a result of certain contingencies, of invoking the War Measures Act. As I asked before: Is anyone in the government now at work amending the Criminal Code along the lines that have been suggested or, if not along those lines, along lines determined by the government? I also wonder, as do thousands of students in Canada, what the civic authorities responsible for enforcing and administering the law intend to do with respect to students who support the FLQ? Are they to be taken to jail? I wonder whether this measure also applies to groups which may for one reason or another feed on the insipient venom of the FLQ.

Why is the government asking for this power for six months? Why not for one year or two years? Why not for one month, as suggested by the hon. member for Cumberland-Colchester North (Mr. Coates). Why should it not be for one week? All the Prime Minister has to do is stand in the House and say, "We want these powers for another week." Is it asking for six months because it means to inflict terror in the hearts of the terrorists? I suggest that that is already there.

I ask, too, Mr. Speaker: On what date did the Premier of Quebec first express concern to the government of Canada about the inadequacy of the existing law? Was that 11 days ago, 12 days ago or two months ago? Did the former Premier of Quebec communicate such concern? Did he voice such concern? I think the people of Canada are entitled to know. They have been asked to accept tremendous limitations to their freedom and they are prepared to accept this. Because they are so prepared, they are entitled to have answers to these questions.

I wonder how often the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) has in the last few days, weeks or months communicated to the office of the Prime Minister his concern about the situation in Quebec. It would be interesting to know how many communications have passed between the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister in the past 12 months on the deteriorating situation in the province of Quebec.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Apart from social gossip and casual meetings in the hallways, I wonder how many hon. members from the province of Quebec have explicitly said to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) that they are concerned about what is happening in their province. I wonder how many have gone to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). I think the people in the province of Quebec are entitled to know that. I have not heard too many of these members talk about this, except in a casual way. I would like to have this specific information. I want to support, as fully as I can, the Prime Minister of this country in any action he feels necessary to rid this country of terrorism.

I also wonder how many Canadians from the province of Quebec have written to the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice in the last 12 months to express their concern. How will we determine when the apprehended insurrection, real or imagined, comes to an end? Who will determine it? Will it be the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice, the Prime Minister of Quebec, the mayor and the executive committee of the city of Montreal or will it be done independently without consultation? We cannot assume the answers to these questions.

The people of Canada are entitled to know the procedure that will bring this situation to an end.

The conditions in the country that will require revoking this drastic step should be made absolutely clear to all Canadians. I am a little surprised that the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) did not do this. We are left to assume when the act will be revoked. I wonder whether the government has taken the opportunity in the last several hours to advise, in an official way, the premiers of the provinces who are members of the privy council of the background which led to the implementation of the War Measures Act and the regulations under it? If not, will they be advised? The sooner they are advised, the better. Even at this late date, the privy councillors should be fully advised of the reasons behind this step.

The people of Canada, as well as the press, are curious. They want to know if there have been any bomb threats or any bombs found in public buildings. How many people have had their lives threatened by the FLQ in the last 14 days, apart from the two about which we know and which hopefully are still alive and in their charge? When will charges be laid against the approximately 300 people who have been arrested since early yesterday morning? When will they be charged and what will the charge be? Who is working on the charge? What will the information contain that is laid against these people? Who is drafting it? Is the federal authority involved or is it purely a matter of provincial administration? Will all the charges be the same or will there be different charges? If this were not such a serious situation, one might be tempted to ask when construction will begin on the penitentiary that is going to house these people.

Has the government given any thought in the last 12 days to the tremendous costs that are involved? Will the defence purse strings be loosened prior to 1973? Are there contingency plans? Will the Department of National Defence plans suffer as a result of this situation? I am not suggesting they should not suffer if it is necessary to make a change. Will any program be curtailed because of the mounting costs resulting from what is happening today?

If this situation continues for any extended length of time, where will the financial assistance come from to meet the tremendous administration costs in the city of Montreal? When will we learn whether the terror in Quebec has clear international implications? One minister of the Crown has hinted at this in this House and on television, yet denies full information to the people of Canada. As a result of this, we can only expect the Canadian people to be concerned.

I do not suggest that the government is attempting to stir up the feelings of the Canadian people. I am sure this is not what was intended. However, this is what has been done. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) earlier today made very clear that there are international implications. If so, those who have the detailed knowledge should communicate to the people of Canada how extensive these implications are.

[Mr. Forrestall.]

I wish to reiterate my support of the Prime Minister and the government in any action to bring to a halt all the terrorist activity that exists today. These people are so cowardly they are really not worth talking about. There must be an end to the conditions that give rise to thoughts that lead men to react violently against their fellow man. If I am satisfied that the situation warrants the implementation of this drastic step, I will support it. However, I first want the answers to a few questions. As my leader stated, there might have been another way for the government to act. It is not enough to simply say this was not possible. If it was impossible, we should be told why. Answer some of these questions and I am sure the people of Canada will accept being deprived of certain of their freedoms for as long as is necessary to rid this country of the evil that exists in it.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): I should like to take part in this debate briefly this evening for two reasons; first, to indicate to this House and the people of Canada the very high level of support for the action which has been taken by the government in that part of Canada from which I come, the Province of Alberta. I have spent many hours on the telephone today, and before today, with respect to this matter and I think I can say, without reserve, that the action which has been taken by the government along with the explanations which have been given has the almost unanimous support of the people of Alberta in all political parties. I want to say that this support has come from good Canadian citizens of all political affiliations.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Olson: My other reason is to argue that there is at least a degree of misunderstanding which is being perpetuated with respect to the legal base for the kind of action the government is taking. I think it should be known to this House and to the country that all the people to whom I have talked in Alberta recognize the gravity of the situation. Indeed, they regard this as a national problem, not as a Quebec problem. I might say I do not believe the people of Alberta who are not as close to the scene where these acts of violence have taken place have the same level of fear, because they are not as closely exposed to it, so I think there is some difference between their understanding of the situation and that of the people who are living with it in Quebec.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Olson: But there is no difference in the views of the people of Alberta, nor indeed is there any difference in the underlying apprehension of the long term effects if the government had not taken action. I say this because the people from western Canada, and from Alberta in particular, realize that the kind of thing which has manifested itself in Quebec in the last few days is certainly not confined to Quebec. The people of Alberta are concerned lest it could be a condition which is contagious,

one might say, undermining the role of law and order in Canada.

Unusual steps have been taken not only by the Government of Canada but by the government of the United States in the last few days to deal with the kind of additional support which the police forces need in order to control acts of terrorism, bombings and that sort of thing. The people of Alberta are aware of this as well, so let there be no misunderstanding about the mood and the general support, as I said, the almost unanimous support, of people in other parts of Canada. They are concerned about this and they want the proper action to be taken. Not only that, but they regard the action which has been taken as being something which is more than a little distasteful to all of us, but necessary.

The other matter I wanted to talk about, and again very briefly, and I say this with a great deal of sincerity, is that there is some misunderstanding about what the War Measures Act is and the legal, consequential actions which must be taken to use the act in an emergency. What worries me is that there seems to be some feeling amongst some members, thankfully only a very few members of the opposition, that the government somehow is not acting on the instructions of Parliament. This is a very serious charge if there were one grain of truth in it, but there is not. I say that because the War Measures Act is in fact an act of this Parliament and the steps the government has taken to deal with this emergency are the exact measures which Parliament knew would have to be taken if a situation arose in Canada where it was necessary to use the War Measures Act.

Mr. Aiken: May I ask a question?

Mr. Olson: I shall be through in a few minutes. I will answer questions then. I say this because the War Measures Act was passed many years ago and it has been amended from time to time. The last time, as far as I can ascertain, was in 1960 when it was amended by the Progressive Conservative government of the day. Section six was repealed and another section was substituted. I have no complaint about that. I think it was a good amendment. The government has followed to the letter the provisions of that amendment. I commend both the people who made that amendment and the actions of the government today in complying with it.

Let us be clear about one thing and that is that the government of the day in 1960 not only amended the War Measures Act, but they must have been aware of all the provisions within that act when they amended it. At that time a special committee reviewed not only the War Measures Act but many other acts in an attempt to make the Bill of Rights consistent with those acts, and to take into account the need for meeting this situation. So, I say this argument that the government is doing something new which was not anticipated by Parliament when they passed and amended the War Measures Act is in my view simply a wrong argument which leaves a dangerously wrong impression with the Canadian public.

The War Measures Act reads, and I shall refer to it very briefly: "The issue of a proclamation by Her Majesty or under the authority of the Governor in Council shall be conclusive evidence that a state of war, invasion or insurrection, real or apprehended, exists." Every government, every Parliament knew that these were the conditions under which the government was charged with the responsibility of bringing in a proclamation and making regulations which would be necessary to give effect to the act.

If in a situation where insurrection is apprehended the government fails to use the tools which Parliament has charged it to use in that connection, the government would have been remiss in its duty and in carrying out its responsibility. But this is not what happened. The government did what Parliament expected it to do in that kind of situation. Surely, if the War Measures Act is not to be used, even in a limited form when there is an apprehended insurrection, what in the name of common sense did Parliament put it on the statute books for and leave it there through all these years?

In this emergency it is incumbent upon all of us to avoid partisanship, to be honest with the people of Canada and not try to tell them that the government did not act in accordance with the statutory provisions of Parliament. As far as an apprehended insurrection is concerned I do not want to repeat the argument which has been advanced, but it goes with the argument I am making now. Surely, if proof of that is not sufficient with the letter and advice from the Prime Minister of Quebec and the Mayor and Executive Council of the City of Montreal, where all these acts are taking place, then what is apprehended insurrection?

• (9:10 p.m.)

May I conclude by saying I believe those who argue that the government have taken an illegal or improper act, that in some way the government have violated the function of Parliament to make statutes, are not fooling the people one bit. In my view, since this measure was and is an act of Parliament and the act anticipated that the government should take certain action if the situation arose, then the government had to take the responsibility to act. Indeed, the government would have been remiss not to do what it did. In the situation we have today, the government has acted in accordance with the declared wishes of Parliament over a number of years.

Mr. Speaker: I believe the hon. member is rising for the purpose of asking a question.

Mr. Aiken: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the minister a question arising out of his statement that some hon. members appear to be questioning the legality of the government's action. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) made his position very clear at the beginning of the debate; he said he did not question in any way that the government had the legal right to take this action. I have been here for most of the debate, but not all, and I have not heard that suggestion made. I wonder whether the minister could enlighten us as to the sources from which this seems to have come.

Mr. Olson: I would be very happy to do that, Mr. Speaker, and to do it very briefly. I was here when the Leader of the Opposition made his opening remarks. I was also here to listen to the remarks of the leaders of the other parties. I realize that the leader of the official opposition and the leader of the New Democratic Party did, in fact, say that at the outset of their speeches. But what concerns me is that in other parts of their speeches, in the press and in radio and T.V. broadcasts that they have made since, they have attempted—I think this is a fair statement—to lead the Canadian people to believe that this action should have taken a different form; that the government should have come to Parliament to get the authority that the police needed to do this job.

What I am suggesting is that Parliament some time ago made a decision as to what it expected the government to do in this kind of situation.

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I am not an expert on hair-splitting and I am not going to argue the legal points.

An hon. Member: You are a lawyer.

Mr. Bigg: Yes, I am a trained lawyer. But I am also a citizen of Canada, and I am putting the welfare of Canada ahead of my own personal and political career. I, therefore, beg the indulgence of the House for a moment while I give my personal views of this matter. My views may or may not agree with my party's views. They may or may not agree with the views of other members of the House.

Having reached the ripe age of 58, I have gained some experience as a result of dedicating most of my active years to the interests of Canada under other people's orders, largely the orders of a Liberal government, and of doing what I was told on the beat. I want to give the House my impressions from, you might say, a retired policeman's point of view. It may be worthwhile because I think I am the only ex-member of the Mounted Police who presently holds a seat in the House.

The present emergency is essentially a job for the police on a very wide scale. I should like the members of the House to remember that the problem in Quebec is not a local problem but a global one. If we look upon it as any less I do not think we can keep it in perspective. It has been said by those in much closer touch with the basic facts than I that these people who are now active in Quebec in murder, arson, bombing and blackmail are not representative of any large segment of the population, but that they get their spiritual leadership, if I may use that word, from an international movement of gangsterism which seeks no less than the tearing up of our western civilization and way of life.

If I wanted to be partisan, I could point my finger at people who in the past have been more or less carried away by no doubt very well meaning ideologies of one form or another. Some people call them fellow travellers, though perhaps I would not go that far. Because of their awareness of inequalities at home, inequalities in regard perhaps to race, colour or creed, they have from time to time written inflammatory literature. It is not long ago that a very large majority in this House censured this sort of thing.

I am not going to take very much time this evening, but I do want to remind hon. members how dangerous it is to be inflammatory, to encourage racial, religious and other ideological passions to the point where people who mean well but blind themselves with what they call patriotism lead us on the road to anarchy and war. This has happened in Quebec. This is what has caused the wave of revolution to hit the shores of this country. I should like to believe that this wave has come entirely from the outside, but unfortunately I know it has affected some of our own people. No words of mine are going to add to the rifts which might come between one Canadian and another. Therefore, I find myself, perhaps foolishly, aligned without equivocation on the side of law and order.

Hon. members can blame me if they like for saying that. After all, they may say, he is a poor, old, tired policeman who did not think for himself, and it does not sound as though he is thinking for himself now. But that is not quite the case. As someone has remarked, I have dabbled in the law. I think I understand some of the legal ramifications of this measure, but I am not going to worry about those. I want to know what we should do faced with this very serious situation.

I should have liked to have the government ask me for advice, but they did not. I should have liked them to ask the advice of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) and a former Prime Minister of the country, the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker). I would like them to have asked the advice at least of two former premiers of our great provinces who are here and are available. What is the use of calling names at a time like this, when the situation requires the full co-operation of every loyal Canadian?

• (9:20 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bigg: I shall try to put forward in my own way a three-point program that we can now follow. The milk has been spilled and an effort has been made to bell the cat that spilled the milk. What can we do now? We have to close ranks. The War Measures Act has been invoked, so I am not now delaying the passage of any important bill. I am here to make a short, positive contribution in the shortest space of time possible. I intend to suggest three steps to which I think no Canadian could object.

Although the War Measures Act has been invoked, I think it is distasteful to Canadian people regardless of the fact that it must be used at the present time. It is time for those on the treasury benches to put aside any false pride they may have and admit that they did not hold the consultations for many reasons. The government is facing a situation which is so grave that it needs consultation with and the support and friendship of every hon. member in this House, particularly

experienced members who have had the responsibility of power and have not in the past abused that power to any great extent. These men can be trusted by every Canadian. These men could sit with the government, behind closed doors if necessary, and give the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) the benefit of the experience and wisdom they have gained over the years.

I suggest that a committee of this House be struck, composed of all Privy Councillors. That committee should sit as the custodian of our freedom and should ensure that the War Measures Act is used effectively, without abuse in fact or in spirit. It is not good enough that justice be done. The people of Canada should, and have the right to know that it is being done, how it is being done and when it is being done, so long as this knowledge does not prejudice the security of Canada. I am prepared to support the appointment of such a committee for this limited purpose. This is not a partisan problem. I do not intend moving a motion, but I should like every member of the House to think about my suggestion. Perhaps we should extend to Mr. Caouette the right to sit on that committee because he is the leader of a very large section of the population although his party does not have many members in this House. We would then have Mr. Flemming, a former Premier of New Brunswick—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I hesitate to interupt the hon. member when he is making such an interesting speech, but I am wondering whether he might not identify members by their constituencies. I think this is a very valuable practice, and I would not think it is in order to make exceptions even for the commendable valid purpose the hon. member has in mind.

Mr. Bigg: I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry that my memory is not good enough to remember all the members by their constituencies. I will leave it at that: the members of the privy council are well known to the House and hon. members will realize who I mean. If this suggestion is adopted there will be no difficulty in identifying those persons whom I suggest be appointed to such a committee of the House.

My second suggestion is perhaps minor if the first one is adopted. The War Measures Act has been put into effect until the end of April, 1971. Perhaps it should be reconsidered by the government and by this House month by month so that the people of Canada would know whether we, their elected representatives, are in favour of everything that is being done. I am sure the government will have the unanimous support of the House as long as the committee I suggested is operating as a committee of surveillance in respect of our rights and freedoms.

My third suggestion is that instead of just talking, we should take active steps to see that the security of Canada is enhanced internationally, nationally and locally. By that I mean we should take a very good look at our foreign policy and our immigration policy. We should also take a good look at our commitments to NATO. These three matters are tied in with external security, without which internal security is a joke.

We should as soon as possible call upon all the young men in Canada, and in some cases anyone under the age of 70 who is physically fit and wants to serve the country in whatever way he is needed. They might be invited to volunteer for service during emergencies such as the one which now exists. Members like myself who are veterans of the mounted police could make themselves available on very short notice for point duty. If they are too old to go out on the beat, ride a motorcycle or bear arms, they could relieve the more active young members for that kind of work while they handle the keys to the cells and perform administrative functions of one sort or another. We should also take a good look at the manpower situation in our armed forces. It has taken a shock like this—a kind of baby Pearl Harbour, if you like—to remind us that we are probably incapable of defending Anticosti Island, let alone the largest coastline in the world and about 3,500 miles of border.

If we are to accomplish these things there must be no talk of partisanship. We must accept the responsibility of dealing with this little spot-fire in Quebec and seeing that it is put out. Anyone who has ever fought a fire, particularly in dry bush, knows how dangerous a spot-fire can be. Only by putting out little spot-fires can you avoid losing a whole territory. We can act firmly now. Nothing will frighten the enemies of Canada more than the knowledge that 265 members of this House put their lives, property and loyalty 100 per cent behind the government.

If the government want this kind of co-operation and loyalty—and I am sure they do—they too must drop any suggestion of partisanship. If we call this non-partisan committee together, it will be seized with the responsibility of securing our borders and securing peace and good will within the country. It will be responsible for making sure the people of Canada not only have this security but know that they have it, how they get it and why they are getting it.

This motion is not spelled out in black and white. I wish I could vote for it in its entirety, but I have reservations. I should like the government to at least consider these three suggestions. If they undertook to consider them, I could perhaps in some way accept the War Measures Act. When there are loopholes in respect of these very great and unnatural powers in peacetime, it is our duty to adopt whatever safeguards we can.

• (9:30 p.m.)

It is not in the nature of politics to pat your political opponents on the back. It is our job to criticize. In spite of the fact that tempers perhaps have flared a little, I think this debate so far has been mostly constructive. Members in this House with whom I have not agreed on other matters throughout the years have stood up and, I am proud to say, have put to one side their personal views concerning how Canada can best be run within our democratic framework. I detect a great unanimity about the fact that we want to restore law and order in our

country. I hope the government will lean over backwards, as I hope I shall do, to see that from now on the FLQ will have 265 enemies, not people who are obviously their enemies but people who are forced into this position. I, for one, will go a long way with the government, with my own party and with other members of this House to see that law in Canada is restored to normal.

Mr. Ray Perrault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): Mr. speaker, at the outset I wish to commend my good friend the hon. member representing Pembina (Mr. Bigg) for a very constructive and positive contribution to this debate. I believe he deserves the commendation of all of us. He has expressed very well the feeling of all members of all parties in this House that, while we may differ in our approach to what is a very serious problem, we are all deeply committed to keeping Canada united and to fighting as diligently as is possible threats to national unity by any forces which would destroy this country.

I have had the honour of serving in the opposition in another House. It is not an easy task to be in opposition. An opposition has a responsibility to set forth a diversity of opinion on the range of issues which may exist in the country. I believe the views of an opposition should be considered, listened to and pondered well. I espouse, the cause of a strong opposition because that is the only way to keep our parliamentary system strong.

In this debate in the past two days, we have listened with interest to a great many valuable opposition speeches. There has been vigorous opposition here to some of the remarks made from the other side of the House. Some members there have expressed serious concern about certain aspects of the War Measures Act. If we are a responsible government on this side, we will do our best to allay those fears which, in some cases at least, may appear to have partial basis in fact. I agree with my hon. friend across the way in opposition who just spoke when he suggested that perhaps we should attempt to gather together as much unanimity of opinion as possible in the House. It seems to me the most damaging blow to the FLQ, and to other groups seeking to destroy Canada, would be an opinion from this House that we disapprove of what they are attempting to do and condemn them with one voice.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Perrault: If in order to achieve that degree of unanimity it may be necessary for certain assurances to be provided from the government side to our friends in opposition, then I think we should provide them. I did not hesitate, when I was in opposition, to suggest that there should be more consultation particularly on important matters among the leaders of the parties in the House. On the rare occasion when it was done in my previous forum of activity, I believe the people benefited by the sharing of knowledge among the party leaders. In matters relating to the security of the state it is not possible, of course, to open every file and dossier. My friend who was formerly a member of the RCMP I believe realizes this. All security files cannot be opened to a wide range of people. But in so far as it is possible I hope the government does share with the other party leaders as much information as possible about the nature and the extent of the challenge facing Canada at this hour.

In the sort of oratorical snowstorm which has taken place in the past two days, perhaps some members on that side have overlooked some relevant facts. Many have said in this debate that the action of the government is unnecessary. They have said that we are guilty of over-kill. But really, in the final analyses, how is the urgency of a situation to be determined? When we are told by the leader of one of the major provinces in Canada that after consultation with authorities directly responsible for the administration of justice the Quebec government is convinced that the law as it stands now is inadequate to meet the situation satisfactorily, when a communiqué of that kind is received by the federal government and immediate action is requested, and when the mayor of the largest city in Canada, a great disciple of Canadian unity, suggests as he did that society is being threatened by seditious action—

Mr. Alkenbrack: He told you that a year and a half ago.

Mr. Perrault: When such information is communicated urgently to the government of Canada, that government must act immediately in the manner requested by those other levels of government. When the head of the police department of the city of Montreal states, as recorded at page 245 of *Hansard*, the following,

> An extremely dangerous subversive organization has gradually developed in Quebec over the last several years with a view to preparing the overthrow of the legitimate government by seditious means and eventually armed insurrection.

no government, Conservative, Liberal, NDP, Social Credit or anything else can remain supine and silent. The government must act and it must fully seize the only legislative weapon, the only statutory piece of machinery available to it, to act in the immediate fashion that these governments crying out for action demand.

The Prime Minister certainly did not defend the War Measures Act as being a perfect piece of legislation. I hope some members will re-read his statements. He said that the measure was too wide-ranging. It should be repeated that the regulations which have been proclaimed permit the exercise of only a limited number of provisions under the act. As well, the Prime Minister, as recorded at page 194 of *Hansard*, said:

> —I wish to make it clear today that the government regards the use of the War Measures Act as only an interim and . . . somewhat unsatisfactory measure.

And in all the oratory we have heard during the past few days, I wonder whether the members of the opposition parties have ignored the request made by the Prime Minister to them. He said this:

> —it is my firm intention to discuss with the leaders of the opposition parties the desirability of introducing legislation of a less comprehensive nature. In this respect I earnestly solicit

from the leaders and from all members constructive suggestions for the amendment of the regulations. Such suggestions will be given careful consideration for possible inclusion in any new statute.

Yet, you know, some members of the opposition have portrayed the Prime Minister of this country as a despot who has been plotting for years to seize power. It is not worthy of any Member of Parliament to make such a charge. Since this crisis arose how much time has been spent by the opposition sitting down in caucus drafting the proposals they believe should be enshrined in the alternative legislation to come before the House to meet this emergency? How much time has the opposition spent? The government is working on it. I guarantee that.

• (9:40 p.m.)

Mr. Forrestall: You are the first person to admit it.

Mr. Perrault: And let me say to you that the offer the Prime Minister made on October 16 is a sincere offer to the opposition to join in the kind of all party unity referred to so eloquently by my friend, the hon. member for Pembina.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Perrault: The question arises: when is the draft of your proposal going to be received by this side of the House? When are the eloquent members of the NDP going to send over their views?

Mr. Peters: As soon as they get back from Saskatchewan.

Mr. Perrault: When will the members of the opposition send in their proposals? The Prime Minister said here he wants to meet the leaders of all parties to discuss legislation. Are you ready to meet?

An hon. Member: Of course, we are ready to meet.

Mr. Perrault: Let there be no baseless charges bandied around the House that the Prime Minister has refused to consult and to meet the opposition. The members of the opposition know very well that prior to the proclamation of the limited powers which are in effect under the War Measures Act, all party leaders were informed about this pending action. Indeed, consultations were held with the former prime minister of this country. Is this the action of a Prime Minister dedicated to a new type of dictatorial rule in Canada? Had there been more consultations when the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) was prime minister, Canada might be in a better condition today.

An hon. Member: Even in his own party.

Mr. Perrault: Yes, even with his own party.

Mr. Forrestall: Stop preaching about unity out of one side of your mouth.

Mr. Perrault: I say that the statements by the Prime Minister earnestly soliciting all party co-operation, and the ideas of other parties, have been advanced in all sincerity. I hope that his invitation is accepted by the Opposition.

There has been a suggestion that there should be a greater sharing of information. At these sessions, which hopefully will take place with respect to a measure to replace the War Measures Act—and I hope as quickly as possible—this exchange of additional information can take place.

I think that the events of the past two days point to a serious deficiency in the Criminal Code of Canada. It has been said in this debate that the government has been aware of a growing danger in the province of Quebec in recent years. The government has been accused of failing to act. Yet, within its ambit of responsibility and power, the government certainly has acted. There have been intensive RCMP activities in the province of Quebec, as hon. members are aware, but, tragically, the enforcement of the Criminal Code, including the section relating to sedition, rests at present with provincial attorneys general. The responsibility for the administration of justice as presently defined in the Criminal Code lies with provincial attorneys general. It may be that all of us can be critical of the failure of the attorneys general in the province of Quebec to act more vigorously. In this regard, I believe that the federal government must be invested with power, through amendments to the Criminal Code, to deal with national crimes such as sedition and treason.

Surely, we have learned our lesson after watching a major situation develop over recent days. Organized crime is operating on such a vast scale, it has become so mobile and so sophisticated in its perverse way, that the Attorney General (Mr. Turner) should be invested with power to act beyond that which he possesses at the present time.

It is not my intention to prolong this debate. Many speeches have been made and all of the ground has been covered. I suggest to members of the House that at this time a demonstration of solidarity, and of agreement, would be the most positive sign possible of the fact that despite our political differences we want Canada to remain free and strong, that none of us will tolerate sedition and anarchy in our midst. If additional assurances can be given by the government that new legislation is being prepared and will be introduced shortly, and that the War Measures Act will be withdrawn as soon as that measure has been dealt with, and if we can have more sharing of information with the opposition with fair consideration given to their proposals—and we have heard some good ideas in the past two days—perhaps we can achieve that level of unity which is so desirable at this time. A united Parliament will demonstrate to the people of Canada that when the fate of the nation is at stake we will not permit partisan politics to dominate our activities in this House. Let us demonstrate the same kind of solidarity on this issue that the provincial governments of Canada, regardless of political stripe, have demonstrated in support of the federal action. Almost without exception they have said "yes, it is an undesirable situation but the action is necessary. We, too, would welcome an alternative to the War Measures Act,

but we support the necessary decision of the federal government". We should strive to speak with one voice on Monday. We should say "No" to those who would destroy Canada.

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I will say at the moment that I will be brief. However, I want to express a few words in support of the amendment now before the House. I am in agreement with the War Measures Act being invoked, but with the restriction that it be invoked for a short period up to the end of this month, October 31, and with the understanding that at that time it be replaced by less comprehensive legislation which will take care of the situation that exists in Quebec. I do not think there is anybody in the House that would not vote for that. The only thing between the government and us in that amendment is the time factor. The motion before us sets the time limit at April, 1971. We say that is too long. All we are asking the government to do is to change course a little and narrow the time. We will then all be in agreement and could speak with one voice, as the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault) has just asked us to do.

As a member of this chamber I never thought I would find myself in the position of having to debate the War Measures Act in peacetime in this House. I have always felt, living in a democratic society, that we would have the necessary goodwill and the judgment to help us to resolve the problems as they occurred in our country. However, we are faced with this situation, and I can assure hon. members that we cannot deal with it perfunctorily.

• (9:50 p.m.)

How are we to vote on this motion and on the amendment to it? We find that peace, order and good government seem to be only a cliche now. We have arrived at a rare juncture in the history of Canada. We have had to declare a state of war in time of peace. Suddenly, we realize that all the freedoms we have enjoyed have been taken away. We find now that the Prime Minister comes to the House of Commons in a bullet-proof car; there are troops on Parliament Hill, troops around the capital; the largest city in Canada, Montreal, is under the control of troops and the police force, and the two year old son of the Minister of Justice of Canada is playing in the backyard under the shadow of a submachine gun to protect him. This is the situation in which we find ourselves in Canada today. It is a sorry state of affairs. I feel badly that I even have to speak about it.

In retrospect, Mr. Speaker, the government has failed us badly. It has allowed certain things to continue, things it knew about and had been told about. I do not propose to take up the time of the House reiterating all the things that have been so eloquently discussed previously. The right hon. member for Prince Albert, a former prime minister, brought many things very forcibly to our attention yesterday. However, there are one or two other aspects that have been overlooked and that I wish to bring to the attention of the House.

First, I want to talk about the Company of Young Canadians. This house approved a budget of approximately $2 million for the operations of the Company of Young Canadians. On November 27, 1969, after about two years of operation and after the matter had been brought to the attention of the government by the opposition and other people, a committee called for an investigation of this Company of Young Canadians. Mr. Lucien Saulnier, chairman of the executive committee of Montreal, and Montreal Mayor Drapeau appeared before the Committee. What did they tell that committee? I would like to put on the record one or two things. I reiterate that this was last fall, in 1969. Mr. Saulnier said:

> We know that in Canada individuals and groups are working actively to implement a plan which will carry the destruction of freedom, of our form of democratic government and, in this plan, the people's will, as expressed in the ballot box, is excluded.

He went on to list a number of things that he had noticed, and then said:

> We also found on the premises officially occupied by the Company of Young Canadians and paid for by the Canadian taxpayers, newspapers and pamphlets showing how to fabricate Molotov cocktails, paint bombs, flasks and vials devised to disrupt police work in the maintenance of public order.

These are the things he brought to the attention of the committee. He also said that these were:

> —things I know and of which I have privately informed the Prime Minister of Canada a few times in the past year.

That means he privately told the Prime Minister in 1968 what was happening in Montreal, and the great dangers involved. What was done? The only thing that happened was the Company of Young Canadians was revamped and a new person put in charge. However, it was allowed to continue in existence. It was not scrapped. It was allowed to continue even after the very devastating observations which I have just brought to the attention of the House.

I also wish to mention the Algerians who came to Canada. In April, 1964, in this House the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) asked several questions about the Algerian people who were allowed to come to Canada. He was told there were 114 of them. I think the House realizes what troubles and problems they have caused in Canada. On July 31, 1964, I was speaking in this House on interim supply, dealing with the budget of the Immigration Department. At that time I brought this matter to the attention of the late Hon. René Tremblay when I said:

> There is another matter which is, I think, of interest, and it concerns the proposed immigration to Canada of a large number of farmers of European descent who were formerly farming in Algeria . . . these people had a reputation which was not of the best.

That was written up in all the newspapers but still we allowed them to come into Canada. Look at the trouble they caused. What about Hal Banks? We had quite an interesting debate with the late minister of immigration of that day who allowed Hal Banks to come here and cause all the trouble on the St. Lawrence Seaway.

What about these draft dodgers we have been allowing to come into our country? I am sure they have not contributed anything to our country or to the peace, order and good government of Canada.

Let us consider the training of the red militants who have been allowed to get into the United States by way of Canada. These people come up here as so-called sugar harvesters. They cannot come directly from Cuba to the United States and so they come by way of Canada. Why should we make it possible for these people to use Canada as a stepping-stone, and to sow their seeds of discontent?

What about the Canada Council? Reading the Ottawa *Citizen* tonight, I noticed that one of those arrested in Montreal was Stanley Gray. The Canada Council, under the direction of the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier), offered a grant to this man of $5,500. I received many letters about it at the time.

To review the matter, the Canada Council was launched in 1957 by the St. Laurent government. The first chairman was Mr. Brooke Claxton, a very respected Liberal politician. Its purpose was to promote the arts and the humanities. One hundred million dollars was provided for its principal funding, and it has been subsidized each year. Last year the government gave $20 million to it. I repeat that the Canada Council offered a grant to Stanley Gray who was arrested yesterday in Montreal. I wrote to the minister about this and received a two-page letter from him under date of May 12, 1969, from which I wish to quote one paragraph:

> Another point had to be discussed by the Council and that was whether there was evidence that Mr. Gray's non-scholastic activities reduced or would reduce his scholarity performance or could in any way put into question his qualifications as a scholar. The Council decided that in this case, Mr. Gray's scholastic qualifications were not in question.

No, they were not in question, but his other subversive activities were certainly in question. The Canada Council did not look into that aspect of things and so offered him the money. Perhaps the director of the Council would not have had to prepare a statement to justify the award to Stanley Gray if all the other implications had been considered instead of just the scholastic aspects. These are some of the things that have been happening.

I would have thought the Prime Minister could have performed his duties much better as the head of this country, if he had remained at home and looked after some of the things that were happening in this country about which he had been told over two years ago. He was told what was happening, yet he found time to fly all over the world and let things slip at home. Now, the government that was in office while these conditions were developing must be prepared to answer for the condition in which the country finds itself today. I said I would be brief, Mr. Speaker, and so I must hurry on. Now, we find that the government has gone all out, in fact, it has gone overboard and brought in the War Measures Act.

Invoking of War Measures Act

• (10:00 p.m.)

I was pleased to note that in the Prime Minister's opening remarks he said, as reported at page 194 of *Hansard* for October 16:

> Following the passage of enough time to give the government the necessary experience to assess the type of statute which may be required in these circumstances, it is my firm intention to discuss with the leaders of the opposition parties the desirability of introducing legislation of a less comprehensive nature.

The Prime Minister says he wants to do this. All our amendment asks is that he do this by the end of this month. The government has gone overboard and brought forward a measure giving it almost unlimited power. I put myself in the shoes of my good friends who live in the province of Quebec. I know how I would feel if my wife and family were in the danger that exists there. I daresay that under those conditions I would think the War Measures Act was not a bit too severe.

When we are told that there are 3,000 members of the FLQ and that they have 2,000 pounds of dynamite and can set it off with methods that are difficult to discover, and when we are told how those people operate with a code system, and so on, it is not hard for me to realize how concerned people must be in the province of Quebec generally and in Montreal particularly. Mr. Speaker, I do not think too much will be cured by this measure. I do not think the trouble in Quebec, or in all Canada for that matter, will be remedied by crushing the FLQ. These troubles can only be resolved if we transform the lives of alienated Canadians whether they be in Montreal or in any other part of Canada. The best way to deal with people who feel they have nothing to lose is to give them something to conserve. I think we have conserved much in this great country of ours. We have tried and tested values which have been handed down to us over 2,000 years and have stood the test of time pretty well. We have conserved many principles and ideals which must be looked at and used again.

In conclusion I say this. The fact that this action has been taken at the request of the Premier of Quebec and the mayor of Montreal cannot be overlooked and overemphasized. The mayor of Montreal, in the letter which the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault) read, said that an extremely dangerous, subversive organization has gradually developed in Quebec over the last several years. There is nothing new about the situation that developed and which required the government to invoke the War Measures Act at four o'clock yesterday morning.

Secondly, I agree that action had to be taken and I also agree that the action ought to have been taken sooner. I think we all realize that the action ought to have been taken sooner. My concern is that the government has overreacted. I am glad to know that the Prime Minister has said emphatically that he will revoke this legislation and replace it with less comprehensive legislation. I am, therefore, prepared if necessary to give up a little of my freedom for a short period of time in order to preserve

democracy for the whole country and, hopefully, to save Quebec.

This morning's edition of the *Globe and Mail* carried an editorial which read in part as follows:

> Mr. Trudeau has said that this is his intention, that he recognizes that 'the act is much broader than is required in the present situation', that he will be working to produce 'legislation of a less comprehensive nature'. He has asked the leaders of the opposition, and all members of the House, to make constructive suggestions for new legislation.
>
> We make one now. Limit the legislation to what is needed, yes; but make it no easier for a government to impose or maintain. Keep it a shocking thing, which no government can impose without a drama that penetrates all and frightens all.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Ouellet (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the words spoken by the hon. members from both sides of the House who since yesterday have addressed this House on the important motion submitted by the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to invoke the War Measures Act.

In my capacity as member for one of our Montreal constituencies, in my own right as a Quebecer anxious to assure the security and welfare of the citizens of this province and as a Canadian proud of this country and wishing that it remain unified and flourishing, I want to thank all the members in this House who rose in favour of the prime minister's motion.

Those of us who live in the province of Quebec and who have lived through the events of these last few days, those of us who took trouble to enquire about the situation, know very well that the government's decision was neither untimely nor exaggerated.

Let us recall all the events. First there were the kidnappings, then the threats to life and private property. There were FLQ communiqués of an inflammatory and seditious nature. There was a systematic use of the communication media by these criminals. For a long period of time already there had been bombings, thefts of dynamite and acts of violence of every kind.

Was it necessary to wait for the heart of Montreal to blow up with dynamite? Was it necessary to wait for selective assassination before taking action? I think the government proceeded wisely and I am sure that most Canadians agree with this decision.

After listening to a large number of conservative members, I realize that, on final analysis, this party did not, still does not realize what is going on in Quebec. We are told about the activities of the Company of Young Canadians a few years ago. We are told about subversive elements in the CBC. We are told about some scholarships granted several months or even several years ago to individuals who have become revolutionaries.

I think that the important point now is not what has taken place a year or two ago, but the events of the last ten days. In this regard, I find that the Progressive Conservative party, through its spokesmen in the House, displaces in an odd way the subject of this debate.

• (10:10 p.m.)

Many of those who spoke have indeed seemed to me to ignore the facts completely. They would have been better to ask their colleagues from Quebec, in particular the member for Charlevoix (Mr. Asselin), or again, the member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle), because really, with the attitude taken in the House by the Progressive Conservative party and its leader, I am certain that this party will never have more than three or four Quebec representatives in Ottawa.

I would have thought however, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Ricard), who spoke to-night, would have shown himself up to the situation.

Not only did he deal a particularly dirty blow at the Minister of Reginal Economic Expansion, but he did not even want to say whether or not he supported the war measures taken by the government to protect the population. His tirade against the minister was totally uncalled for, since the minister is one of the great champions of the citizens' rights in general, and especially of the workers and of underprivileged people in Canada. I think that the work he is doing within his department to eliminate regional disparities should cause admiration and should be commended by all members.

The member for Saint-Hyacinthe has left the House even though he said he would remain here to listen to all the speeches the members would make. Before leaving he had urged the Liberal members from Quebec to voice their opinion. His leaving the House rather gives me the impression that he was here not to hear members' speeches, but just to wait for an opportunity to take the floor. I deeply regret his absence, as I would have asked him some questions. I want to refer to the part of his speech where he spoke of the editorial published in this morning's Montreal paper *Le Devoir*, outlining certain views expressed by editorialist Claude Ryan.

I would specially refer to a paragraph of that editorial which the member for Saint-Hyacinthe carefully refrained from mentioning and which reads as follows:

> Going back on former impulse, Mr. Bourassa, all things considered, chose to resort to the authority of Ottawa. By his voluntary request for implementation of the War Measures Act, the premier accepted the principle of subordinating his government to that of Mr. Trudeau. He thus sanctioned, in the eyes of the rest of the country, an old recollection according to which Ottawa is the seat of the true national government and Quebec, finally, a province a little more turbulent than the others.

I should like to know if the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe endorses those words. It is often said that words exceed one's thoughts. I am really wondering if Mr. Ryan, in his writings, has not exceeded not only his own thought, but what he really hopes for, what he has been concealing for a number of months, his real thought on Canadian politics and the true place that Quebec should have both in Canada and abroad.

When I hear an editorial writer from Montreal say such things, I find that he is going too far. We are living in a country called Canada, under a Canadian govern-

ment, and I do not believe Mr. Ryan is right when he says that the events happening in Montreal come exclusively under the jurisdiction of the provincial government.

In my opinion, what he said in his editorial ties in quite well with the remarks made recently in Montreal by the leader of the Parti Québécois, Mr. René Lévesque, who spoke of the federal government as of a foreign government. This is very unfortunate from an editorial writer such as Mr. Ryan who enjoyed, however, the admiration of many people.

I am under the impression that during the last few months, following a series of lead articles more or less well thought out and, in particular, after this article, he is much less popular not only in the province of Quebec but elsewhere in Canada.

I think that the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe was much too vague in his remarks. Yet, his three Progressive Conservative colleagues from Quebec had said that they supported the position of the government and that they would vote for the motion. I am wondering if the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe will be here Monday to vote, and if he does not vote, I think that he will be shirking his duty.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this crisis does not only concern Quebec. Too many hon. members have seemed to look at what is happening in the province of Quebec as if it were strictly a Quebec matter. It is really a Canadian matter. It is not only a crisis affecting Quebec only but Canada as a whole.

Our country has changed in ten days. I would like tonight to express the wish that our present trials will make us grow up, will enable us, as Canadians, to tighten the bonds that tie us together and will teach us to co-operate in the best interests of the nation.

That is why I deeply regret the comments made in the House by certain members of the NDP. It is all very well to speak in the name of freedom. I do not believe that there is anyone here who is against individual liberties. Because of the NDP's weeping and wailing, I am tempted to repeat the well-known sentence: "O liberty what misdeeds are done in thy name!"

Under the circumstances, the attitude of the NDP is completely irresponsible and unacceptable. Obviously, that party does not have any elected members from Quebec and will not have any for a long time yet, considering its totally unrealistic mentality.

Judging from what the New Democrats say, one would think that they were living in limbo, that they have no knowledge whatever of the serious situation prevailing in Montreal.

Mr. Speaker, it is dishonest to pretend as some have done that the extraordinary legislation proposed by the government will deprive Canadian of all their freedom.

These emergency measures adopted by the Canadian government are exceptional measures meant exclusively for terrorists, revolutionaries, in short those who would overthrow legitimate authorities by violence, crime, murder.

The vast majority of the population, well meaning citizens whose conscience is at peace have nothing to fear from these emergency measures and should not let the members of the NDP convince them that their liberties are at stake. The Army and the police will not bother them. On the contrary the task of the armed forces is to protect the population and to maintain peace.

I trust that by using such powers the government will be able to put an end to intimidation and terror and to ensure peace and security for all.

I pray that the lives of Mr. Cross and Mr. Laporte will be saved. I pray that their wives and children may see them home again safe and sound.

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): Mr. Speaker, it is rather late. All of us are tired. The problem is serious and I have no reason to speak now.

• (10:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

While I do not approve of what the government did on Friday morning, I am willing to support it. I was willing to support it on Friday; I thought the element of surprise was necessary. But I do not know whether I am willing to accept it today. I was willing to accept it Friday morning.

An hon. Member: That was a fish day.

Mr. Comeau: I think the government should come forward very soon, as promised by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) last night on television, with legislation so that we may revoke the War Measures Act and bring in a bill which will deal with the situation more closely.

[*Translation*]

I am not from the province of Quebec but I think that the current problems there have become much worse since last week. There is no one in Canada who is not disgusted with what is going on in the province of Quebec. Those events have consequences for French-speaking Canadians throughout the country. The FLQ matter is serious, there is absolutely no doubt about it. This clandestine movement must be crushed. I really wonder if machine guns and guns will be enough. But this is not the way to solve the situation once and for all.

We all know that in the last few years, society has become—I do not blame anybody—much too permissive.

[*English*]

Protests have been encouraged in the last seven years. Young people, although in a minority, have made a lot of noise. Some people have been allowed to break every rule in the book across the country, the police watching them. The unrest we sense today in Canada has to do mostly with young people. This is unfortunate, because not all young people are for this type of measure.

I suggest one of the reasons a minority of young people is disturbed is that there is just no challenge today for our young people—no challenge in our schools, no challenge in our universities, no jobs to give them in the summertime. I am not saying that this is a cause of the situation we have today, but it is a cause of unrest. It is something that has to be tackled. We have allowed situations to develop, which I shall not deal with, in the province of Quebec and elsewhere and now we are in a state of civil war or at least on the verge of it, we are told. This scares me. I am relatively young, but it scares me to see soldiers and these measures being used. I know they are probably necessary, but it scares me to see people being arrested without bail. It scares me to think that if one belongs to an association, one can be arrested by the police. It scares me that it is not what you do but what you think that makes you liable to punishment.

I know very well that tonight, and since four o'clock yesterday morning, the Prime Minister has the support of 99.9 per cent of Canadians for what he has done. I know it, but I say we can still have our objections. I hate members of the government criticizing us because we raise questions. Surely we can raise questions, we can have doubts. We are not bound to accept everything per se. Even knowing that 99.9 per cent of Canadians accept what the Prime Minister has done, we can still raise questions.

What really scares me about this situation, what really makes me think about what is going on in Canada today, is that if in this passage in the Canada *Gazette* the words "Parti Quebecois" had appeared in place of "Front de Libération du Québec", 99 per cent of Canadians would still support the measure. I say, also, that if the Prime Minister had stated at this moment in time, "Let Quebec separate", 99 per cent of the people of the nine other provinces would still approve.

An hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. Comeau: That scares me because, by God, if that is the case, what is Canada coming to? It is not only against the FLQ that the people of Canada are supporting the Prime Minister today; it is not only what happened yesterday . . .

Mr. Corbin: Explain.

Mr. Paproski: Be quiet.

Mr. Comeau: I have explained. If words other than "Front de Libération du Québec" has been inserted, the rest of the people of Canada would still support this measure. Maybe they would not support it to the same extent because there are some in the nine other provinces who still believe in Canada and in the province of Quebec. But there are very many people who are completely fed up with what is going on. It scares me that if the Parti Quebecois had been named in that document, the people would still support the Prime Minister. There is nothing wrong in belonging to a political party, no matter what it is. I am not a friend of the separatist movement but there is nothing wrong in a country like Canada, where we have free speech, in belonging to that party. Members of the FLQ are probably members of the Parti Quebecois, but members of the Parti Quebecois are not automatically members of the FLQ.

[*Translation*]

This is what embarrasses me a bit and I will repeat it in French. If the Parti Québecois were subjected to the war measures, most of the Canadians would still support the enforcement of those measures. I do not like that.

• (10:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

I represent a constituency that is 30 per cent French-speaking and about 60 per cent English-speaking. It was the English-speaking people who elected me here. The people in my riding do not care whether one is a Catholic or a Frenchman; they know you for what you are, Mr. Speaker.

I support what the Prime Minister did on Friday morning, but I do not support his action on a continuing basis. I plead with the government to revoke the War Measures Act and to bring in legislation to deal with the situation. The word "War" in "War Measures Act" scares people. An incident was referred to this afternoon concerning what happened to a 20-year old girl at the hands of the FLQ, or someone, in Hull. It would probably not have happened if the War Measures Act had not been invoked. Although it appears to have the support of the Canadian people, this does not make the measure any more justifiable.

As an opposition member my job is to ask questions to make sure that things are done correctly. I listened to the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) this afternoon criticizing us for being against this act, criticizing us because we had a different opinion. He gave my leader hell for having a different opinion from his own. Six months ago when my leader supported the B and B Commission, the hon. member praised him. Today, because he does not agree with him, in his book my leader is no good. I say, let us revoke this measure soon. I hope hon. members will accept the amendment moved by the hon. member for Cumberland-Colchester North (Mr. Coates).

Mr. Guay (St. Boniface): How will you vote?

Mr. Comeau: I will support the amendment. Hon. members opposite accuse us of playing politics, yet I cannot find one of the 155 members opposite who is not going to support the Prime Minister. They are not going to question this measure. What kind of country is this?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. I ask the hon. member—

Mr. Woolliams: Just a bunch of sheep.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. We should have order in the House. The hon. member for South

Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) has the floor. If this debate is to carry on peacefully, hon. members should refrain from making remarks from one side of the House to the other.

Mr. Comeau: All the amendment provides is that instead of keeping this measure in force for 6½ months, we do so only till October 30. This will give the police all the authority they want for another two weeks. The government can come back to Parliament at the end of October and ask for another debate on this important matter. Then if it is necessary to extend the measure, we can do so. But I do not believe the government should have this power for too long.

I make no apology for raising objections to the measure even though some government backbenchers do not approve. I hope the government is right and that this is the last time the War Measures Act will be used. I hope we will be able to cure the ills of this country in the near future.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Arthur Portelance (Gamelin): Mr. Speaker, when I was elected a member of Parliament, on June 25, 1968, I did not think that we would have to vote on a matter as delicate and as important as the one now under consideration.

I know that several members of the opposition agree with the decision taken by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his cabinet. Certainly, they did not arrive at such decisions without due consideration. They simply answered the call of the premier of one of the Canadian provinces, the hon. Mr. Bourassa, as well as the call of responsible persons, such as the mayor of Montréal, Mr. Jean Drapeau, and the chairman of the executive committee, Mr. Lucien Saulnier.

Members of the opposition seem to believe that a dictatorship has just been implanted in Canada. If such was the case, the government members would be the first ones to object to it.

However I do not believe that such is the situation now. I am convinced that all my constituents entirely support the decision of the federal government to help Quebec restore order.

The province of Quebec is not the only province in Canada, and Canada is not the province of Quebec. This country includes ten provinces all equally important.

I was surprised to hear the former leader of the Progressive Conservative Party, the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) say that the citizens in his province would be deprived of certain liberties for some time.

The hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) made similar remarks. Yesterday, I heard him on television refer to some freedoms of which citizens other than Quebecers would be deprived.

Now, if I were in their shoes I would be ready to do without some freedoms if I knew that problems similar to those now prevailing in Quebec might develop in my province.

Being a Canadian does not merely mean being a Quebecer. We, Canadians, are privileged, for the whole world looks at us today. Many people would be happy to come and settle in Canada if it were possible.

We must be proud to be Canadians, and to safeguard that freedom I am happy to be part of a government headed by the present Prime Minister.

A few days ago, Mr. Cross was kidnapped in Montreal. His mission in Canada was to help Quebec and the rest of Canada to secure foreign capital to help the underprivileged by creating employment. I believe that was one of the projects of the Quebec government. In fact, the premier of that province spares no effort these days in order to secure foreign capital. Mr. Cross's main responsibility was to interest his government in investing in Canada. How strange that Mr. Cross, by coincidence, should disappear from view.

Later, another personality, and not the least important, the Hon. Pierre Laporte was kidnapped. From the time he entered politics, Mr. Laporte was the one who fought the most zealously for freedom in Quebec and in Canada. He wanted a free press and he fought for it vigorously in the province of Quebec. Mr. Laporte also wanted freedom in the labour movement. He has nothing to blame himself for with regard to freedom.

Mr. Speaker, those coincidences are strange. In the same time, the FLQ speaks of liberty, endoctrinates the students, devotes a lot of time to the universities, the CEGEPs and high schools to win over our young people. What did it promise? We do not know, because it had nothing on which to base its promises. Its members did not have the courage, every four years, and at times oftener, to try to be elected democratically.

The Quebec government is aware of the problems it must face and does everything possible to help the underprivileged but, as the member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) said yesterday, it is not only the underprivileged who are members of the FLQ.

It seems to me that some young people attending university, take a rather active part in such groups.

At the present time, in Montreal, the situation is untenable. Everyone knows that. Several members have mentioned that, last year, one of the committees of the House, of which I was a member, considered the problems concerning the Company for Young Canadians whose offices were located in Quebec. The chairman of the Montreal executive committee provided us with the proof that a revolutionary movement had developed in Quebec. If it had been conclusive evidence, if the arrests of some of its members had been possible, the Quebec authorities held the necessary powers to make the required arrests. But this has not been the case. However, some arrests have been made since the FLQ, with its blackmail, asked the government to release some of its prisoners.

The Montreal police, in spite of its efficiency—and I know personally several of its members who are honest and hard working people—has difficulty in controlling a movement which seems to me rather well-organized.

Last week, visits were paid by people who, apparently, are members of the FLQ. Besides, some of them have already been arrested. Indeed, some had been recently liberated, and the opportunity had not been missed to have them on the CBC television network so that they could give their impressions to the viewers. Those same persons were then visiting CEGEPs and universities, and intended to visit still more this week. Fortunately, an end has been put to those activities.

Last Thursday, one of my daughters, who attends the University of Montreal, was present at one of those meetings where there were political agitators inviting the students to hold public demonstrations. All the students of Quebec are invited to do just that, Mr. Speaker. I wonder what those agitators have to gain by having our students hold demonstrations. Is it planned that next week or later, all the students of Quebec will take to the streets? Are there special reasons to wish straight thinking students to act in that manner? Is there something to hide? Is it because some could not attend the lectures? Are some professors busy doing something else? Is it difficult to justify one's absence, at the university, either as a student or as a teacher?

In particular, I call upon those students within my constituency who are attending CEGEPs, high schools and universities to make it their duty to be present on time in their classrooms. Perhaps they will assist us in exposing some of the agitators who belong to their groups and encourage them to behave as they should so that there might be some success in restoring order in the province of Quebec.

This afternoon, the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald) was expressing his concern about separation by the province of Quebec. He said he had the honour of spending five weeks in Quebec this year. So, after a stay of five weeks in Quebec, the hon. member suggests he knows about all the problems of the province of Quebec.

No hon. member of the Quebec region, of Montreal or of any other part of the country would think to tie in the parti québécois with the FLQ. I quite agree with the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau). However, the hon. member for Egmont should not lose any sleep because a government was democratically elected in Quebec on April 29 last. For the information of the hon. member, there were then 76 per cent of the electors who did in fact vote against separatism.

Hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (10:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Forrestall: He was out one per cent.

Mr. Portelance: Well, it is one per cent too much probably. But 76 per cent voted against separation. The majority of the people of Quebec do not agree with it, and I am one of them.

Mr. Forrestall: But do not be critical of them for trying.

[Mr. Portelance.]

Mr. Portelance: No.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, last night, the right hon. Prime Minister addressed the nation and today I had a chance to get in touch with several of my constituents. Moreover, I had to decline an invitation to a function which I really wanted to attend and it would have been an occasion for meeting many of them. But as the member for South Western Nova so eloquently said, I assure him that 99.9 per cent of all Canadians are supporting him. The others assuredly are neither Conservatives nor Liberals but I know that they still are conscious of the present situation. I am convinced that the people of the constituency of Gamelin have full confidence in the government of the day and again I would ask the students to help us save democracy in Canada and I pray all of those who will some day want to become part of the Canadian government to stick with our present system, for if ever they join the system which is being offered to them as a substitute, I cannot promise that they will ever have the honour of being elected as representatives of the Canadian people.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*English*]

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to contribute a few remarks to this debate. Certainly, in my experience in this House, it is an occasion of momentous import and one which I am sure all members of this House hope they do not have to experience again, certainly in peacetime, that is to be debating the War Measures Act and the proclamations under it. This is something I never thought I would see in this Parliament of Canada. Even though we have been debating this resolution for two days, because of the very nature of the proclamation under the War Measures Act, no one so far has mentioned that great parliamentary word "filibuster". Action has already been taken under this measure. Men are in jail. Women are in jail. Certain rights have been suspended and this Parliament, instead of legislating, as the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) said earlier, is really philosophizing and meditating on the steps the government took when certain information came to its attention. We are discussing whether the government should have taken more or less steps, whether it moved too fast or too far.

It has been a long day and I realize that other speakers wish to add their thoughts to this debate which is unprecedented in the parliamentary life of Canada. I quite agree with most speakers I have heard—and I have been here most of today and yesterday—that the great majority of Canadians do not really appreciate the complexity and seriousness of this debate. Although this has been a long day, I say to you, Mr. Speaker, it has been no longer than the dark cloud which has covered Canada since this debate on the War Measures Act commenced in this Parliament. This day has been no longer for anyone here than it has been for the families of those who have been kidnapped. We have heard some very fine expressions today, especially in the recent remarks of the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) who

articulated a thought to which I think we should all hearken, including the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) and anyone else who comes from the western provinces.

I am apprehensive because I believe many English speaking Canadians are ready to delegate their authority to the Prime Minister, and not just because of the FLQ. This bothers me. I could not begin to try to emulate the sincerity of the hon. member for Gamelin (Mr. Portelance) who, as did other members today, told us of his personal knowledge of matters within his province. But that province is part of Canada and this is a Canadian problem, not just a Quebec problem. This is the reason I have no hesitation in speaking tonight.

The hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault), in what I thought was the most constructive contribution made tonight, wanted to know how we could unite. I say to him that there is no doubt on any side of this House so far as the FLQ is concerned. Members on this side of the House, on his side of the House and in the legislatures of Canada stand unalterably opposed to the FLQ. So far as I am concerned, the actions of the FLQ, the recent kidnappings, the terrorism and the ransom requests, as well as the question of whether or not the government should have acquiesced to them, is not the point of this debate.

• (11:00 p.m.)

This debate comes down to one issue alone. That is whether the application of the War Measures Act as set out in the proclamation, which applies to this country from coast to coast and outlaws associations of certain political parties, was the proper move for the government to make in response to the request of the authorities in Montreal and Quebec; and whether the 6½ months within which the government can exercise this power is the sort of authority which this or any Parliament should delegate to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) or any prime minister. That is the issue.

We have heard many sincere expressions of thought from those who have become personally involved in what is happening and who, because their domicile is in the province of Quebec, feel a real apprehension about what is happening in their province. But I put it to you, sir, that coming from Nova Scotia and having practised law for six years in British Columbia, I was horrified when I came back from that pastoral land, that province by the sea, to see three armed soldiers across the street from where I live in Ottawa. The only thing that brought a sense of reality and a sense of humour—which is lacking in this debate because this is a serious issue—to the situation was when my four year old boy went over to cross-examine the soldier, who was in his teens, and there was a humorous exchange between them as the boy was trying to find out whether the gun was loaded.

The only facetious question I wish to put in this debate—it has something to do with the amendment moved tonight and with where we are going in Canada—is that if the amendment to limit the government's extraordinary powers to October 30 does not carry, what will the children of Ottawa do on Hallowe'en? I ask the question because I say very seriously that there are houses in Ottawa to which I do not want my children to go for trick or treat, and there are houses to which they would not be allowed to go because of things that have happened. Some children in Canada are talking about that. I know that what I am saying is light and frivolous and that it is potentially facetious. A minister lives close to me. I do not know what he will do.

I agree in part with what my friend, the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau), said. I have no doubt that the Prime Minister—who disappointed me in many ways last night, not because of his lack of sincerity but no one has a monopoly on trying to do the best thing for Canada in this hour of crisis—did not give us all the facts. As a politician and a parliamentarian I thought I was entitled to hear the facts. If I am not entitled to hear the facts, I think at least the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), as one of the three officers of the House—mentioned in the BNA Act—the other two being the Prime Minister and you, Mr. Speaker—could have been taken into the confidence of the Prime Minister and could have been consulted so that we would not have to give a blank cheque on a proclamation under the War Measures Act which gives special powers to the government for 6 months.

There is no doubt in my mind that because of the fear, tension, consternation and apprehension that all Canadians feel at this novel and disgusting development in our political history, the people are instinctively and emotionally with the Prime Minister with regard to the proclamation under the War Measures Act. The hon. member for Coast Chilcotin (Mr. St. Pierre), to whom I usually listen with a great deal of interest and with expectation, disappointed me today because he suggested that under the War Measures Act the press gallery should be banned. While there may well be complaints about the press gallery from time to time, I was hoping he would give a constructive point of view, of the kind that I have always heard him give in this chamber, with regard to the basic problem under discussion, rather than lead us down the trail with the red herring of the press gallery.

After saying that the Canadian people are prepared to give instinctive, emotional support to the Prime Minister, let me say that this was the proper move. There is, for example, the incident mentioned today by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan) concerning the girl in Hull. Whether this was done by the FLQ or was a result of the hysteria that has developed in Canada, I do not know. The fact that there are troops in the streets makes people prone to look to the father figure and to delegate our responsibility and duty to someone who we believe and hope can resolve the problem.

I do not suggest that the test of the War Measures Act is whether it is popular tonight or whether it will be popular next week because I, like the hon. member for South Western Nova and others, question some of the facts and the reasons behind the invocation of the act. I question where it will lead us. That is not the test of the

most unprecedented parliamentary move that has ever been made in this country. Is it right, and will it work?

I agree with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) when he said in this debate on Friday that it was a matter of value judgment. The government has the responsibility of exercising their judgment in this very difficult situation.

In anything I say tonight I do not want it understood that I do not appreciate—having been exposed to people in high office at a time when they had to make decisions of state—the tension and strain under which our leaders have lived these last few days. It is a matter of value judgment; I do not argue with that. I suggest that it is much easier to agree with them tonight and hope they are right, than to question and be misunderstood, as I am afraid many of us may be. I stand here tonight prepared to question because the pages of history are full of questions. There is no monopoly, on the government or on the opposition side, on men who question the easy path and do not accept the easy way. Because of the judgment factor I feel very ill at ease about granting the Prime Minister these special powers in response to the letters of the Premier of Quebec and the authorities in Montreal.

Another point on which we are all united is this. We do not doubt that there had to be a response. I am directing my attention to the kind of response the government has made. It is ironic and sad that the matter of the constitution and the Bill of Rights, involving all the components of Canada—a matter on which the Prime Minister, because of his alleged expertise in this field, has been given a mandate—is becoming an albatross around his neck. I have to confess sadly tonight that I do not have faith or confidence in my Prime Minister in this very difficult period.

• (11:10 p.m.)

An hon. Member: Oh, oh.

Mr. Nowlan: And for anyone who laughs or smiles, I will recite why I do not have confidence. I do not intend to take too long but I go back, as other hon. members have done, to this whole problem of insurrection, of terrorism, of revolution, and of the FLQ. It did not come about last Thursday. It came six or seven years ago when the first bomb exploded and injured or killed, I forget which, someone. That was when the FLQ was born. If it had not been the FLQ as such it might have been some other organization because, at the moment, the world is full of revolutionary organizations. But what happened?

In October, 1969, Mr. Saulnier, the same man who wrote the letter that was supposed to be one of the catalysts for the Prime Minister's decision to invoke the War Measures Act, wrote the Prime Minister. When the Prime Minister was asked about this letter, because it was produced at a committee meeting, he had paid so little attention to it that he did not remember receiving it. This was the letter indicating there ought to be a security commission to investigate what was going on in Montreal. To his credit, and to the credit of his advisers, he was informed before the day was out that his answer was wrong. He came back into the House and apologized.

But, Mr. Speaker, this was a letter from Mr. Saulnier, from an important individual to an important individual about an important subject, and I found it difficult to appreciate fully the memory lapse the Prime Minister had.

You, Mr. Speaker, and all other members of the House know that after that letter was sent other events occurred. Just about a year ago, close to Hallowe'en night, there was the Montreal police strike. There were fires in the city of Montreal, and a policeman was killed. Other events occurred that brought a parliamentary committee into being to investigate the CYC. The right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert has reviewed all that for us. Earlier today the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) gave some evidence of his attempts to attract the attention of the government to some affairs going on in Montreal as far back as 1963. Then, there was Expo '67 when the Cuban embassy or pavilion was allegedly giving out pamphlets dealing with terrorism revolution and insurrection. But nothing was done.

As a member of the committee that investigated the Company of Young Canadians, the committee to which Mr. Saulnier and Mr. Drapeau gave evidence, I well remember that from some of the press, and certainly from the majority of the members of this House, came the allegation that we were witch hunting. Government members indulged in white-washing, trying to cover their own administrative mistakes and to point the finger at somebody else. That left things up in the air, and the request for a security commission went unheeded. That is point No. 2.

Now, I come down to a political area where I would expect that the judgment of the Prime Minister, and of the members of his party from Quebec, would be far superior to mine. It was only about a month and a half before the provincial election in Quebec that the Prime Minister said certain things, in that colourful phraseology that he uses. He said that the Parti Quebecois had miniscule support in Quebec. He used other objectives about the people who supported that party, all of which gave me the impression that it was a pretty small unit and that the election would take care of it.

An hon. Member: It did.

Mr. Nowlan: Some one is saying it did, but look at an analysis of the voting and you will see that one out of every three French-speaking Canadians voted for the Parti Quebecois. I say the election did not take care of the problem in Quebec or in Canada, and the problem in Canada vis-à-vis Quebec will not be taken care of as long as the Prime Minister tries to use, as a dose of castor oil for the terrorists, those constitutional policies he is applying unilaterally across Canada. We are all a little different in the different parts of Canada. The hon. member for Coast-Chilcotin (Mr. St. Pierre) and I who come from two different coasts are a little different. I say that difference stems from the collective way of life of the respective societies we have in the provinces.

After that I was a little perturbed at the Prime Minister's underestimation of the political support for this

separatist party. Then, when I was back in Nova Scotia, involved in some other events, I read in the newspaper that the Prime Minister had been talking about bleeding-hearts on Parliament Hill and weak-kneed legislators. I did not think that was quite the type of remark to make about a serious subject. What did not help me either was a picture on the front page of the Montreal *Gazette* the day after showing his bullet-proof limousine, and his big fist sticking out of the window at the reporter's camera. Perhaps it was just one of his gestures, but when there had already been blood on the streets of Ottawa not to mention Montreal, it is no joke. My faith was shaken, but I was still prepared to give him the benefit of the doubt.

Then, the Prime Minister bawled out the press for giving free publicity to the FLQ. He asked, "What are you trying to do" or words to that effect, yet within 48 hours we had the War Measures Act introduced which gave the FLQ a status internationally that it never had previously. I am not going to go into what has happened since the proclamation was issued, but there are other matters that make me ponder about the judgment of the Prime Minister in these areas of his supposed expertise.

I could not understand why it was the Quebec Minister of Justice who answered to the world about the kidnapping of the diplomat, Mr. Cross. I though it should have been the Prime Minister or the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp). But we all heard Mr. Choquette, and his very first words were, "I am instructed by the federal government to say..." This is a little thing, but the whole bundle bothers me, Mr. Speaker.

I come now to the use of the powers given by the War Measures Act. I do not know all these individuals in Quebec who have been arrested. I have not read that the kidnappers were captured, but some of the Quebec intellectual elite, some of the entertainers, some of the union leaders were picked up and are now held somewhere relatively incommunicado. Certainly, while they are being held their rights have been suspended.

An hon. Member: What about Vallieres and Gagnon?

Mr. Nowlan: Yes, I am aware of those two. They worked for Cité Libre at one time, as I understand it. I did not mention that until you did.

I listened to the Prime Minister on television last night, and there was a part of his statement that I just cannot rationalize with much of what has gone on today. I have not got the text of his speech and I may be misquoting but I heard him say, no doubt to re-assure Canadians, something to the effect that the situation was under control. The seizures, Mr. Speaker, have taken place. The surprise moves of the police and the army have taken place. I guess the majority of people who could be apprehended have been apprehended. If the situation in that sense is under control, then I ask why does the Prime Minister need the open-ended powers that the War Measures Act gives to him completely across Canada? When we talk about it being revoked in six months, or six months and a day, we all know that according to the regulations it can be extended at any time. I believe that in his statement the Prime Minister was kind enough to say he would come back to this House if that were done and lay the proclamation on the table for study. That does not leave me too satisfied.

Then there was the investigation of the B and B Commission leak, when the RCMP were called in. That by itself was perhaps nothing. The statement made in London two years ago about the crummy press, and that he would sic the police on the reporters if they investigate certain private lives perhaps was nothing by itself. But when you put all these incidents together you ought to become a little apprehensive and concerned.

• (11:20 p.m.)

I have sat in this House for five years and heard the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), and other eminent gentlemen who have been in the House longer than I have and who have served longer than I will, talk about democracy and liberty. I have heard it said that if we do not pass this measure, the walls of Parliament will fall and the people will not respect Parliament.

I am a young member, as is the hon. member for South Western Nova. Quite frankly, I appreciated the rhetoric but I do not necessarily agree that the institution of Parliament has reached the stage some have suggested. We are all men of good will. We are debating the War Measures Act; the liberty of some is at stake and the liberty of many others may be at stake. No one can deny that. Yet it seems passing strange to me, Mr. Speaker, that his should be the first debate I have been involved in wherein liberty really has been the kernel of the dialogue in this House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nowlan: That may be a sad commentary on our society. It is also sad that the one Canada in which many Canadians believe has become the armed Canada for many of us, that the just society has become the armed society and that the flower power of the Prime Minister has become soldier power around Parliament Hill. These are not all troubles of the Prime Minister's making. Expectations were raised, some have not been realized and the inevitable frustrations have set in. We must have conciliation and not confrontation in order to resolve conflicts between people.

The Prime Minister's Achilles heel is that he utilizes logic and textbooks in attempting to solve the problems of people. You cannot resolve problems with logic and textbooks alone; you must realize that the human element is also involved. That, I am afraid, is where the Prime Minister has overstepped the mark.

Some of the people, quite logically, stand behind the Prime Minister tonight in the implementation of the War Measures Act. But will they be behind him three months or six months from now, especially if we find out that there was no real basis for these stringent methods and that proper procedures in the police courts and jails have not been followed? Is it not a painful paradox that a man such as the Prime Minister, who thought the World War II was a war of imperialism, should now use the power of war to fight a perverted nationalism?

It is also a passing strange paradox that the discussion of the Bill of Rights and its underlying philosophy that was the highlight of a federal-provincial conference, should now have shifted, and that we should be debating a proclamation which gives the government almost absolute power over all of us. The government has panicked because of the actions of a few.

I listened with a great deal of interest, as I usually do, to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey). I was appalled by some of his analogies, by some of his red herrings and the smokescreen he tried to lay. I was not appalled at his sincerity because I fully accept that. When he talked about our Prime Minister and his contribution to civil liberties in Quebec, I wanted to ask him whether in his heart of hearts he thought that if the powers under the War Measures Act had been invoked at the time of the asbestos strike, the Prime Minister would have ended up in jail.

I ask two questions about this measure. Is it right to invoke it? Will it succeed? Some tried to leave with us a pretty clear inference that underlying the all-encompassing powers under the War Measures Act which has been invoked is information that is available to members on the government side but is not available to members of other caucuses—the caucus I belong to, the NDP caucus and the Créditiste caucus. If that is so, it makes a mockery of our unity. That will not unify us.

• (11:30 p.m.)

Another question is this: Will the measure succeed? I put this question to all members of the House and especially to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner). Has the knock at night, or has repression by day in any jurisdiction in the world solved the political problems of the society concerned? Such action might divert people's attention. It might put a damper on them. It might put them behind bars for awhile. One should take off one's blinkers and look around at the world to appreciate that people no longer want a strong father figure to govern them. The knock at night, whether at four o'clock or two o'clock, and continuing repression by day on the part of any government with unique powers will not resolve political problems. Such action will defeat their solution. After all, fear breeds fear and force answers force; and power without persuasion and belief is about as permanent as quicksand.

I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, not because I want to alienate anyone but because there may be some in Quebec tonight who have supported the Parti Quebecois but who subsequently thought there was a federal option and were prepared to opt for it: these people may be alienated. Some people may have had friends in the FLQ; they may not have thought them such bad fellows. I am not talking about people like Vallieres; I am talking about some others. For instance, two good friends of mine went to see Chartrand speaking in Montreal. They were not very impressed by him. But by imprisoning some of these people are we not in danger of making martyrs of some and heroes of others?

[Mr. Nowlan.]

Will not the task of those who like the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) opted for federalism be made more difficult? Unfortunately, I was not here to listen to the minister's speech but he, on behalf of the French-speaking Canadians he represents, opted for federalism. Will these repressive measures not confirm some of the misleading propaganda and literature that has been prostituted by the FLQ? That is what bothers me, Mr. Speaker.

I will spend little time answering the argument put forward by the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher). Some have asked whether the implementation of the War Measures Act is legal. There is no question but that the Prime Minister can quite legally invoke the War Measures Act, but that is not the test we should use. The test is whether it is right and whether it will work. There was a man in Munich who created legal tribunals and appointed judges to be the dispensers of justice meted out by those tribunals. He headed a parliament that passed laws and made certain people criminals. He was interviewed by a British correspondent, Sefton Delmer of the *Daily Express*, on March 3, 1933. I am referring to social history. These facts are contained in Alan Bullock's book, "Hitler, a study in tyranny".

Mr. Delmer made inquiries about certain powers that had been assumed after Hitler had asked for them following an unfortunate incident involving the burning of the Reichstag on February 27, 1933. I am not trying to suggest that anything like that is happening here. I am only trying to meet the argument that this action is legal, and therefore good. Because of the fact it is legal, it should be carefully scrutinized by every member. Look at the answer given to the correspondent, a member of the fourth estate, with reference to these changes in civil liberties. The correspondent from the *Daily Express* asked him what truth there was in rumours of a projected massacre of his political opponents Hitler replied:

> My dear Delmar, I need no St. Bartholomew's Night. By the decrees issued legally we have appointed tribunals which will try enemies of the state legally, and deal with them legally in a way which will put an end to these conspiracies.

This interview with Hitler appeared in the *Daily Express* on March 3, 1933. I would like to put something else on the record with regard to legality. It is a statement of a politician, and it reads:

> The streets of our country are in turmoil. The universities are filled with students rebelling and rioting. Communists are seeking to destroy our country. Russia is threatening us with her might and the republic is in danger. Yes, danger from within and without. We need law and order.

If I asked some people who said that, I might get the answer "Spiro Agnew". However, this is what Adolf Hitler said in 1932. This is the serious aspect of what we are debating here tonight. I am unalterably opposed to the War Measures Act being invoked at this time, unless the Prime Minister can take my leader or the members of Parliament into his confidence and tell us what happened in the last seven years that makes last Thursday any different from the six and a half years before that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nowlan: As far as the powers are concerned and the argument that they are only for six months with the option to renew I point out that in Greece, the foundation for the western democracy, a junta there some years ago passed extraordinary emergency powers on a temporary basis because of insurrection. I forget all the names, but that junta is still in command and these extraordinary emergency powers are still in operation. This happened in a country where they said it could not happen.

We should not be concerned about what is happening because of the soldiers on the streets and the bombs, but because of what Parliament is doing. We should look to the south where they have had selective assassination. They have had more bombings than Quebec and Montreal have had. Several years ago 40 blocks of the city of Chicago were burned. There were more blocks burned in the city of Los Angeles than in any city in this country. The government, be it state, congress or the president, have done nothing more than call out the national guard to put out the fires and to shoot the snipers. Have they taken away the civil liberties by due process of law? I say no.

When talking about the White Paper six months or a year ago, the Prime Minister and some ministers of the government smugly talked about the difference in social values between this country and the United States. If we move ahead with this War Measures Act for six months with an option to renew, no longer will a politician or any Canadian be able to stand smugly and suggest that social values in this country are far superior to those south of the border. With all their stress and strain, selective assassinations, bombings and killings, that country has not done what we propose to do on Monday when we vote on this.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by coming back to where I began.

Mr. Mahoney: You have not gone very far.

Mr. Nowlan: I urge the member for Calgary South (Mr. Mahoney) to get off his rear end and contribute something from his head instead of his seat.

Is it right and will it work? I say that it is not right as presently drafted. Even more serious, it will not work. It will be a sad day for the Liberal government or anyone who pretends he is Liberal in spirit or in thought if this passes unamended. It will be a pathetic day for this Parliament if it passes without some restrictions. More important, it will be a sorry day for Canada and for Canadians from coast to coast if it passes unamended.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): It is a long time since I have had the opportunity of speaking on Sunday morning. I was quite willing to wait for that opportunity.

In the years that I have been here there have only been four or five debates that have deserved the attention of all Members of Parliament in the way this debate has. I wish to comment on the calibre of the speeches that have been made. Most of the people I have listened to have been very sincere in the arguments they advanced. Very little time has been spent on defending the government's position, but rather they have spoken about the position of the individual and his role.

I was interested in the speech of the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau). He indicated that the Prime Minister has the support of most of the people in this country. He used the figure of 99 per cent. I do not think that is correct. We must discount the FLQ and their supporters. We must also discount other people for various reasons. I agree that the majority of Canadians are in favour of this resolution. However, it is for a totally different reason than the one stated in the House today.

These people believe that the Prime Minister has suddenly said "To hell with Quebec. We are putting the army in Quebec to straighten out these people. They are going to be just like other Canadians when I finish with them."

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Peters: The people from Quebec, on the other hand, are saying that the army was put in to keep things the way they are. There are some very distinguished people in this House from Quebec, but they always refer to themselves as Quebeckers. I never refer to myself as an Ontarian. The only other people in this House who refer to themselves by a provincial name are the Newfoundlanders, but there may be others who use a fancy name. Sometimes the people from Alberta use the designation Albertan. Ever since I have been in this House, the people from Quebec have called themselves Quebeckers. Since I have been in this House people who have come here from Quebec have always said, "We are different. We want to run our own affairs. We do not want legislation passed nationally because it may hurt us provincially. We will not let you play a role."

The leaders we have had, with rare exceptions, have been provincial first, and then come to Ottawa for various reasons later. Most members will agree that in this debate many of the members from Quebec have considered their own situation. I do not blame them for this because the situation there is very bad. If the action of the Prime Minister is going to work, those cabinet ministers who are provincialists will have to give up some of the things that they think are essential to the province of Quebec. They must work to make it more like the other provinces. There must be a Canadian atmosphere rather than "What can we get and what can you do for us?". What they should be asking is, what they can do for the rest of Canada. Most members from other provinces have always been sympathetic toward Quebec.

Some speakers from the Liberal party have referred to the two party policy of the New Democratic Party. I agree that we have had that. The same people I am speaking of have advised us many times about the type of policy we should have. We listened to them because we did not know what was going on in the province of Quebec. We could not speak the language. The adherents to my party have been limited in Quebec. We were sold

all kinds of ideas. People who have been in the party for a long time have sold us many ideas. It is very surprising tonight, but I am not unhappy to see, that one them is in gaol and the other one is in the Senate. These are people who have been giving us ideas from that province for many years. Maybe that is not the way they should end up. Some of those who have given us advice are in the cabinet today. I make no apology for the mistakes that we have made. We have made them with the best of intentions. We agreed to everything they asked for and they asked for various things over the years. We got ourselves into one hell of a position, and if you ask me what the policy of the New Democratic Party was for the Province of Quebec I haven't the faintest notion, Mr. Speaker.

• (11:40 p.m.)

I believe, however, that there are a lot of people in the Province of Quebec who do believe they should have the opportunity of participating. You can remember, Mr. Speaker, when we passed the Trans-Canada Highway Act and other acts—you can name them by the dozen—and Quebec said: Not us, don't run the highway through Quebec because it costs federal money. We got around to a state in which whatever was done for Quebec it could not be said the federal government had done it. For example, in the case of a technical school, we do not say that the federal government put up 75 per cent of the money. We only talk about the 25 per cent the Province puts up and we allow the Province total control. Rightly so, Mr. Speaker, because Quebec asked for it. The people of Quebec should consider the reason the majority Canadians today support the Prime Minister's actions. I think they will find that many Canadians are totally fed up with the machinations that go on in the Province of Quebec, totally fed up with the idea that they are different in each and every case. Most Canadians think that today we are making a last ditch stand to keep Quebec in confederation by force and they are supporting the Prime Minister because he is doing this.

The debate which is taking place in the House tonight, Mr. Speaker, is not on that issue. But I come from the Province of Ontario. I am not unfamiliar with the French fact in other provinces, since there are probably 25 or 40 per cent French speaking people in my constituency. But they are in Ontario and they do not feel the same way. Not long ago a totally French community in my area asked me for assistance to get them a CBC satellite from Montreal directly off the CBC. I asked them why. I said they had two stations 30 miles away, one in Ville Marie and another in Noranda. They said they were tired of listening to local politics from these stations and wanted straight programming from the CBC. So, the problems of these French speaking people are not necessarily the same and I think we should look at them in that light.

There is another problem, Mr. Speaker. Every problem has been discussed, so I don't intend to take up much time, but there is another problem that I think we could look at in terms of what is right and what is wrong. I agree with the previous speaker that this act will not solve all the problems that we think it will solve, but if it can solve some of them we shall have accomplished something. It has been suggested, and it has been suggested by members of my own party, that we pass a statute. Let me say right now, Mr. Speaker, that I would much prefer to support the War Measures Act which I know will disappear eventually because public opinion will find it repugnant than to add a section to the Criminal Code or a new statute to our statute books which would enable the Prime Minister every time he gets a letter from the head of a municipality to invoke substantially the powers contained in the War Measures Act.

The hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault) made an eloquent speech tonight. Just let him think about what would happen if the mayor of his community were to ask for this kind of power. I think it would be the most amusing, the most disastrous and probably the bloodiest arrangement you could have. I think he would agree it would probably be less than desirable. I am not interested in providing this kind of power by means of a statute. Whatever we do, surely we will consider it to be an emergency beyond any normal requirement and this kind of power will only be granted on very rare occasions, and only after a great deal of consideration has been given to it and public opinion taken into account.

I hope the police will now have power to do something about those people who are engaged, in my opinion, in assassination and in total destruction. I am not too sympathetic toward many of the other people in that province because they have sure encouraged these people. The Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) is one I single out. But I think every time we try to put the unilingual fact in a bilingual nation difficulties will arise. Unless we are willing to make some compromises with the Province of Quebec, unless there is willingness to co-operate, these difficulties will continue.

We cannot blame the young premier of that province. He must be under terrific strain. He is probably scared to death by the enormity of the situation. In my opinion, in his election campaign, he set about trying to do something about the basic problems, to supply jobs, to improve the economy in Quebec just as one might attempt to do in any other province rather than worry about whether an ambassador to France should be appointed, or whether only French-speaking people should be brought in, even if it was necessary to get them from Algeria. He has embarked on an economic program which will eliminate many of the problems of that province. But I believe he is in serious difficulties and I hope considerable assistance will be given to him by those from that province who will be obliged to reorient their thinking.

Then, I remember Michel Chartrand. I can remember the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. I can remember when they were talking to the CNTU. They were talking about having it only for Quebec, having it strictly in the province. I agree the position changed after a period of time, but I can remember the syndicates as well. I can remember Michel coming into northern Ontario and telling the people there how they had to unite with their brothers in the Province of Quebec or

their whole heritage would disappear. I have listened to Michel for 30 years. I don't think he has become any milder now than he was then. I did not understand him any better then than I do now. His language was always that of a miner or a bushworker. It really hasn't changed. I do not think of him as a bomb-throwing revolutionary—the bombs he throws are words, and I think this will be found to be true of many of the other people who are involved.

There are members of this House who are totally committed to trying to help solve the problems which have created this situation. I suggest, however, that all the members of this House are not blameless. When I first came here we did not have simultaneous translation. The only time members from Quebec participated in our debates at all was when the subject affected their own province, and then they spoke in their own language. I say, with shame, that the rest of us were not bilingual and the debates at that time were like running two Parliaments. This has been overcome, and I think many things which have stood in the way of greater co-operation have been removed.

In the minds of many people—and many in the Liberal party do not seem to realize it—this is probably one of our last chances. This Prime Minister, with his mandate, offers probably one of the last chances to unify the country. All of us will have to work to this end and for this reason I hope we will give every assistance we can to get rid of the problem. I hope we will receive every assistance to fight the problem facing us today; that we will recover those who have been kidnapped and eliminate those who are obviously bent on a course of assassination.

• (11:50 p.m.)

I remember listening on the radio to the story of the kidnapping of the Lindberg child and I well remember all the problems that arose as a result. These people in Quebec, the terrorists, not only kidnapped one person; they kidnapped two in the city of Montreal. Supposing five or six were abducted; how would you feed them? Would you send round to a Chinese restaurant for take-out dinners? These people do not seem to see anything wrong in what they have done.

One member yesterday accused the NDP of not knowing anything about the province of Quebec. It is true; we do not. But I think the hon. member would be very dishonest if he were to say that we in this Parliament, certainly in my term of 13 years, have not on numerous occasions granted practically anything asked for in order to help maintain unity in Canada. When Quebec has made a request we have acquiesced. When they asked to opt out of something, we allowed them to do so. When they asked to opt in, we likewise agreed. The same thing goes for the building of highways, and so on.

The history of co-operation between Members of Parliament from other parts of Canada and their fellow members from Quebec is fairly good as far as our party is concerned. At the same time, it behooves the members from Quebec to look at the problems in the rest of Canada as well. I realize the Prime Minister has been supported by the majority of Canadians; but the people of Quebec might be shocked to find that that reason for choosing the Prime Minister is the exact opposite of the reason the people in other provinces gave their endorsement of the Prime Minister.

I do not know whether this problem can be solved. Certainly there is a long piece to go. I am sure there is great misunderstanding between the Francophone and Anglophone cultures. I have listened to most of this debate, to every special broadcast on radio and television, I have heard interviews conducted on the street and have been very interested in the matter, as I think all Canadians have. In this time of catastrophe in the province of Quebec there lies an opportunity for some outward-looking on the part of both sections of Canada. If the will for unity in Canada exists at all, it exists today. I think each section of Canada can see how the one can help the other. Together we can solve the problem in Quebec. If it is not solved, then many of the faces we see here today will not be in the House in a few months' time.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Prosper Boulanger (Mercier): Mr. Speaker, I especially want to reply to one of my colleagues, the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Ricard) who has left the House about three hours ago. He had been asking the government members from the province of Quebec to express themselves as clearly as he claimed to have had the courage to do so. It is easy to meet this challenge. For this reason, I shall express my own opinions which are very much in accordance with others expressed here tonight.

[*English*]

I listened to the remarks of the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) and I also heard what was said by the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan), who has now left the House. If I were to open a theatre and needed a comedian, I would call on that hon. member right away because he really is a good actor and could make quite a show. If I needed a lawyer, perhaps I would use him too, so long as I had a cause that was not too important. Having listened to the debate for two days, it strikes me as funny when members on the other side say they know that 90 per cent of the population agrees with the government's action and are in favour of its decision. Yet they stand up and try to defend what they call the civil rights of the people.

I have received telephone calls from people in my riding, and I have also made a few. But let me tell the Tories tonight that there are only a few Tories left in Quebec. If an election were held tomorrow, there would be even fewer: in fact, I do not think there would be any. All hon. members are doing is trying to get their names in the newspapers; they just want to have something to say. Hon. members are losing their credibility when they say they are trying to save the unity of the country.

[*Translation*]

—national unity. Where is the merit in all this?

[*English*]

If I asked one of the Socialists, an NDP member, to make a political speech such as I have heard here, I would have to ask what was the difference between the PQ and the Socialists. I see the hon. member for Timiskaming looking at me when I say that.

Mr. Peters: I think Levesque would be looking at you, too.

Mr. Boulanger: What is the difference between a Quebec Socialist and the PQ? There is none whatever. Let me tell you why I say that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I would ask the hon. member to address his very interesting remarks to the Chair.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Boulanger: Mr. Speaker, if I had to draw a comparison between the two, I would say that the experience of the last federal elections would make us laugh, because, in my constituency, for instance, the candidate of the New Democratic party was, in the following provincial election, the treasurer of the candidate of the Parti Québécois. When that kind of people try to make us believe that they want to save a situation which they do not seem to know at all, I think they are increasingly losing the confidence of Quebecers.

I heard the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) say earlier: We, the French, but, in Quebec, we are Canadians and we do not say: We, the French, but rather: We, the French-speaking Canadians. That is the difference. What a pity that the one who presided over the fate of France for years came here and practically challenged us by shouting "Vive le Québec libre" on the steps of Montreal's city hall where I sat for many years. Should he not be held partly responsible for what is happening? We must tell ourselves that this is not a problem peculiar to Quebec and to Canada, but a problem of international revolution and it is much more serious than some members of the opposition may think.

As for me, at the request of the member for Saint-Hyacinthe, I shall be much more specific.

I shall say neither "yes" nor "no". I shall be delighted, after having heard the speeches given in the House today and yesterday, to vote for this measure.

The member for Saint-Hyacinthe attacked verbally the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand). He even accused some of us of not wanting to speak up. When the time comes to answer him, he is no longer in the House. I hope that tomorrow he will know that I made things clear.

He should not have kept us waiting so long. In his 20-minute speech, he did not say much. He practically insulted some of the members of the government.

• (12 midnight)

[*English*]

Before I sit down—and I said I would not be very long—let me say that people should stop saying, right now, they are trying to save Quebec. The Quebec members here are trying to save Quebec. Many of us wore uniforms during the war. We were together as Canadians in the first world war and we were together as Canadians in the second world war. We will be together for many years to come, because the idea of separatism in Quebec will not get through. Some people are using the extremist way and they call themselves FLQ. Some groups use the so-called democratic way. When you read newspapers such as were referred to by the hon. member for Saint-Denis (Mr. Prud'homme), particularly when you read the words of the leader of the party, you see

[*Translation*]

No government in Quebec!

[*English*]

What does he mean? That man has been disappointed because of the small success he has had so far. Before it came to be called a party it had many names. Some hon. members know how many names it has had, because the Socialists have had many names. It was called many different names. Once it was RIN, and so on. I hope hon. members are not trying to tell us they agree that we should stick together because they want to save the province of Quebec. Why are the Socialists in Quebec such close friends of these other people? These members surprise me. I heard the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) and others speak. You are lucky. As we say in French:

[*Translation*]

The members of the New Democratic Party always try to run with the hare and hunt with the hounds. But, in 1970, it does not work so well. Thus, the socialists in Quebec will not go far.

I do not want to be humorous during such a serious debate. Earlier, I listened to the news. New proposals were made to the abducters of Messrs. Cross and Laporte. The Quebec government has given explanations has to how to save the life of a Canadian and an Englishman who, I think, are men of great value.

This is serious business. There has been enough talk. We should now wait until Monday to know how the opposition will vote.

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in listening to the hon. member for Mercier (Mr. Boulanger) who has just finished his remarks, because he portrayed by his comments the typical Liberal arrogance that we see here every day. He said that just because he had made a decision, nobody else had the right to talk about it.

An hon. Member: You should have put your earpiece on.

Mr. Yewchuk: The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) said something similar. He put forward a complete fabrication which he attributed to some member of the opposition, and then denied it himself. In spite of the fact that the hon. member for Mercier feels that the government's

decision is correct and does not deserve comment from anybody, we should be given the courtesy of making comments whether he feels they are useful or immaterial. It may be that the comments made from now on will not cover anything that has not been mentioned. Nevertheless, we wish to make comments and perhaps in some way contribute to this debate.

Terrorism in the world is not something new; it has been going on for some time. In the past ten years there has been a wave of terrorism in most countries of the world and, lately, through South America and the United States. Canada has not been immune. Kidnappings have occurred in South America for the past year. When we heard about the events in South America, most Canadians felt, I am sure, as I did—that we were really glad to be living in Canada because that sort of thing could never happen here. Now, just a few months later, exactly the same thing has happened here. This indicates that something very serious is happening in our world. It indicates that there is a good deal of satisfaction with the system as we know it and as it is operating.

Perhaps it indicates a little more than that. According to the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey), it indicates that an international organization is involved in all these revolutionary activities around the world, including those in Quebec. I suppose this is a possibility. If we look at the manifesto the FLQ put forward, we find it resembles the manifesto put forward by certain groups in the past, groups associated with either Marxism, Maoism or some other "ism," usually on the left of the political sphere although further to my left than by hon. friends here. We should try to find out why this sort of unrest is happening in our country. I should like to put forward some ideas which may or may not be acceptable to members of the House. They do not have to listen to them if they do not accept them, but I will make them anyway.

I think this unrest results partly from a trend, or fashion, in this country to glamorize change. Change has been a god in this country over the past few years, particularly under the leadership of the Liberal party which is dedicated to change. I do not think change in itself is bad, but when change is made for the sake of change it does not necessarily improve conditions in the country. Change has been falsely equated with progress, and I suggest this is not necessarily the situation. There is a rash of change in this country and in our crowded environment there are those who feel that things are not changed as quickly as they should be. With the desire to bring about change in everything with which we are familiar there is a tendency to mock and scoff at established institutions. There is a tendency to adopt ways of doing things in order to speed up the desired change. I see this as the way Liberal principles—I should change that wording because they have no principles. I see this as the Liberal mechanism of doing things, or that is the way it has been portrayed to us.

• (12:10 a.m.)

Many members have mentioned that the FLQ is not something new; that it did just happen two or three weeks ago and certainly not last Friday morning. It has been operational since about 1962 or 1963. During the past two or three years this situation has been referred to by members of the House during the question period. On each occasion the ministers who were questioned simply scoffed at these suggestions. They adopted the attitude of sticking their heads in the sand in the hope that if they did not recognize the problem it would disappear. However, while they were holding their heads in the sand in ostrich-like fashion, the FLQ came along and gave them another push so that their heads went further into the sand. Then, their heads popped out of the sand long enough for them to realize that something serious was going on in the country.

Following the kidnappings of a British diplomat and a Quebec minister, they suddenly recognized there was a problem. I wonder whether either minister present, the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) or the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) can keep their heads out of the sand long enough, and keep the sand out of their eyes, ears, nose and mouth, to tell us why they waited for this dire emergency to occur before taking action since the first bomb blasts occurred in 1963 in several major areas of the country. Now, the crisis has reached the stage where it is necessary to invoke emergency measures, including the War Measures Act. Actually, this is the first action that has been taken against this organization which has been operating in this country since 1962 or 1963.

Mr. Olson: That is not correct.

Mr. Woolliams: I think it is correct.

Mr. Yewchuk: Today, several members on the government side stressed over and over again what great guys they are because they are living up to their responsibility as members of the government. I think they really have been neglecting their responsibility for a long time. This responsibility has been neglected by the government since 1963, when the first bomb went off in Montreal. This government has not done anything about the situation. The members of the government have been guilty of gross negligence in not attempting to deal with the situation before it reached crisis proportions. This is very typical of the way in which this government, and the government which preceded it, have been dealing with the problems of this country since 1963.

Mr. Olson: How did the FLQ members get in jail?

Mr. Woolliams: You don't really believe that.

Mr. Yewchuk: Mr. Speaker, a private conversation is being carried on right beside me.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Would the hon. member resume his seat. I wonder whether we might hear the hon. member I think he has something of importance to contribute. It is difficult for the Chair to hear him while there is a private conversation being carried on across the chamber.

Invoking of War Measures Act

Mr. Yewchuk: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not speak very loudly and I know how much you want to hear what I have to say. We heard the Prime Minister speak yesterday. I was quite impressed by his television appearance. He did a fine job. He mentioned how fragile our democratic system is, and how fine a line there is between stability and democracy. I agree with him. It takes a crisis of this magnitude for the government to realize that it must act. I believe one of the greatest blows democracy in this country received was when this government came to power.

First, this government whittled away at the democratic rights of Parliament during the last two years. Second, we have lost our civil rights completely for a period of six months with no real explanation concerning why such a measure was necessary at this time. We have not heard very much since Friday morning, other than what has been happening for the preceding two or three weeks or even for a long period. Yet, suddenly this very severe measure is introduced. I should like some sort of an explanation for that if anyone should care to give it.

Just lately we heard that Premier Bourassa had made another offer to the kidnappers. Apparently he has offered them immunity from punishment if they deliver the two victims unharmed. I can appreciate the sort of anguish he must have experienced in making this kind of offer because, in considering the safety of two persons, he had to yield a little to what we consider to be blackmail. I do not envy him his position. I think we should offer some alternative to the action the government has taken. This has already been mentioned on several occasions by members of the opposition. The War Measures Act is in force but it is not really necessary that it be in force for a period of six months or even longer.

I support the amendment moved by one of our members to the effect that the act be in force only for a period of a couple of weeks or long enough to give the government ample opportunity to bring in another statute or an amendment to the Criminal Code which would allow the government to deal effectively with the crisis which exists. I suggest that if such a statute should be brought in, it should contain a time limit just sufficient to meet this crisis situation.

It is likely that a new bill or an amendment to the Criminal Code to deal with this situation could be quite severe. We must be sure that such severe legislation would be limited only to the time of the crisis with which we are dealing. If it should be brought in, there should be an understanding that it would be reviewed within a certain period during a cooler time in our history, whenever that might be. In the circumstances, and considering all the factors involved, I consider it possible that invokement of the War Measures Act was the right thing to do because there may not have been any other way to handle the situation after the decision was suddenly made to take action. My only hope is that this exercise will lead to greater freedom rather than less freedom.

No one is very happy to see armed soldiers, guns and bullet-proof cars around our capital city, in the province of Quebec or anywhere else for the purpose of protecting our citizens. It is an unusual sight and one that we have difficulty accepting. I hope that in a year or so this whole scene will become only a relic in the museum of Canadian history. In order to ensure that this happens one might try to determine why these problems have arisen and why the FLQ has flourished. Personally, I know a couple of reasons, but I believe we should also examine the basic discontent with our social structure and recognize that in many areas of our country, including Quebec, poverty is a very great problem. Unemployment, too, is a major problem and the economy in general is in a poor condition. The people of Quebec have had some difficulties with their language and some cultural problems. There are many other problems which have been plaguing the country. All of these have to be tackled in earnest, along with any new proposed legislation that will be brought in, if the solution to this crisis is to be of a lasting nature.

• (12:20 a.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Eymard Corbin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, as most hon. members, I feel a little tired, even exhausted at the end of such a long debate.

However, I do not want to miss the opportunity to speak as a member coming from a minority French-speaking group outside Quebec, because I feel it is my duty to do so.

The events now occurring in Quebec were a great shock to my fellow citizens of Madawaska-Victoria whom I represent in the House. I must say that my area is right next to Quebec. My constituency lies south of that of Témiscouata, in the lower St. Lawrence, and the newspapers we read as well as the television programs we watch come for the most part from Quebec.

We live in New Brunswick, but it is not superfluous to say that we maintain cultural and other relations with Quebec. Most of our professionals have received their training in Quebec. Even today a great number of the teachers in our schools come from Quebec where they have also had part of their training. This goes to say that Quebec's influence is greatly felt in my region in the north-west section of New Brunswick.

As most Canadians, my fellow citizens have been upset by the developments of the last few days, but they were quickly relieved to see that Canada was in such good hands and that the federal government had not shirked its responsibilities. They therefore support the government's decision as I do myself and this is the reason why I have stayed here this weekend. My constituents did not expect any less from me even though they would have preferred to see me take part in the electoral campaign under way in my province at the present time.

My colleagues in the Liberal Party, even some opposition members, have condemned the attitude of the mass media in this whole affair, and especially the manner in which they have interpreted the events taking place and

the statements of the government. I have applauded such comments. I agree with their authors. In such serious circumstances, the press has not been quite up to it. I note, however, that it seems to be amending its ways and that it now sticks to the facts more than it has done in the previous days. This undoubtedly betokens greater strength on the part of newspapermen than was first assumed.

I said a while ago that the greater part of the information which in New Brunswick reaches the French-speaking audience comes from Quebec and we in New Brunswick are nonetheless far from being satisfied with the media through which this information is fed to us.

We also depend on Quebec because of our lack of news media. Our area is served by the CBC national radio and television network. We believe we are entitled to know what is going on in Canada. We agree that the majority of the CBC French network listeners reside in Quebec but this is no reason why we should be kept in the dark as to whatever goes on outside Quebec. For the past five years we have been flooded with separatist propaganda. Whenever a separatist did something, he was shown to us on television. That is no reason to keep us unaware of what goes on outside of Quebec.

The CBC French network is not exclusively reserved to the province of Quebec, and yet what else can we conclude when we look at its programs. They can stand a great deal of improvement. I hope events will give CBC authorities a little push because our young people have been brainwashed by what is being broadcast by national networks. That is a crime against youth, which does not always know the whole truth.

I am not a television fan, but when I do watch it, news bulletins are really what interests me and God knows how many times we have been deprived of sound and objective information.

Not only have we been flooded for a few years by separatist statements, either in a so-called democratic way or not. What is more serious—as I mentioned a while ago—is that we were not informed about the other side of events. We were refused systematically and regularly a real image of events. We were cheated. We never had our chance, Mr. Speaker. Now, we demand it.

I could say many other things in fact, but as it is late, I will spare the House. I could have taken advantage of this debate to talk about a particular situation, and come back to the events of New Brunswick. I could have spoken of a separatist training camp developping at Moncton's CBAF radio station. The CBC staff of Moncton is now occupying key positions of CBC commentators in Montreal. I shall not speak any more about this but I just wanted to convey my dissatisfaction about the service provided until now by the CBC.

The condition of the French-speaking press in New Brunswick is also rather interesting. I want to speak particularly of the daily newspaper *Évangéline*. In fact, the situation of this newspaper was not specially interesting until a short time ago. Some separatists, maybe members of the FLQ or rather strong supporters, had infiltrated it. Some Frenchmen also. They were little soldiers of general de Gaulle refusing to do their military service and they were sent here like that, to teach us a lesson, it is said. Their mission was to awaken the Acadians, to introduce them to protest methods and to organize demonstrations. This situation lasted for a few years. The alleged leaders in Acadia were surprised in their sleep. Fortunately, they awoke before it was too late. They kicked those intruders out and since then things are much better in Acadia. They are better in New Brunswick and I am sure that they will stay that way.

• (12:30 a.m.)

Nonetheless, this does not mean that there are no more agitators within the confines of New Brunswick. I could not tell what their political affiliation is. All we know is that they are there to stir up strife and spread confusion in the minds of our young people.

Mr. Speaker, as I said a minute ago, it is getting late and I would have much more to say. However, I do not intend to inflame this debate further. I only wish to reiterate my complete faith in the government, and I must say that I will support it with my vote on Monday.

[*English*]

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, it is with some reluctance I stand here on Sunday morning at 12.35 a.m., having been here since eleven o'clock on Saturday morning, to take part in this debate in a period of our history which, to say the least, is most disturbing. To even take part in this debate is perhaps a little bit presumptuous of me in view of the fact that I come from Canada's newest province, Newfoundland, which has been part of Canada for only 21 years.

It is also perhaps presumptuous of me to take part in the debate for the simple reason that I am not able to stick my thumbs in my lapels and stand here as a great statesman like many other hon. gentlemen, the leader of my party, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) of Canada, and the Right Hon. John Diefenbaker whom I have admired for years. I doubt that there are many members of the House who want to listen to the remarks I have to make; they having been here for many hours, and I am aware of the fact that there is little anybody can add to the remarks of great statesmen.

It is very encouraging for me, as a young Canadian, to see that the House of Commons has responded eminently to one of the most critical situations in our history. I have been privileged to sit as a member of this House for the last two years. Perhaps I will not be sitting here for many more years, since I have no aspiration to become a professional politician. On many occasions during those two years I was disillusioned because the House of Commons seemed to be a place where parliamentarians played a political role, a political game, where people became involved in political discussion just because they thought it was the thing to do. I have frequently felt that the inclination of members to play a role, and on many occasions to express hypocritical attitudes, dominated their instincts and inclination to be great Canadians. But in the last two days I have been encouraged at the ability of Members of Parliament to put aside their political

motivations and to offer to Parliament and the Canadian people some leadership, some advice which might help Canadians toward a better life in the future.

It seems to me that it takes a crisis like that which we are faced with today to bring out the best in Canadians. Perhaps as Canadians we have had it too easy. We have been willing to go along with the tide, to adopt a lax, lackadaisical attitude, to allow ourselves to be lulled into a sense of false security. I believe that the present crisis may elevate our parliamentary system to a level that is more respectable, and that will be admired more by Canadians.

I am a little at a loss, Mr. Speaker, to understand the sudden confusion and disturbance that has developed in the chamber. However, I have just been informed that there has been a break in the situation as it pertains to the tragedies that have befallen our country. I do not know if it is in order for me to pose a question to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) but, with the unanimous consent of the House, may I ask has he anything of a significant nature, to indicate to Parliament, which the Canadian people may want to hear before I continue my remarks?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would think the hon. member should pursue his remarks.

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Speaker, I will just leave the impression I have created and continue my remarks. In my opinion, and perhaps my opinion is not very valuable at this point in our history, in the last number of years there has been a tremendous deterioration in the various institutions and systems which make up the Canadian nation. This includes the institution in which we are now serving, the churches, and the family, which is the most fundamental institution in our nation. All Canadians have had reason to question the breakdown in law and order, and the deterioration which has taken place in our social systems.

• (12:40 a.m.)

Perhaps I broke a little ice on Sunday evening a week ago when I indicated that I thought there should be a debate in the House of Commons on the present situation. I understand that some who are pretty close to the Speaker and others in high authority thought I was somewhat presumptuous in making such a suggestion. I felt we ought to have a debate such as is now taking place, which I believe has served a useful purpose. No one feels more strongly about the need for law and order in our country than I do. I think my behaviour on Monday illustrated my feelings in this direction.

There must be law and order in the country. I support and respect the attitudes, values, aspirations, goals and objectives of the Canadian people. However, in the past two years I have been disappointed in that we have had very little leadership in this nation. I was amazed to see some good friends of mine, people who aspire to being parliamentary secretaries and ministers and who are potential leaders of our nation, today stand up in the House of Commons and give the government their blind allegiance.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member. There are conversations in the gallery which make it very difficult for the Chair to follow what the hon. member who has the floor is saying. I think there should be respect for the hon. member who has the floor.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lundrigan: In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, there is no one in this chamber with stronger feelings than mine about the fact that in the last two years the Canadian nation has not been given the leadership it deserves. In Canada, we need someone to stand out there in the distance, elevated over the great heights, to be a beacon to show us the way and to show that we have values and attitudes which ought to be admired. We must have a beacon, Mr. Speaker, a man who will stand up and say, "This is the way of progress for Canada." This is the most disturbing period in Canadian history. I am not concerned about myself. I have thought that perhaps I should not have entered Canadian politics if I wanted to make a living. I am fairly content—

An hon. Member: The hon. member should get out of politics.

Mr. Lundrigan: Please do not interrupt. Mr. Speaker, would you ask the hon. member to allow me to speak without interruption for a few more minutes? It is possible for one to get by in Canada, yet I have great concern for the tens of thousands of school children in our nation who want the opportunity to make a living. They want to carve out a small place in our society which gives people freedom to be themselves. Mr. Speaker, it seems that these little niches on our very small globe have become very few and far between. I thought Canada was the place where Canadians could feel free to progress and to advance if they had the leadership which is so necessary. I am disappointed in what has happened in the last couple of years.

Someone has said that the Irish in me is coming out. Perhaps it is. Perhaps I am a bit sentimental. Perhaps we are not sentimental enough because too many of us speak from a political standpoint and tend to say that which is necessary and will appeal to our constituents. I urge all Members of Parliament, including our Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), who has grave responsibilities, and the leaders of the various parties, to exercise from now until we get Canada back on the proper track the greatest discretion, and to provide the best leadership that has ever been had in Canadian history.

Mr. Robert Borrie (Prince George-Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to participate in this debate, but after hearing the comments of some hon. members in this chamber I felt my position should also be put on record. My reasons for not wanting to participate in the debate were these. I felt the views of my colleagues from Quebec would have greater import and impact than mine with regard to the reason for the proclamation issued yesterday. I believe they know conditions in the province

of Quebec much better than I know them, and having listened to the comments of some hon. members I think they would agree.

Prince George-Peace River is a long way from the heart of the problem that required the Prime Minister to make the proclamation yesterday. Even though separated by distance, Mr. Speaker, we are no less sensitive than others to the anguish the FLQ has brought to the citizens of the province of Quebec. We are not faced with the physical presence of violence. We do not have to concern ourselves with the safety of our families. Our businesses and social activities have not been interrupted or challenged by terrorism.

Some hon. members who oppose the government's action suggest that the measure is too broad. They ask: What need is there for other provinces to be covered by the same legislation, when the cancer is rooted in only one province? Mr. Speaker, I feel that the federal responsibility is to all provinces, to all citizens. When we start considering legislation to ensure law and order for citizens in one section of our country, we are tending to balkanize Canada. We will not contribute to the balkanization of our country; legislation passed in this chamber is for all Canadians.

My friend opposite, the hon. member for Kootenay West (Mr. Harding), insisted this afternoon that the government make the information that led to the proclamation yesterday available to Parliament. Surely, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend and others who advocate complete disclosure and revelation of facts must know that the divulging of those facts may be of greater value to the FLQ than to hon. members. Confidential information and discussions, even in caucus, oftentimes turn out to be the day's headlines. I am not implying, Mr. Speaker, that all members are loose of tongue. If I were a law abiding citizen who supplied information to the police or the government, I would start looking for a haven if I knew that my reports were being discussed in this chamber or in committee. Our intentions may be of the highest order, Mr. Speaker, but it does not require a high degree of intelligence to know that informants may be found when the type of information sought is known.

• (12:50 a.m.)

The suggestion has also been made that the act be revoked Monday, and that this House consider special legislation. With all due respect to the process of providing legislation, I hesitate to turn that responsibility over to this chamber. In my few years here I have seen and heard the verbosity that goes on and on in the preparation of refined legislation. Debate is a necessary part of democracy, but in a time of urgency and emergency I would not want to see law enforcement agencies working in limbo, working without the support of the lawmakers of this land.

Concern has also been stated time and again in this debate that this War Measures Act gives too much power to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). I think I speak for a good many Canadians, Mr. Speaker, when I say the power could not be in better hands.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Borrie: This is a pretty gloomy day, Mr. Speaker. No Canadian in full possession of his faculties wants to see the act in use. However, the response that I have received from my own constituents indicates that we have support for the type of regulation in the proclamation.

I have just learned, and I suppose it is general knowledge in the House, Mr. Speaker, that a news bulletin reported that a body has been found in one of the cars used to abduct one or the other of the kidnap victims. A further news report confirms that it is Mr. Laporte. I think that this news firmly entrenches my opinion, views and conviction that this government has acted in a proper way. We are not dealing with political dissenters; we are dealing with organized murderers.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, anyone rising to say anything at this point, in view of the news that has reached us in the last few minutes, cannot but speak in sadness and with restraint. I assure hon. members that I shall exercise restraint and that I shall be as brief as I can. Indeed, apart from the news that brings a special sorrow to our hearts at this time, one would not want to indulge in any repetition at this stage of the debate. Neither do I think there is need for any recrimination at this time.

It is still my view that using the War Measures Act was a mistake. I shall express that by my vote on Monday. But I am prepared to admit that a verdict on that action which perhaps will be more valid than the judgments we try to make here will come later. That verdict will come when all the facts have been made public, maybe a few months from now. If at that point those facts justify the action, we who now feel otherwise will have to admit it. If at that point the action is not justified, the people of Canada will be able to express their opinion when they get the opportunity to do so.

The reason I would like to say a few words, even this late in the debate, is that the question we should now be facing is very simple: Where do we go from here? I have three brief suggestions to make.

The first relates to the question as to what we should do in view of the general feeling of repugnance regarding the use of the War Measures Act, a repugnance expressed not more forcibly by anyone else than it was yesterday by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

This evening I listened with interest to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) when he suggested that because Parliament had put the War Measures Act on our statute books, it was anticipated that it would be used. I do not read our history that way. This evening I again read the statement made by the then minister of justice, Hon. Mr. Doherty, in August 1914, who when moving the bill the first time it was presented, assured Parliament that it was a temporary measure.

I also read this evening the words of Mr. St. Laurent in 1946 when we were in the process of getting rid of the proclamations under the War Measures Act. He said to this House that he hoped it would never be used again. It

seems clear to me that an act that in 56 years has never been used in peacetime is the kind of act that really was not intended for such use. Even so, I confess that I am not happy about the suggestion that has been made repeatedly—indeed, some of my own colleagues have made the suggestion—that instead of dealing with this matter by the War Measures Act that we should amend the Criminal Code.

What bothers me about that is that the Criminal Code is a permanent piece of legislation. If we put into it measures strong enough to deal with a special situation, we may find ourselves with permanent law that goes beyond our concepts of civil liberties and should not be on our statute books.

I make the suggestion that maybe there is room in our statutes for a piece of legislation that could be known as a civil disturbances act. I have in mind an act something similar to the War Measures Act in that it would come into effect only on proclamation, but it would be a special piece of legislation for disturbances or difficulties inside the country. When proclaimed such an act would provide much narrower powers than the War Measures Act, in other words only those powers actually needed. I make this suggestion as one that might be considered. It was my intention to develop that more fully, but obviously at this hour of the morning one shortens his remarks.

Secondly, I feel we have to work very hard to show that in our kind of society we still think there is a better way than to use force or repression to deal with ideas that we do not like. Let it be clear that I am not confusing the FLQ with those other people in Quebec who would like to have independence. The FLQ is the violent expression of that idea. Because the two have got confused, we are in the position of trying to cope with an idea we do not like by use of force.

We have to cope with the idea of separatism or of Quebec being independent in a much better way, by a determined effort to make it clear that it is a better Canada, both for Quebec and the rest of us, if we remain united. I do not want to live in a Canada without Quebec. I agree with the hon. member for Mercier (Mr. Boulanger) that what we are concerned about in this debate is not just saving Quebec but saving Canada.

• (1:00 a.m.)

I think that in order to do this we must rely, not on force, not on repression, not on laws or regulations which go beyond the concepts of civil liberty, but we have to work in all parties in Canada on the proposition I am sure all of us believe in, namely, that this Canada united is better for all of us than a Canada divided in any way whatsoever.

Mr. Prud'homme: Enough.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): A sentence or two more, if the hon. member will permit me. I think we have to face the fact that the terrible experience we have been through has put a strain on relations between French Canada and English Canada. This crisis will pass away, all of us hope, and when it passes away the old conflicts, the old disagreements will come up again. They are submerged at the moment. When they do come up again it will be partly because of what we have been through. We must work very hard, harder than we did before, at understanding each other.

Let us not be surprised if the problem is more difficult because of what we have been through. I think the goal is still worth achieving, the goal of a united Canada, and—

Some hon. Members: Enough.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I recognize how strongly people feel, and I am prepared to recognize the fact that those who knew Mr. Laporte more intimately than did some of us, feel very sad. This is a sad moment not only for Quebec but for all of Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Saint-Denis on a question of privilege.

Mr. Prud'homme: Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances, the best thing the hon. member could do would be to offer his silence for a better united Canada.

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I do not quarrel with the hon. member. I was in the midst of my last sentence. I shall say no more. We are all very sad, tonight.

Mr. Speaker: It appears to the Chair that all hon. members who desired to do so have spoken to the motion now before the House. Accordingly, pursuant to the special order, a recorded division on the motion and the amendments thereto is deemed to have been demanded and ordered deferred until Monday, October 19.

This House stands adjourned until Monday at eleven o'clock in the morning.

At 1.05 a.m. the House adjourned, pursuant to special Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, October 19, 1970

The House met at 11 a.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

THE LATE PIERRE LAPORTE

ASSASSINATION BY FLQ—EXPRESSION OF TRIBUTE AND SYMPATHY

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the House learned late Saturday night of the brutal, cowardly slaying of Pierre Laporte. That tragic event is evidence of the moral wasteland occupied by the FLQ. Their activities these past days have been designed to turn Canadian against Canadian. The FLQ scheme has been a deliberate provocation of hate. Their purpose is to inspire within all of us fear and hatred, and in this atmosphere to destroy our nation.

They will not succeed.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: Canadians for too long have known freedom, practised tolerance, and enjoyed the benefits of our rich cultural diversity. They will not be tricked by such a transparent device; they will not be dominated by criminals. Canadians have seen, too, the bitter and divisive effects in other countries when hatred is met by hate, when crime is followed by vengeance, when reason is overcome totally by emotion.

[*Translation*]

Made up of men full of hatred, the FLQ resorts to violence to inspire hate, feed it and to spread it insidiously, hoping that disorder, confusion and panic will then prevail.

Such is its first purpose. Such is the trap it is setting for us: to turn Canadian against Canadian, to divide us through hatred and racism, to aggravate disagreements between generations even to the point where they can no longer be reconciled. But those fanatics are perhaps even more diabolic in their need to inspire hatred for themselves—blind hatred. Thus they could bring us down to their level and degrade our society.

[*English*]

Pierre Laporte devoted his life to the betterment of the people of Quebec. Hon. members will have an opportunity tomorrow to pay their respects to this man. In the interim, all Canada grieves for Madame Laporte and her children. They will know that the name of Pierre Laporte will be repeated by school children for generations as a symbol of our steadfast opposition to division, disunity and hatred in Canada.

This deed will not deter progress toward needed social change; rather, it will reinspire the many persons in all parts of Canada who share the broad vision of Pierre Laporte.

By this deed the FLQ has sown the seeds of its own destruction. It has revealed that it has no mandate but terror, no policies but violence, and no solutions but murder. It is alien to all that is Canadian. It will not survive.

[*Translation*]

Those men with hatred in their hearts thought they could divide us in tragedy, but they bring us together today in a same will.

For the only passion which must drive us now is the passion for justice. Through justice, we will get rid of the perversion of terrorism. Through justice, we will find peace and freedom.

• (11:10 a.m.)

[*English*]

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my deep regrets and those of my colleagues to those expressed by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). My colleagues and I were shocked, as was the rest of Canada, by the brutal murder Saturday of Pierre Laporte.

His death was particularly shocking because Mr. Laporte was a great humanitarian and he died in a very inhumane way. He was, of course, a distinguished parliamentarian, a journalist, and a man who has rightfully been called one of the fathers of the new Quebec.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, our French-Canadian fellow citizens are going through grievous hours of national mourning. But this affliction is a blow to the whole country.

Posthumously, I would like to stress how convincing Mr. Pierre Laporte was in his determination. This supporter of human rights was the victim of pseudo reformers. The execution of an innocent man makes their action all the more horrible.

Those activists, which we can hardly call men, have already proven that nobody can hope to build a new society through bloodshed.

[*English*]

Mr. Laporte believed that firm words were the instrument of effective social change. Throughout his career his words and deeds were his weapons of progress in his beloved Quebec. Pierre Laporte has become a martyr in the eyes of all democratically-minded Canadians. His

death must not be a useless tragedy. We must ensure that his death will be a milestone in the struggle for Canadian unity.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: This, sir, should be a day of unity. The questions I raised on Friday last remain as important to me as then, but this is a day for unity and I hope that we can show it.

Mr. Laporte was a gifted parliamentarian. It is especially fitting, therefore, that we pay tribute to him here in Parliament. I express my sympathy to the government, to the National Assembly and to the people of Quebec. Above all, Pierre Laporte was a gentleman and a devoted husband and father, and it is for his family that our feelings run deepest at this time. He was a friendly man, and all Canadians have lost a friend in the death of Pierre Laporte.

[*Translation*]

Once more, Mr. Speaker, in this hero of democratic values, I pay homage to a man dedicated to his cause and his province, a responsible parliamentarian.

I express my deepest sympathy to the family and friends of the deceased.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*English*]

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, all members of the House, and I am certain the great majority of the Canadian people, are appalled and disgusted at the unnecessary and cruel murder of Mr. Pierre Laporte. This was a crime for which there can be no possible excuse.

Pierre Laporte was a man who believed in the unity of the Canadian people, who worked toward that end and maintained a bridge between the French-speaking and English-speaking people of this country. He is a martyr now in that cause. It remains for those who support his point of view in the province of Quebec and those who support his point of view in the rest of Canada to take up his task and to cement that unity and that friendship between the two founding races of this country. I should like to pay tribute to Mr. Laporte's memory, to the heroism of his death, and to the magnanimity of his life. On behalf of the New Democratic Party I should also like to extend our deepest sympathy and heartfelt condolences to Madame Laporte, members of the family and his colleagues in the government and legislature of the province of Quebec.

I wish to say that on this day all members of this House, irrespective of political party, stand united in our determination to stamp out terrorism in this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): There is growing up in the world a double standard of morality. Some hold forth the concept that crimes committed in the name of an alleged cause are excusable although they would not be excusable if committed as a result of passion or for personal gain. I reject this double standard. Terror is terror, murder is murder, kidnapping is kidnapping, and to claim that these crimes are committed for political reasons is no excuse whatsoever. Therefore it is the responsibility of this Parliament to give the government every support in its attempt to apprehend and bring to justice those who have been responsible both for these kidnappings and for the murder of Mr. Laporte.

In this very serious and tragic situation I believe it is important that all of us keep cool heads and that we do not allow hysteria to precipitate us into taking action that we would later regret. The government has a responsibility. That responsibility is to use all the means in its power to hunt down those who are responsible and to bring them to justice. That is a laudable objective. In the carrying out of that responsibility the government will have the fullest support and co-operation of the New Democratic Party members in this House.

But we in the opposition also have a responsibility. Part of our job here is constantly to remind the government and the people of this country that in taking the measures that are necessary to punish those who are guilty we do not at the same time injure innocent people. It is a function of the opposition always to raise its voice in the interest of those who may innocently suffer in the process of seeking out the terrorists. I hope we can make clear to the people of Canada that there are democratic ways by which we can meet a crisis like this and that we never want in Canada to have to choose between the horrible alternatives of terrorism on the one hand or a police state on the other.

We believe, as I think all Canadians do, that if we stand together with clear objectives we can effectively meet this crisis and at the same time preserve the democratic institutions we hold dear and for which brave men have laid down their lives in days gone by.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (11:20 a.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and myself endorse fully the statement of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on the dreadful events which took place in Quebec over the week-end.

Any French Canadian worthy of the name feels great shame following the savage assassination of Pierre Laporte. We wish to extend to his wife, his mother, his children and his family, as well as to the Quebec government, our most sincere sympathy.

It is indeed unfortunate that this dirty job should have been carried out by people claiming to be dedicated to the liberation of Quebec when they did not hesitate to destroy in cold blood the life of Pierre Laporte. Let us face it, the avowed purpose of the FLQ is to do exactly what they have done in Quebec over the week-end. I say

that all its members are killers just like those who put an end to Pierre Laporte's life, unscrupulous killers.

I am convinced that the FLQ leaders know everything, including the place where their bandits are hiding, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that those leaders should immediately be brought before a firing squad and compelled to divulge everything about the activities, the structure and the existence of the FLQ movement, which is bent on destroying the free society in which we live. They should be compelled to denounce their killers, their bandits, on the threat of having 10 of their members executed for each person they kill.

The government knows who are the leaders of the FLQ. It should bring them before the firing squad, in order to put an end to this unspeakable terrorism in Quebec.

My words may sound harsh, Mr. Speaker, but I suggest that, if democracy does not defend itself, it will again be attacked within a few days or a few weeks.

The people of this country are sick and tired of FLQ activities which do not date back to only a month or two. You may blame as much as you like the distress of some people in certain areas of Canada for the existence of the FLQ, it is just not so. You may succeed in providing Canada with the best of societies, still the FLQ members will try and destroy it because their purpose is not to build but precisely to destroy, to foster hate and iniquity and to maintain an unbreathable atmosphere in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, in the last couple of days, I have received many telegrams referring to the stand we took immediately after the government and the Right. Hon. Prime Minister introduced this new legislation. Out of all those messages, only two take us to task for supporting the government.

The first telegram came from the Communist Party of Toronto, the Communist Party of Canada. The second, from the heads of the Federation of National Trade Unions and of the Quebec Labour Federation, from Mr. René Levesque and Mr. Claude Ryan, of *Le Devoir,* put the blame on Ottawa for the present situation.

Those are the people who are blaming us for taking the position everyone is aware of in regard to what is happening in our country. We must stand our ground. We must enact new legislation to ensure greater respect of individual freedom. We do not want a permanent police state, but neither do we want the people of Canada to feel that their rights are being encroached upon and that they are being deprived of their freedom.

In view of present developments, we believe the government will bring forward more appropriate legislation so that individuals—mothers, fathers, young people of both sexes, children may live free and secure in a country which deserves better than this weekend's tragic events.

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

UNDERTAKING TO INTRODUCE BILL TO REPLACE WAR MEASURES ACT REGULATIONS

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a short statement having to do with the future business of the house. As background I wish to draw attention to a statement made by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on Friday last in the debate, with which we are all familiar. The Prime Minister said:

> Following the passage of enough time to give the government the necessary experience to assess the type of statute which may be required in these circumstances, it is my firm intention to discuss with the leaders of the opposition parties the desirability of introducing legislation of a less comprehensive nature. In this respect I earnestly solicit from the leaders and from all hon. members constructive suggestions for the amendment of the regulations. Such suggestions will be given careful consideration for possible inclusion in any new statute.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that letters have already been directed to the leaders of the opposition parties on this general question, indicating the willingness of the government to consider their suggestions.

At the same time, at the request of the government the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) has been working all week end with his officials with a view to determining when it might be possible to bring in the bill to which the Prime Minister referred in his statement. The Minister of Justice has now reported. In fact, he concluded his work at midnight last night and, as a result of his report, it will be possible to have such a bill prepared and we intend to introduce it for first reading in the House within a month.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacEachen: Naturally, Mr. Speaker, the present proclamation cannot be revoked until the new legislation is passed by Parliament. How long that will take in view of the importance of the legislation is very difficult to foresee and will depend on the time taken in proposing amendments, in discussion in this House and in the other place.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for his statement. I think it goes to show the country that this House, like a family, can, when a crisis escalates and catastrophe threatens, draw together and present a common and united front to show the enemies within and the watchers without that strength can be used with moderation and reason.

What has been said by the minister makes some difference in the approach this party takes to the issue now before the House in the amendment which has been proposed, and before I sit down I intend to seek on behalf of the member who moved the amendment—he may have to do this himself—unanimous consent to withdraw it. This, of course, will make a difference in the support

this party will be able to give to the motion which has been placed before the House by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

• (11:30 a.m.)

The virtue, Mr. Speaker, of a democratic system is that there can be a debate on the issue on such an occasion, permitting hon. members to place on record views they may hold very strongly on certain points, and at the same time meet the crisis with the sort of unity which is so very essential. If it is not in order to withdraw the amendment now, I give notice on behalf of the hon. member for Cumberland-Colchester North (Mr. Coates) that at the appropriate time the amendment to the motion will be withdrawn.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, the members of the New Democratic Party welcome the statement by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) that legislation will be introduced within a month to deal with unusual civil disturbances or anticipated sabotage. We in this party took the position last week that the government should have dealt with the situation in Canada in this way rather than by resorting to the invocation of the War Measures Act.

Some of the statements that have been made in the last few days indicate how serious such a sweeping measure can be. For example, the mayor of one large city said that this would be an excellent way to clear out the hippies and draft dodgers. The difficulty with such sweeping powers is that they may not always be used for the intended purpose, particularly in view of the fact that the Criminal Code and the Public Order Regulations, 1970, will not be administered by the federal government but by the Attorneys General of the provinces. Consequently I can understand the desire of the government to bring in specific legislation rather than having the great reservoir of power it now has under the War Measures Act.

There is little value at this time in arguing about whether the government should or should not have invoked the War Measures Act. We feel they should not have, but that question is academic. We are now operating under the War Measures Act. But the sooner we can get out from under this Act and have specific legislation dealing with specific crimes, the better, rather than an omnibus piece of legislation; a net so wide it can gather in all kinds of people who may not be persona grata with the authorities in some parts of Canada.

At ten o'clock this morning I received the letter, dated last Saturday, from the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in which he asked for our suggestions. We thank the Prime Minister for requesting our opinions. We will certainly give him our best thought on this matter and suggestions which we hope the government will consider.

When the legislation is introduced we will be prepared to give the government what we deem to be adequate powers to deal with the crisis provided that the rights and liberties of citizens are fully preserved and protected. The sooner the government can have this legislation ready for our consideration, the better. I am convinced that it is not a healthy situation to have the country under the very wide powers under the War Measures Act which are now granted to the various authorities.

[Mr. Baldwin.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, we are thankful to the government and to the President of the Privy Council for introducing this motion which will enable us to consider an appropriate measure to take care of situations that may arise in this country.

But, we must not forget that Friday morning when the government suggested support for the War Measures Act, it did not impose it to the province of Quebec. It was upon request by the government of the province of Quebec and the municipal authorities of Montreal that emergency measures were proposed last Friday.

At that time, there was no other way to act faster, I think, than the government did. But if the government can introduce a bill within a month to ensure freedom to its citizens while being able to act more promptly to hunt down those who are responsible for the situation—as we know it—to arrest those who are responsible when there is a riot, an attack or activities which are not in the best interest of the people and endanger the security and the freedom of Canadian people, we shall then have a more appropriate legislation.

Given last Friday's circumstances, the government did what it had to do. Contrary to what some people claim, it did not impose its will in the province of Quebec. Indeed, certain discontented people insinuate that the government of Quebec is the slave of the federal government. It is quite far from the truth: the authorities of Quebec and of the city of Montreal asked for the assistance of the federal government. I know what I am saying because the mayor of Montreal called me on the subject.

Those who say that Ottawa wanted to take the lead are wrong. I think that Ottawa wanted to help the province of Quebec and the city of Montreal in order to restore order and maintain the right to freedom of individuals who want to be free.

Mr. Speaker, again we thank the government for bringing in this motion under which it will be possible to pass legislation ensuring personal freedom and at the same time, authorizing the arrest of those ready to deprive Canadians of such freedom.

* * *

[*English*]

CANADA SHIPPING ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING DISCHARGE OF POLLUTANTS BY SHIPS

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-2, to amend the Canada Shipping Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

INVESTMENT COMPANIES BILL

FILING OF STATEMENTS AND INFORMATION, QUALIFICATIONS AND DUTIES OF AUDITORS, TRANSFER OF SHARES, ETC.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-3, respecting investment companies.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

EMERGENCY GOLD MINING ASSISTANCE ACT

AMENDMENT EXTENDING APPLICATION TO JUNE 30, 1973

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-4, to amend the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

• (11:40 a.m.)

[*Translation*]

DEUTERIUM OF CANADA ASSISTANCE ACT

AUTHORIZATION OF GRANT TO NOVA SCOTIA TO ASSIST COMPANY

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-5, entitled "An Act to authorize the making of a grant to the province of Nova Scotia for the purpose of providing assistance to Deuterium of Canada Limited.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Under the heading "Introduction of Bills" there is, as hon. members know, a long list of private members' bills to be introduced. I propose to make a statement in connection with the introduction of those bills. The House may feel that this might not be the appropriate time to become involved with this kind of statement. I think it might be made tomorrow if hon. members will allow these bills to stand.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: First reading of Senate public bills. Government notices of motions. Oral questions. Orders of the day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

NATIONAL SECURITY

APPREHENDED INSURRECTION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43 TO APPROVE ACTION OF GOVERNMENT IN INVOKING WAR MEASURES ACT

The House resumed, from Saturday, October 17, consideration of the motion of Mr. Trudeau:

That the House approves the action of the government in invoking the powers of the War Measures Act to meet the state of apprehended insurrection in the Province of Quebec as communicated to the Prime Minister by the Government of Quebec and the civic authorities of Montreal and further approves the orders and regulations tabled today by the Prime Minister on the clear understanding that the proclamation invoking the powers as contained in the regulations will be revoked on or before April 30, 1971, unless a resolution authorizing their extension beyond the date specified has been approved by the House.

And the amendment thereto of Mr. Coates (page 269).

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I understand there is a desire on the part of the hon. member who moved the amendment to seek the unanimous consent of the House for the purpose of withdrawing it. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendment (Mr. Coates) withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the wish of the House that the Chair put the motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the wish of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Speaker: Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Trudeau) which was agreed to on the following division:

• (11:50 a.m.)

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken	Baldwin
Alexander	Barrett
Alkenbrack	Basford
Allmand	Beaudoin
Anderson	Béchard
Andras	Benson
Asselin	Bigg
Badanai	Blair

Division

Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Brown
Buchanan
Caccia
Cadieu
Cafik
Caouette
Carter
Chappell
Chrétien
Clermont
Coates
Code
Comeau
Comtois
Corbin
Côté (Richelieu)
Côté (Longueuil)
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Danforth
Danson
Deachman
Deakon
Diefenbaker
Dionne
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Drury
Dubé
Duquet
Faulkner
Flemming
Forget
Forrestall
Foster
Francis
Gauthier
Gendron
Gervais
Gibson
Gillespie
Givens
Goode
Goyer
Gray
Greene
Grills
Groos
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Haidasz
Hales
Harries
Hees
Hogarth
Hopkins
Horner
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Howard (Skeena)
Howe
Hymmen
Isabelle
Jamieson
Jerome
Kaplan
Kierans
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Korchinski
Lachance
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt)
Langlois
Laniel
Laprise
La Salle
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lind
Lundrigan
MacDonald (Egmont)
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacEwan
MacGuigan
MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond)
Mackasey
MacLean
Macquarrie
McBride
McCleave
McCutcheon
McGrath
McIlraith
McIntosh
McKinley
McNulty
Mahoney
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Langelier)
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Marshall
Mather
Mazankowski
Monteith
Morison
Munro
Nesbitt
Noble
Noël
Nowlan
O'Connell
Olson
Orange
Osler
Ouellet
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Perrault
Portelance
Pringle
Prud'homme
Reid
Ricard
Richard
Richardson
Roberts
Rochon
Rock
Roy (Timmins)
Roy (Laval)
Ryan
Saltsman
Schumacher
Scott
Sharp
Skoreyko
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
Stanfield
Stewart (Cochrane)
Stewart (Marquette)
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
St. Pierre
Sullivan
Tétrault
Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Tolmie
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Valade
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whicher
Whiting
Winch
Woolliams
Yanakis
Yewchuk—190.

[Mr. Speaker.]

NAYS

Messrs:

Barnett
Brewin
Broadbent
Burton
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Gilbert
Harding
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Lewis
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Nystrom
Orlikow
Peters
Rose
Skoberg
Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley)—16.

* * *

• (12:10 p.m.)

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The House resumed, from Thursday, October 15, consideration of the motion of Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel, for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session.

Mr. S. Perry Ryan (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, may I congratulate the mover (Mr. Trudel) and seconder (Mr. Douglas, Assiniboia) of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. They have been signally honoured by being chosen for their role in this debate and they have acquitted themselves well and deserve the commendations of this House and of their constituents. May I also compliment the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Badanai) who spoke so well on Wednesday, not for the manner in which he felt he had to eulogize the Speech from the Throne but for his excellent remarks on the subjects of anti-Americanism and immigration.

This country is in a mess. It promises to become worse rather than better. Dreaminess, softness, inaction and then over-reaction have replaced practicality and common sense. As a result there is social unrest in this country. The financial and fiscal affairs have been mismanaged and the government's ivory tower misconcep-

tions of the needs of the country have been and are harmful to its urban areas and particularly harmful to metropolitan Toronto.

The affairs of this country are in an almost incredible mess, given the facts of our wealth of resources, plant, know-how and connections. This country was not fighting a war, at least until last Friday, save for the public relations war on poverty. This government was not policing the world; yet our interest rates and inflation have risen higher than in the United States and all the western nations except for a few banana republics, and our rate of unemployment is 6.9 per cent.

At the last election the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) asked for a working majority. At the rate he is going he should have reversed that and asked for a majority working.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Ryan: According to the Paris-based Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, which studies such things, Canada's economic growth as revealed by its annual productivity increase has fallen and is now just over 2 per cent, or one of the lowest in all the western countries. It is expected to be zero by the end of this year. This organization expresses surprise at our poor showing having regard to our potential. At this moment in time what this country needs as a leader is not a dreamy front man, but a practical, economic redeemer and social stabilizer.

Since I joined the young Liberals when I was 16 years of age until I became a Liberal Member of Parliament I was adamantly convinced of a few Liberal political dogmas: First, that the Tory party was the party of big business; second, that the Liberal party was the party for immigration and the Tory party was constantly and inconstantly the one to turn the tap off and on; third, that in this country Tory times were tough times.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: But you changed your mind.

Mr. Ryan: I did. I first found out as a member that the Liberal party was the party of big business, then that the Liberal party was prepared purposely to cut immigration in half, and some wanted to eliminate it completely and, finally, that Trudeau times were tough times.

In respect of inflation I feel that the government is largely the author of its own misfortune. It has doubled the money supply since taking office in 1963. Not being on the gold standard, it exercised its prerogative to print money and printed too much. The money supply includes bills and coins in circulation and moneys on deposit, as most hon. members well know.

• (12:20 p.m.)

In the midst of this situation and to my astonishment, at the time of the last ten-year review of the Bank Act the government decided to lift the ceiling on bank interest rates completely. I could see the allowance of government-controlled increases, provided the power to lower the ceiling was retained, but not removal of the ceiling. Against some opposition in the Liberal party, the then Minister of Finance, now Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp), insisted on pressing for complete removal. This made one wonder how large the campaign contributions had been to the party. All that was required at the time and all that is required now is a ceiling sufficiently high to permit the banks to compete with trust companies and near-banks for savings deposits. These competitors should be controlled too, if necessary. Thus, there should be a ceiling and it should float at the discretion of the cabinet, on the advice of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson). The Speech from the Throne should have announced a new ceiling of 6½ per cent.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Ryan: But no—and as a result of this naïve and disastrous decision the five big Canadian banks have had not just a hey-day but three successive years of record profits at the expense of downward spirals in almost every other sector of the country's economy. There have been repercussions in other ways. With swollen deposits created in large part by the printing presses, as the government sought to dodge interest payments on bond issues, the banks have made a killing. In raising their rates to all the traffic could possibly bear these solid but favoured institutions drove interest rates on mortgages and consumer credit loans to new and almost incredible highs. With what results? Big business, cost-push inflation, buyer resistance, construction slow-down, housing lack, excessive wage demands, excessive prices, productivity slump bankruptcies—and there are many of these in Toronto now—demands to exclude immigrants, unemployment, emigration and, finally, loss of government revenues.

The need to float the dollar has caused the government to break this country's agreement with the International Monetary Fund to keep a fixed dollar. The Canadian dollar became suddenly strong, not just because our exports, mostly of primary resources, surged temporarily after long strike conditions, nor because our auto pact agreement with the United States is productive of foreign exchange, nor because our imports are down due to lessened productivity. The truth is that it became temporarily strong mainly because the combination of the premium of eight cents on the dollar plus our fantastic domestic interest rates was starting a flood of United States dollar investments in Canada, in both properties and equities, which condition, in addition to giving the government an exchange problem, would give Walter Gordon and the Toronto *Star* apoplexy if it were allowed to continue. Indeed, the failure to act in time and firmly on controlling interest rates, prices and wages, and the oversteering of this government by the Prime Minister and his awkward squad within his office and in the cabinet, have caused a domestic emergency within this country and further harmed its low stock abroad.

Because I was closely associated with the NATO picture and Canada's position in the Alliance I was deeply disturbed when the Prime Minister, before the last election, began questioning this country's participation. I was alarmed at his and others' remarks afterwards. As chairman of our Parliamentary Association I had travelled for two and a half years liaisoning with the 14 other NATO countries. When he did not seek my opinion I wrote to him offering to prepare a memorandum of my thoughts on NATO for him to consider but received no reply whatsoever.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Ryan: While I did not and do not want our troops to remain in Europe forever or even to carry on their nuclear roles past 1975 when our planes will be obsolete, I believed and still do that we must pay our fair share of the premium for this successful insurance policy. The irony of our unilateral reduction of our heavy armoured brigade at Soest and our air wing in southern Germany against the spirit of the Harmel report and the pleadings of our allies is that the air mobile force will have to be equipped with helicopters and other forms of transport that will likely cost more than the tanks and planes to purchase and to operate, and NATO really does not need that role filled as it did the former ones. To some degree our participation in the alliance has been maintained but the cost to our country's reliability in the 14 other NATO countries has been great.

So much for the west. In the east the government has been on its knees for almost two years trying to be recognized by Red China, to the dismay of a great many Canadians, the United States and almost every country on the Pacific rim. After the last election the government decided to recognize Red China even if it meant withdrawing recognition of the Republic of China at Taiwan and expulsion of its embassy at Ottawa. This is said to be a logical thing to do because Mao in Red China rules over millions of people and a large territory and has *de facto* control. Exactly the same logical case can be put for the recognition of Rhodesia and East Germany, but the Secretary of State for External Affairs has stated in the House that Canada will not recognize these regimes. Neither Red China nor any other country should dictate our foreign policy.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Ryan: And it certainly should not dictate to us what our relations will be with any other country or any other government, but it did. Now the Maoists have a red carpet to Ottawa and a front seat view of Washington at a time when the author of this misfortune has found it necessary to invoke the War Measures Act to fight their like and to cancel his trip to Moscow. Oh, the irony of it all!

Like so many of the policies of the government, Mr. Speaker, the promise of participatory democracy in Canada is a sham. The "Action Trudeau", young live wires of 1968 have died in infancy. Contrary to vaunted, bureaucratic utterances, the white paper on tax reform is not a valid example of participatory democracy. Mr. Philip Johnson of the Montreal *Gazette*, killed this notion dead when he wrote on September 30 last:

> So what it boils down to is, in order for Mr. Trudeau's participatory democracy to work, every citizen must be rich, highly educated, unemployed and have access to all government information.

• (12:30 p.m.)

> The only ones in Canada who appear to measure up to these standards are cabinet ministers, but even some of them are not that rich or educated.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Ryan: Of course, a very bad feature of the policy of issuing a white paper and then debating tax reform in the various communications media and in House committees is that lawyers and accountants do not know how to advise their clients with any certainty. How can a lawyer possibly draw a good will these days for a client worth $100,000 or more? This has been the situation for almost a year and it is likely to continue indefinitely. Many new business ventures, particularly in Ontario, have been stalled or lost because of the uncertainty created by the white paper.

After the federal changes are made the provinces will ask: where will we get our money and what will we do to adjust to the new changes in the income and estate taxes? I submit that these problems will continue for a long while yet. The provinces will not be happy either because, for some reason, they were never consulted before the white paper was drawn up or tabled. So much for this government's respect for co-operative federalism.

I am greatly concerned about urban problems, particularly as those of metropolitan Toronto are worse than those in any other city or region in Canada, and they promise to worsen rapidly. Everywhere across the country there is increasing unemployment, and cities are hard-pressed as they see ever larger numbers of employable people applying for welfare. They attribute the increase to the government's peculiar way of fighting inflation and they seek assistance from that government to make up the difference in the cost. So far there has been no sign of relief from Ottawa.

Urban transit presents grievous problems in both Canada and the United States, but the United States is doing something about them. The federal government there has committed itself to the provision of $5 billion over a period of five years for the capital and operational requirements of urban areas throughout the United States, whereas the Canadian government up to this point has never really been involved in mass transit financing or planning.

Montreal, in addition to Dorval, is getting a great new international airport at Ste. Scholastique. Toronto and southern Ontario may or may not have another airport by 1976, and it may or may not be an international one. No one knows very much about it.

The present Malton airport is international but in a very limited sense as direct flights are only permitted to the United States, the Caribbean and a few other points. If the direct scheduled flights from other continents which should be permitted to land at Malton on the basis of points of origin and final destination were permitted to land there directly, then there would be no need for the Montreal district to have a second airport in priority to the Toronto district. In that part of the just society the inhabitants of the Toronto region are being grossly penalized in terms of inconvenience, loss of time and expense.

The following airlines may land at Toronto only: BOAC, Air Canada, and Canadian Pacific. The following airlines can land at Montreal only: Sabena, KLM, Swissair, Alitalia, Air France, Lufthansa, Iberia, Aeroflot, and Canadian Pacific. The following airlines will be able to land at Montreal next spring: El Al, and TAP.

Charter flights go directly from departure point to destination. During the first three months of this year, 15,726 passengers took off from Toronto for European cities. Only 2,735 took off from Montreal, and we cannot get the exact breakdown figures from DBS on scheduled commercial flights. However, these charter flight figures illustrate that the Toronto airport is almost six times more important as an international airport than Montreal. On scheduled flights to and from Europe, perhaps one million passengers a year are compelled to make an unnecessary stop at Montreal. I believe that this glaringly unjust condition will only be rectified by the defeat of the present government whose leader is convinced that Toronto is the city that has everything and that it should be treated as a milk cow and nothing more.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Ryan: This Robin Hood philosophy leads the Prime Minister to believe that the constitution prevents him from doing anything for this metropolitan area, but when the designated areas of Quebec, the Maritimes and the Prairies are needy the story is quite different. Under FRED and ARDA and other aid programs, millions of dollars collected in Ontario, British Columbia and Alberta are used to pay for roads, bridges, parks resettlement, and manufacturing and processing plants in these areas. I do not complain about the economic assistance to these areas, although no doubt many of the ventures being assisted will prove to be uneconomic and a large part of the program will be a failure. But I do complain that none of this handing-out could be done without the co-operation of the provinces and municipalities involved. The Prime Minister's inconsistency is that the constitution does not bind him for these programs, but it does for similar types of aid to the cities. It is an incredible position for the Prime Minister to be taking in the circumstances.

I am glad to see that after the constant prodding and urging of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) the government in the Speech from the Throne proposes the reorganization of its urban activities. Now it admits it had some. Such reorganization is to be under the direction of a minister of state for urban affairs and housing. He will not have a full-fledged department but a co-ordinating role, we are told. This could be a good, sincere move but, on the other hand, it may only be a tranquilizer and a stall. The Prime Minister has never been enthusiastic about urban problems and has had to be bulldozed into making this change, not just by the Leader of the Opposition but by some hon. members across the floor. The need of cities to improve and expand their services is great and urgent, and their taxing field has reached the point of exhaustion. Federal money is a must for the cities.

Mr. Alexander: Hear, hear!

Mr. Ryan: I hear the hon. member for Hamilton West (Mr. Alexander) thinks so too. We in Toronto can be thankful to the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Hellyer) for his great sacrifice of one and a half years ago. The greatest need of all in the Toronto area is for an adequate supply of good, serviced building land for planned subdivisions in the adjoining countryside, satellite or new cities, or all three types of development. Only federal money can provide the necessary land bank that will plan towns and reduce the cost of a serviced building lot. This assistance, together with the removal of the 11 per cent tax on building materials at least for residential construction, is desperately required in Toronto, and I am sure also in the Montreal and Hamilton areas. If nothing is done in the area of housing and planned subdivisions, in a few years the lack of housing and lodging in Toronto at sensible costs and rents will cause the city to decline into a city of eyesores, slums and contrasting baronial homes, all of this associated with mounting violence.

In recent days we have seen terrorists attempting to subject the government to blackmail. They have stooped to assassination. Citizens and government alike are forced to recognize that we have failed to deal adequately with the deeply set social problems which give rise to such terrorism.

• (12:40 p.m.)

We must realize that a great many of our social ills have their roots in our cities, with their inadequate housing and outmoded urban transportation systems and, most of all, poverty. The federal government likes to give the impression that it is meeting the problems of our cities. Nothing could be further from the truth. For the whole country it allocated some $200 million for low-income housing projects. The city of Toronto alone, with a waiting list of 22,327 families for public housing, could very well have found use for most of the $200 million. Montreal and Vancouver, with their tremendous increases in population, are facing an equally tragic situation in trying to give their populations adequate housing at a price they can afford. The brightly coloured wood panels hiding the scars of our cities can no longer contain the restlessness of our people.

It was said in the Throne Speech that a just society is "a society in which individual freedom and equality of

opportunity remain as our most cherished possessions." We sincerely hope that the government still bears in mind this high ideal in the thinking out of its public housing policy.

If public housing projects are in too many cases better looking ghettos, as has been indicated by the minister responsible for housing, then the authorities should not be afraid to consider other alternatives. The government should consider empowering the Canadian Development Corporation to run provincially incorporated building societies as subsidiaries or to invest in them. Large-scale, subsidized rental in certain cases might be a much more appropriate answer to the needs of the citizens. If it is not too late, let us give our cities a human face. Let us bear in mind that an urban policy should not aim at efficiency to the detriment of the well-being of the citizen. Cities should be built for man and not man for the city.

We of the opposition welcome the decision of the government to establish an urban council. We hope that this council will achieve what is most needed and what the government took so long to recognize—co-ordination of federal activities in the cities. This urban council should not be a centralist mechanism through which Ottawa tells the cities and provinces what it has decided to build, as was done in the case of some airport projects. The urban council should be a source of information and knowledge, a council where the three levels of government consult and exchange data which will contribute to improving the quality of urban life.

The membership of the urban council should consist of permanent members of federal and provincial governments along with flexible representation for municipal authorities. In other words, the membership should change for the cities and other municipalities according to the problem being discussed and the region affected. For example, a new Toronto airport location is the concern of most municipalities in southern Ontario, whereas waterfront development is the concern of the municipalities from Oshawa right around the western end of Lake Ontario to Port Dalhousie.

In its research division we sincerely hope that the urban council will dedicate its energy to finding a solution to the pressing problem of urban transportation. In Toronto even 16-lane highways are insufficient to meet the demands of the heavy traffic flow. Solutions must be found for in-city traffic, whether by pressurized tubes, mini rails or other such systems. These are badly needed in areas which the subways do not service.

Canada is a young and affluent country, yet its railway systems are 20 years behind. The nation's capital is serviced by a milk train to Toronto. Canada should take a look at Japan and France where immense progress is being achieved in the field of railway transportation.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I just say that investments in urban affairs programs are not a modern frill. They are urgently required to repair the damage of years of neglect.

[Mr. Ryan.]

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Roy (Laval): Mr. Speaker, before I make any comments on the Address in reply to the Throne speech, I would like to mention that we have just witnessed a vote I consider the most important since my election to the House. I think that there is not one member who would like to see a situation similar to the one that exists in Quebec repeat itself.

I would also like to thank and congratulate all the hon. members who expressed their views in the debate that lasted until Sunday morning. We all felt that the problem did not concern Quebec only but the whole country and as a member from Quebec, I thank all my colleagues who gave us their sympathy, although the tragic events occurred in the province of Quebec, and particularly in Montreal.

Being the first government member to speak on the address today, in the name of my constituents I wish to extend sincere sympathy to Mrs. Laporte and her family in the tragic hours they are living at this time. Pierre Laporte was a great parliamentarian who had a clear vision of the problems and was a specialist in urban matters.

When he was Minister of Municipal Affairs, Pierre Laporte fully endorsed the Sylvestre report recommending the merger of 14 municipalities on Ile Jesus, a centre that now ranks as the second largest municipality in Quebec with a population of 230,000.

Many have paid tribute to you and justly so, Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the proceedings. Such expressions of admiration and regard reflect your own impartiality and the firmness you have always shown in conducting our proceedings.

I wish to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, the hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel) who made us so deeply aware of urban problems, and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas), who outlined the situation prevailing in the western provinces.

• (12:50 p.m.)

These two members distinguished themselves by their committee work, the former during the study of the proposals for tax reform by the Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs and the latter, during the study of Bill C-196 entitled "An Act respecting grain."

I am pleased to make my humble contribution during the debate on the Speech from the Throne. I shall take this opportunity to acquaint the hon. members with some peculiarities of the constituency I have the honour to represent here.

The Laval constituency, in the western part of Laval, on Ile Jésus, is separated from the Canadian metropolis by the Back River and comprises 60 per cent of the population of City of Laval. As I said at the beginning, it

is the second largest in Quebec, both in size and in population. We anticipate an increase in population of approximately 100,000 over the next ten years.

The City of Laval as seen from the air, looks like an island of greenery between two bodies of water, the Rivière des Milles-Îles and the back river, Rivière des Prairies.

All ethnic groups are represented in Laval, which contributes to its cultural wealth. In a move to get closer to our western friends, on September 22, 1967, the City of Laval was paired with the City of Saskatoon, and this initiative has helped to seal the bonds of friendship between those two Canadian cities.

Large green areas have been set aside. The fertile soil of the farm-lands is ideal for growing vegetable produce for the Montreal market; in addition, four golf courses make of Laval a golfer's paradise. Because of the interest shown by the municipal authorities and of a well-organized sports and recreation department, Laval will be preparing serious contenders for the 1976 Olympic Games.

The lay-out of Ile Jésus which has relatively few irregularities, has all the characteristics likely to facilitate urban development.

A 42 million square foot industrial park is available to industries wishing to take advantage of the facilities of Laval, in the way of geographical situation, skilled manpower and communications, which will be improved in connection with he building of the international airport at Sainte-Scholastique.

Needless to say, the location of the airport Sainte-Scholastique will contribute considerably to the economic development of Laval. This action on the part of the federal government will ensure better services to Laval residents. The building of a bridge at the Cavendish exit has been awaited for over 15 years.

Considering the present and future needs of the residents of Laval, the Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans) announced last summer the purchase of land in the industrial park of Laval in order to erect there the first mail sorting plant in Canada. This pilot project will help speed up mail delivery.

Moreover, in order to improve postal service, two sub-offices will be constructed, one of them at Sainte-Dorothée and the other at Laval-Ouest. I hope that another one will soon be erected at Sainte-Rose. I have decided to speak in the Throne speech debate for several reasons.

In my opinion this Speech reflects accurately the principles which have been expressed since the last election campaign in 1968 with regard to the establishment of a "just society". Canada is entering a new decade. Together we have to build a society made for man. Misery, labour disputes, governmental institutions which are sometimes out-of-date, revision of the education system, housing, air and water pollution, pollution by noise, inflation, crime, dissent, non medical use of drugs, all these are complicated problems of modern life which is forever changing.

A hundred years in the age of the printed word is equal to ten years in the electronic age. We are not fatally condemned to be the slaves of technology nor do we have to be smothered by giant and impersonal organizations.

Is it not the role of each member to set up the standards of a society where the young will not feel alienated, where a class of society will not be excluded from the decision making centres, where the old will no longer be considered a burden, but rather as a pool of experience gained through daily work and where the rich will not take over all the powers regardless of the needs of Canadians who are less fortunate or less favoured geographically?

A country needs more than dollars or natural resources to live. It needs motivations, aspirations and imagination. It needs something to conquer, to strive for.

The Speech from the Throne says, and I quote:

> We are entering an age of tension, an age of challenge, an age of excitement. At the threshold of the seventies a choice is open to Canadians as it is open to few persons in few countries. With foresight and stamina and enterprise, our's may be, if we wish it;
>
> —a society in which human differences are regarded as assets, **not liabilities;**
>
> —a society in which human individual freedom and equality of opportunity remain as our most cherished possessions;
>
> —a society in which the enjoyment of life is measured in qualitative, not quantitative terms;
>
> —a society which encourages imagination and daring, ingenuity and initiative, not coldly and impersonally for the sake of efficiency, but with warmth and from the heart as between friends.

This is the kind of society that we want. Are we ready to work to attain these objectives? Is it not more logical that instead of attending to the most urgent issues first, we should undertake a transformation in depth of our society? It is urgent to amend the constitution so that it might better reflect the aspirations of all Canadians.

Canada must continue to be a land for man, a land where freedom and respect for the individual are nurtured, a society whose government is capable of standing firm against conformist tendencies, blackmail, or the pressures of those groups which have no respect for human values, and try to destroy the present structures instead of improving them. The systematic destruction of our political structures would only precipitate us into an economic recession.

In Quebec, as everywhere else in Canada, the young people—and they are the majority—believe that efforts and work are the best weapons to attain and deserve key positions in society.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it one o'clock?

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It being one o'clock I do now leave the chair until two o'clock.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Roy (Laval): Mr. Speaker, at the time of adjournment, I was making remarks on the unfortunate situation now existing in Quebec. Our civil liberties are threatened and our people are worried.

Democracy is like one's health: we appreciate it when we lose it, either because we abuse of our liberties, or because abusive force or violence are used.

The governments acted conscientiously in taking steps to protect the collective interests of the nation. Had they not done so, the people would condemn them. We are living most tragic hours, for the survival of our basic principles and respect for the individual are threatened. Let us avoid irresponsible comments: let us place the problem in its true context and let the powers that be take the initiative of making statements.

We will fail in our attempt to transform society if we surrender to our fears, or nurse feelings of hate against certain ethnical groups. The only way to cure our society is to forge ahead determinedly, with the co-operation of all those who are prepared to take their responsibilities in order to find the causes of the present unrest. The sick society cannot be cured by the sole intervention of its governments. On the contrary, it is the business of everyone who has a craving for truth and justice. It is appropriate that everyone examines his conscience in the tragic hours we are experiencing at this time.

Let us be conscious of our role, of our capacity and of our will to contribute to air a little every day the lungs of that society which certain elements wish to suffocate. To that end, it is necessary to establish clear goals. During the first session of this 28th Parliament, the House of Commons considered more than 101 pieces of legislation. Last year, 90 other measures were submitted to our study. During this session, 68 bills will be examined.

It is necessary to stir up the imagination of men by presenting them with various pieces of legislation in the form of a White Paper in order that they contribute to draft laws which will really reflect their aspirations. Such a dialogue with the population is likely to crystalize their thoughts into laws.

Is that not what we have done here in order to bear out the extent to which the population is anxious to participate in federal legislation?

Following the press release that the chairman of the Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, the hon. member for Gatineau (Mr. Clermont), published on December 19 last, in which briefs from the public were invited, the said committee received 524 briefs, as well as 1,093 letters and other documents.

While studying the tax reform proposals, the committee met 146 times and looked into 211 briefs provided by 820 people. Such evidence, I believe, shows to what extent our people wished to participate in the legislation.

Is this not the job that we are pursuing under the leadership of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau)?

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a government member, to belong to the great Liberal family, which is getting larger every day, which is respectful of human rights and is equal to its task in any situation. I am proud to belong to the dynamic group now administering the country and whose aim, over the next decade is to make our society more humane.

On reading the Speech from the Throne and the speeches of the mover and the seconder of the Address in reply, one notes that the government wishes to take part in the development of our cities through the construction of low-rental housing, the renewal of urban centres, the construction of homes for the aged, and the enactment of legislation to protect consumers.

Hardship, discrimination and social disintegration work havoc to a greater extent in urban centres. There, because of its size and complex and heartless society sometimes engenders the most deplorable situations.

We are aware of this situation and we wish to do something about it. I do not know whether the member for Spadina (Mr. Ryan) had read the Speech from the Throne. He would have noticed that, to foster coordination of the activities of all levels of government, and to contribute to sound urban growth and development, the Government proposes the re-organization of its urban activities under the direction of a Minister of State for Urban Affairs and Housing. The Government seeks, by making rational its efforts in these fields, and through consultation with those most directly concerned, to help Canadians reach and implement the decisions that will determine their urban future.

The right hon. Prime Minister stated in this House, on Friday October 9, as recorded on page 36 of *Hansard*:

> Let me say as well that it is false to sugest that the federal government has not been active and welcome in the cities of this country for many years. More than 20 departments of the federal government are now present and engaged in the cities. And some of them are very active. In the field of low income housing, for example, 44 per cent of all the activity undertaken in Canada since 1950 has been achieved in the past two years.

In the name of my constituents, I wish to thank and congratulate the Minister responsible for housing (Mr. Andras). Last year, $200 million were invested in Canada for the construction of low-rent housing. In the city of Laval, 1,000 new units will be built thanks to a $12 million federal loan granted under the National Housing Act. This injection of economic blood by the federal government represented a new start for construction in Laval.

Moreover, the federal government has guaranteed a loan representing 95 per cent of the building cost of the Centre de séjour Laval where 350 people will live. The centre will be erected in Sainte-Dorothée.

Under the adult professional training program, the federal government has contributed $362,907,385 to the province of Quebec out of total investments in Quebec, of $654,386,037 as of April 1, 1969.

In the city of Laval, the federal government has paid more than $18 million for the construction of polyvalent schools.

Under its adult professional training program, from April 1, 1969 to January 31, 1970, the federal government has paid to Laval an amount of $559,675 for the purchase of courses from the Quebec Department of Education and $766,830 in allowances. At the Quebec level, the contributions amounted to $31,612,780 in allowances and over $23 million have been affected to the purchase of courses.

To abstain from divulging this information, Mr. Speaker, could tend to support certain arguments still going on in Quebec.

At the beginning of my statement, I pointed out that the Laval constituency was situated on Île Jésus between the back river, Riviere des Prairies and the Riviere des Milles-Îles. Those two rivers are unfortunately utterly polluted and every spring when the waters rise, the rivers overflow their banks. Every spring, the residents of Laval-Ouest, Sainte-Rose, Saint-Eustache, Rosemère, Bois-des-Fillions, etc., sustain considerable damage. Thousands of dollars are spent by residents every year because of flooding. Deposits from these polluted waters contaminate the two river banks.

My predecessor, the hon. member for Ahuntsic (Mr. Rochon) when he was member for Laval, drew attention to this problem time and again. In those days it was a priority, but today it has become a crucial problem. The project to channel the water from these rivers would control the water level and eliminate damage and losses. The dredging of these two rivers is not only a priority but an emergency. The alarm has been sounded. An anti-pollution program must be carried out. I beg the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Laing) to grant the request of the members representing the interested constituencies who have submitted briefs on the subject.

In closing, I warmly congratulate the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Jean (Mr. Lessard), first on his appointment as Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson), and also for his speech on the agricultural situation in Canada, in which he familiarized hon. members with the existing crisis in the Quebec poultry market. I think this is an urgent problem and in order to solve it we are asking for the co-operation of all hon. members.

• (2:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to speak in this debate. First, I should like to congratulate the mover (Mr. Trudel) and the seconder, (Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia)), of the address on the capable manner in which they carried out their duties.

The Speech from the Throne is an amazing document, a document long on philosophy but short on policy. On page one, the author of this grim fairy tale states:

> We live in a period of tenseness and unease. It is an age frequented by violence as desperate men seek-ill-defined goals; an age of frustration as gentle men question impatiently old assumptions. It is an age in which the life-support systems of the biosphere may collapse unless man reverses his present course and begins again to live in harmony, rather than in competition, with his environment. It is an age in which the forces of science and technology now in motion are so massive, so swift, and so comprehensive that man may be facing his last opportunity to control his own destiny rather than be subject to it.

• (2:20 p.m.)

These words, Mr. Speaker, remind me of the words in a book which was first published in 1859. The first chapter, by Charles Dickens, of "A Tale of Two Cities" reads:

> It was the best of times, it was the worst of times; it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness; it was the epoch of believe; it was the epoch of incredulity; it was the season of light; it was the season of darkness; it was the spring of hope; it was the winter of despair; we had everything before us; we had nothing before us; we were all going direct to heaven; we were all going direct the other way!

Things have not changed very much since 1859, for I note a marked similarity between the words of Dickens and the words of the Throne Speech, and unfortunately a marked similarity between the conditions described by Dickens and conditions as they exist today. The speech says that the decade of the seventies extends beyond our present vision, and that is the understatement of the day. In fact, that is one of the troubles with this government; it lacks vision. In proverbs we read that when there is no vision the people perish.

In another paragraph, the speech states that man must anticipate and plan; that he must accept that contentment and indifference are illusory; that the most dramatic reality is change; that there is more need that ever before to preserve as constant values truth, honesty, excellence and relevance. Was there ever a period when man was not required to anticipate and plan ahead? And was there ever a period when man's plans were more frustrated than they are today by the present federal government?

The Throne Speech speaks of truth and honesty, and then goes on to say that unemployment remains distressingly high in some parts of Canada, although the rate has not increased significantly in recent months. Well, I do not know what figures the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) was looking at when he made that statement, but according to the press the federal government paid out $43.9 million in unemployment benefits during July, up from $41 million in June and up from $25 million in July, 1969. Canadians made 148,000 new claims against the unemployment insurance fund in July, up from 120,000 the year before. In all, there were 439,000 people claiming benefits at the end of July, 160,000 more than the year before. On top of this, the proportion of people who have been on unemployment insurance for more than six months rose to 23 per cent from 15 per cent a year ago.

What is the prediction for the future? According to the *Financial Times* for September 21, unemployment is still high and the worst is yet to come. We have 6.9 per cent of our labour force unemployed at present, but recent lay-off announcements in the electronics and chemical

industries, plus the side effects of the automobile strike, are expected to drive up the number of unemployed by the end of this year to approximately 750,000 people. This would mean an actual rate of people unemployed in the vicinity of 9½ per cent of our labour force, a cruel and intolerable situation in a nation like Canada, since this would be a rate of unemployment higher than at any other period in our history. This is not what we want as Canadians.

The Speech from the Throne states that with foresight, stamina and enterprise we may have a society in which individual freedom and equality of opportunity remain as our most cherished possessions, a society in which the enjoyment of life is measured in qualitative, not quantitative terms. I would remind the Prime Minister and his government that without jobs and incomes there can be no way of life, no enjoyment of life, for hundreds of thousands of Canadians.

What we as Canadians really want is not more people on the welfare rolls; we want more people on the payrolls. Even the Prime Minister and his colleagues seem to be dimly aware of this fact as they talk of pursuing the distant ideal of a just society. In fact, the government's pretentions of a just society today are only a mirage, and like all mirages it keeps fading in the distance, unobtainable and without substance.

The Throne Speech states that one of our needs in Canada is adequate housing. This will always be a problem in any nation where there is a marked shift from the rural to the urban areas. But surely the government is aware that the 37 per cent decline in housing construction across the nation today can be directly related to the building codes imposed on CMHC loans, to the high interest rates on those loans, and to the federal taxes on construction equipment and building materials. It is unfair and unjust to our young people, and some not so young, to make housing the lever by which the government manipulates the economy, upward or downward, like a puppet on a string.

Our housing development and our construction industry will only go forward when the government establishes a stable housing policy which is designed to encourage home ownership at reasonable cost, with the future wellbeing of our Canadian families as the central core of that policy. It is the Canadian family that provides stability to this nation, and if there is a breakdown in our family life there follows a breakdown in society. This brings with it an outbreak of lawlessness, a disrespect for law and order, something that is all too prevalent in Canada today. The withdrawal, for example, of the 11 per cent sales tax on building materials and construction equipment would go a long way towards reviving housing construction in this nation.

As I read the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but question the motives of this government. I ask myself, conscientiously and seriously: In what direction are we being led? The speech calls for the reorganization of the government's urban activities, under the direction of a minister of state for urban affairs and housing. In other words, another minister, more bureaucrats and more civil servants. I would remind the government that what we need are not more housing authorities; what we need in Canada are more houses.

The Prime Minister is reported as saying during the past summer that if we do not like the way he is governing this country we can lump it. I for one do not like it, and I submit that the onus is on us to speak out against the present government's form of empire building. In Canada today we already have 25 government departments, 13 departmental corporations, 15 agency corporations, 14 propriety corporations, and 46 designated departments for purposes of the Financial Administration Act, making a total of 113. In this bureaucracy, at the federal level, we have a total personnel in excess of 371,000 people, excluding military personnel. When you add to this the bureaucracy of the provincial governments which employs some 333,000 people, and the 275,000 employed by regional and municipal governments, hon. members will realize there are close to one million employees in government in Canada today, and this for a nation of less than 22 million people.

What does all this mean, Mr. Speaker? It means that the influence of the government on business and on the public will continue to grow. I mention this because of the words in the Speech from the Throne which refer to the white paper on taxation and the implied threat made to corporations. Under this government it has apparently become illegal to make a profit. In my early years, when I was working for a large corporation, I was always pleased to note that the parent company was making money. Profits are the best guarantee to an employee of future job security, a fact that this government would do well to remember.

What worries me is the growing socialistic thinking of the government. There is an attitude that government can continue to take more and more out of the private sector of society without any concern at all for the state of the economy. However, there is a limit beyond which governments cannot go, and I submit that we are now nearing this limit in view of the rate of taxation imposed on industry and Canadians generally.

• (2:30 p.m.)

For example, let us consider some of the reports emanating from our large corporations. Take Massey-Ferguson, for example, Canada's fifth largest company. Sales for the first nine months of this year were down $14,500,000 from the corresponding period in 1969. For the third quarter, their net loss was $11,100,000 compared with a profit of $9,500,000 for the third quarter in 1969. In Toronto, General Motors has announced the closing of its Frigidaire home appliance division which will affect the employment of some 400 people. They presently employ, I am told, 1,400 people in that particular corporation and they plan to move a thousand of these people to other sections of their operations, but this still leaves 400 people unemployed as of the first of this coming year.

In both cases the reasons for the heavy losses or close down are similar. Production costs no longer make it

feasible to continue in this field, and costly strikes, reduced demand, accelerating inflation and the high cost of money are curtailing profits. These are the end results of the policies of this government on our large corporations, and they are having equally disastrous results on our small businessmen throughout the nation. In my opinion, the answer does not lie in building up a greater bureaucracy in Ottawa. As we say in Atlantic Canada, we have too many people cutting bait and not enough fishing. We cannot share the wealth until it is first produced. We cannot have a higher standard of living in this country without increasing productivity first and increasing the quality of our product. Unfortunately, this is not the situation which exists at the present time. In my opinion, steps should be taken immediately to reduce the number of people in the establishment in Ottawa, not expand it.

At page 3 of the Throne Speech there are words with which I can agree. It states that we have an economy that is in need of adjustment, a society beset by a variety of tensions, an environment that has been abused and degraded, an international community that is under intense pressures and that these are the problems that demand our urgent attention. Of course they do, but do you Liberals ever ask yourselves what brought about this desperate situation in Canada so graphically described by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in the Throne Speech? Did it ever occur to you that it is the policies of your government that have thrown our economy out of adjustment and almost completely out of control?

It is the policies of your government that have beset our society with tensions, and which promise more of the same now that Chinese communists can legally come to Canada, where they are already reported as increasing their efforts to turn Toronto's Chinatown into a Maoist stronghold. The tears in the eyes of the Nationalist Chinese as they watched their ambassador depart from Canada gave some indication of their concern for their future wellbeing in this country.

If this does not worry the Liberal party and its members then it should, because it worries me and it worries the people I represent in this House. It is the policies of this government that have placed our international community under intense pressures. With your defence and foreign policy, or lack of it, we have lost the respect of our former NATO allies. It was some 37 years ago, at the famous Quebec conference of Churchill, Roosevelt and Mackenzie King, that a decision was made to proceed with the invasion of Normandy to liberate northwest Europe. At that time Canada had reason to be proud, for our armed forces commanded respect. Today, in matters of defence and foreign policy, our reputation in the western world is almost extinct, and in some quarters it is held up to ridicule and abuse.

Obviously, we are now trying to isolate ourselves from the world by walking out on our NATO allies at a critical time. Britain is obliged to send another brigade to fill the gap we left in the NATO defence line. As a result of our actions, we no longer command the same confidence and respect of our two closest friends, England and the United States, our partners and allies on the Normandy beaches. The same can be said of our relations with the people of the Netherlands, the people of France as well as the people of Belgium. They labelled our recent white papers on foreign affairs as so much window dressing, for in essence they indicate we have no clear purpose and we have no defence policy.

However, they have done one thing. They have given encouragement to socialist and communist governments throughout the world. Many Canadians are now beginning to ask why we are isolating ourselves and why we are no longer interested in international co-operation. Those of you who support the present government have a responsibility to answer these questions in view of the calibre of the government with which we are now allied, such as communist controlled Cuba and communist controlled China.

Today, when the strength of NATO is vital to world peace, I believe that Canada would be well advised to take a greater interest and responsibility in collective security than is presently the case. The present government seems to have forgotten that world communist leaders may from time to time alter their timetables, but their objective remains the same, namely, world domination and a completely controlled society.

At the rate we are going under the hon. member for Trinity's (Mr. Hellyer) disastrous unification scheme, we shall soon be like an old dog, a dog that can bark but cannot bite. We are simply deluding ourselves if we believe we are under the United States nuclear umbrella and, therefore, we have no need to train combat troops; that our NATO allies can provide a detente with the Communist forces without us. In my opinion, we are drawing the wrong conclusions because we start with the wrong premise. I only hope that Canadians become aroused to what is happening to us in the international sphere under this government before it is too late.

Our Prime Minister had planned to visit Russia. In view of internal problems in this country we are told now that this visit has been postponed, but he will be going at a later date. In view of his attitude towards NATO I have some questions for him and I hope he will secure some answers when he does visit Moscow. For example, I should like to know why there has been such a massive increase in Russian military power in the Middle East, as well as the addition of four more communist divisions facing NATO forces. We would like to know the reason for the great Russian naval expansion or buildup in the Mediterranean. We would like to know why Russia now has some 10,000 military advisers in Egypt, and why there are also some 100 Soviet flown MIG-21 planes and some 22 Soviet-manned missile sites in that country. Why is the Soviet navy stretching out into all the world's oceans with new naval bases being established? Why should they increase their fishing fleets enormously on the east coast the number of ships which can easily be converted to naval ships if the occasion should require it? Surely, we should know.

We should ask ourselves why Russia is building up this great military strength so quickly. How realistic are the

peace negotiations and the talk of detente in Europe? I hope our Prime Minister can obtain some answers to these questions, for surely we should not be foolish enough to imagine that we can negotiate from weakness with Russia. In my opinion if NATO, the core of western defence, should collapse or should lack strength or purpose, we may well sacrifice world peace and see another generation committed to the tragedy of another even greater war or enslavement.

The Throne Speech indicates legislation will be presented to the House dealing with pollution in the ocean and in the atmosphere, and suggests there is a need to co-ordinate and consolidate our efforts under a department of environmental affairs. The Prime Minister, when speaking to this House on October 9, said this department would have as its core the Department of Fisheries plus the water sector of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, plus the administration and the responsibility for the Canada Water Act. It would also have the administration of the Canadian wildlife service.

This is in keeping with suggestions that were made by Conservative members on this side of the House when speaking on Bill C-204, an act to amend the Fisheries Act, including members from Newfoundland, Nova Scotia and other parts of Atlantic Canada. We stressed this very important point and at that time we said the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) should be given more power under the Fisheries Act so that our industries and our municipalities would know where they stood on the serious problem of pollution control.

However, when we were making these suggestions we specifically mentioned strengthening the authority of the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry, not the abolition of this historical department. We have had a Department of Fisheries ever since Confederation, and I deplore the indicated downgrading of this department by changing its name to the Department of Environmental Affairs. By this proposed action, the fishing industry loses its historic and traditional position as a leading department of government representing an important primary industry on both coasts.

• (2:40 p.m.)

In his speech the Prime Minister referred to the inscription over the doors of the Parliament buildings, "The wholesome sea is at her gates, her gates both east and west". I implore him to remember the traditions built up over the years, especially in Atlantic Canada where wooden ships and iron men established our eastern provinces and built up an enviable position in the fishing industry. By all means give more authority to control pollution to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry, but let us not destroy the traditions built up over more than 100 years by changing and downgrading the Fisheries Department. Perhaps the answer would be to combine fisheries with agriculture, as has been done in the United Kingdom. The abolition of the Department of Fisheries or the putting of it on a par, for example, with the Canadian wildlife service is nothing more than bureaucratic nonsense.

[Mr. Crouse.]

The Minister of Fisheries and Forestry in his Speech, as recorded at page 162 of *Hansard*, referred to what has been done toward the cleaning up of our rivers and streams that were being polluted by our paper mills when he and his department enforced the terms of the Fisheries Act. He followed by listing seven proposals which if implemented would all be helpful in cleaning up our environment. We on this side take no issue with those proposals. However, it would not be the new department or the minister or even the law that would clean up our air and waters but rather the enforcement of the law and the co-operation of the people that would really aid in improving the conditions under which we live. For example, the Fisheries Act had the teeth but its lack of enforcement contributed in no small way to the present pollution of our rivers and streams. Therefore, some of the blame must be accepted by the present government and some of the blame must be accepted by the present Minister of Fisheries and Forestry.

The need to control pollution and improve our environment runs like a thread through the Throne Speech. Since action on the problem is important, I believe it is timely for the government to reconsider its stand on tidal power in the Bay of Fundy. When the Atlantic Tidal Power Programming Board was formed in 1966 to make a definitive study of Fundy's possibilities it seemed that, at long last, the question was to be resolved. However, when the board made its report earlier this year the government turned down the proposal. In their view power certainly could be developed and in large quantities, but with interest rates at 7 per cent they implied it would cost too much. In my opinion the question in the next decade will not be whether tidal power can compete economically but whether any alternative to tidal power can be developed to compete with its freedom from any form of environmental pollution.

The truth of the matter is that the tidal height in Minas Basin is greater than anywhere else in the world. Therefore, it follows that if development is uneconomical the prospects of developing tidal power anywhere are very grim indeed. We know, however, that tidal power is being utilized on the river La Rance in Brittany, France and the working model at Expo '67 gave an indication of its possibilities in our part of the world. It is difficult to understand why the government turned down the development of this project, since large sums of money have been found for cultural activities while bread and butter issues which would provide employment and be self-liquidating must take second place. We know billions of dollars will have to be invested in the next four years to build new Canadian power stations. Demand for electricity is expected to grow at a compound rate of 7½ per cent a year between now and 1975. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics forecasts that generating capacity will have to be boosted to nearly 54 million kilowatts, up some 16½ million kilowatts over the generating capacity of last year.

The harnessing of the tides of Fundy is almost a must when one considers that the pollution of our air, land and sea is recognized as a real threat to the future well-being of mankind. I say this because thermal plants

liberate carbon dioxide and other pollutants into the atmosphere, while both thermal and nuclear plants have to get rid of large quantities of waste heat. Tidal power would give us electricity while conserving some of our irreplaceable natural resources such as oil or uranium. Tidal power would bring a new prosperity to Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island through the provision of vast quantities of electrical energy, some of which could be exported to the power-hungry eastern seaboard of the United States. This would help to defray the cost of construction.

I urge the Prime Minister and the government to carefully consider this project. In an age when we have high unemployment, with one-third of our population living under the poverty line, and while millions of Canadians are suffering from the ravages and misery of inflation, this is one self-liquidating Canadian development that could be helpful in bolstering the economy of the Atlantic provinces and indeed could be helpful to all of Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. J.-R. Comtois (Terrebonne): Mr. Speaker, the third session of the twenty-eighth legislature begins in the early 70's, a decade which will, undoubtedly, be of special importance.

Canada is entering into a new era, where already certain forces, incomprehensible to us, are at work, the causes of this being both internal and external. The conflict between the new values and those of the past, the need felt by the young and the disappointed generations to adopt new attitudes and perspectives, unavoidably give rise to unrest and tension. It is an era marked by violence to which bewildered men resort in pursuit of uncertain objectives. Even for many men of good will, who impatiently question the old principles, it is a time of frustration. But it is also a period of hope and of challenges to be taken up in order to attain "the just society" to which we all aspire.

Mr. Speaker, in the night from Saturday to Sunday, we suffered a great loss through the death of Pierre Laporte. In my own name and in the name of all my fellow-citizens, I want to extend to Mrs. Laporte, to her children and her family, our deepest sympathies.

Pierre Laporte was well known back home, Mr. Speaker. He was educated at L'Assomption College, It is in l'Assomption also that he met his wife, Françoise Brouillette.

It was in my area that he spent his summer vacations for 20 years. We have known Pierre Laporte the politician, but also Pierre Laporte the man. He was a great Liberal and a great democrat. I am sure he will not have sacrificed his life in vain.

Mr. Speaker, are those we are looking for the only real culprits? What about those we have seen on television and heard on radio who for a number of years have stirred up passions and daily preached hatred? What about René Lévesque and company who preach there is no longer a government in Quebec? What about all these saviours of the race who are ready to govern Quebec, but without facing the electorate? I don't want to put too much emphasis on that, but I would ask the people of Quebec—youth in particular—to reflect on the events that afflict us at this time.

Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted, in the course of this debate, to pay a well-deserved tribute to the former member for Terrebonne and Labelle, His Excellency Léo Cadieux, the newly appointed Canadian Ambassador to France. I wish him the greatest success in his new functions and I am convinced he will be a credit to all his fellow citizens. I can even give him the assurance that the coming by-elections in Labelle on November 16 next will result in replacing him by a Liberal.

I also congratualte the hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel) for his outline of the problems of his constituency, of his region and of the country when moving the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. Among other things, he pointed out the role of the federal government in the economic development of his constituency and of Greater Montreal.

The co-mover of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas), ably showed us the similarity between problems of his region and those of Eastern Canada. He spoke of the inevitable changes of agriculture and of the regrouping of farms to make them more profitable. What is a necessity in the West becomes urgency in the East when the size of farms in the East is compared with those in the West. Also, he has mentioned the possibility of opening a national park in his constituency and I hope from the bottom of my heart that he will soon see his wish materialized.

The constituency of Terrebonne which I represent is half-urban and half-rural. The local population knows its problems and is endeavouring to solve them. The future international airport of Montreal at Sainte-Scholastique happens to be within my constituency. This major project will create special problems for us, including construction of adequate access roads and highways, new modern utilities, regrouping of municipalities in the area, public transportation, improvement of telephone facilities, etc.

Mr. Speaker, I do hope the federal government will seriously look into the possibility of designating all this territory as a special area for the purpose of helping the province of Quebec in carrying out these major projects.

Mr. Speaker, the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation is very active in our region. Every year we can see hundreds of new buildings and I congratulate the government for having set up at last a Department for Urban Affairs and Housing.

Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker, the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Roy), told us about the pollution of the back river, Riviere des Prairies, and the Mille-Îles River.

As you know, those rivers touch on my riding and I strongly support the representations of that member so that pollution be stopped. For 25 years local authorities and House members have been urging the government to canalize both rivers. I hope that the next budget will

allocate funds for completing these projects because there are more than one and a half million people in that region.

The Throne Speech announces the early presentation of White Papers on communications, citizenship, immigration, national defence and income security which we will have the pleasure of examining. The government has also tabled 68 bills to be submitted to members of Parliament during the session. Several of them are of particular interest to my constituency. For example there are bills to amend the Small Businesses Loans Act and the Farm Improvement Loans Act, a bill creating the Canada Development Corporation, one relating to income security, veterans pension legislation, a bill to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act, a bill respecting government organization, a bill creating a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, another creating a Department for the protection of the environment and, finally, a bill respecting farm products marketing agencies.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I be allowed to remind my colleagues that there is still much work to be done in our beautiful country and that to do so in order, peace and social justice, there is nothing better than work, perseverance, dialogue and understanding. Canada will thus be more thriving and beautiful. Canadians will be more united if all together they do their duty simply.

• (2:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, as everyone understands, this is a difficult day during which to make a speech. However, even in times of adversity life must go on, and I suggest that it behooves us not to slacken but rather to intensify our efforts to build in Canada the kind of society in which there is human dignity for all our people. We are of course quite conscious of the many strains to which life in this country is subject, and for the short while that I would like to speak this afternoon I wish to say something about one of those strains. Indeed, it is the one that I think is most serious, not only for us in Canada but for mankind throughout the world.

I refer to the strains and the stresses that are created in human society by gross inequalities and widespread poverty. Ours is an age in which we sometimes marvel at and even boast of our scientific and technological achievements. We like to quote figures to show how great are the advances we have made. Mind you, in recent times we have come to realize that progress is not everything, particularly when one of the by-products of progress is the bespoiling of our environment to the extent that it might be impossible for human life to continue. That is a problem by itself, a problem of great magnitude. I welcome the widespread public concern over that problem and I welcome the fact that the government is also concerned about it. However, alongside that great problem of saving our environment so that human life can continue, I suggest that there is this other extremely serious problem, namely, poverty and inequality.

[Mr. Comtois.]

The situation on the world scale is well known, namely, that about two-thirds of the world's people live their entire lives in hunger and poverty. We know that despite the tremendous amounts of money we have spent on external aid, despite the fact that we have raised the living standards of some of those in the developing countries, the gap is still growing and our world is still threatened with all of the difficulties that come because two-thirds of our people are hungry and the other third enjoy only at least a slightly better standard of living. But not only is that true on the world scale, I think it is terribly true for Canada.

I insist that along with the efforts we must make to meet our stresses and strains in the constitutional area, between or among our various racial and other groups, we must also concern ourselves with the fact that when masses of people are poor and have nothing to look forward to but living in poverty throughout their lives, this kind of thing tears our society apart.

• (3:00 p.m.)

I suggest indeed that no matter how perfect a constitution we might write, no matter how much accord we might achieve in federal-provincial relations, and in relations between the executive and the members of the House of Commons, unless we do something about this problem of poverty and inequality our society will not be able to stand the strain.

There are two things which I think are not the answer to the problem of poverty. The first thing which I am convinced is not the answer is something on which we have relied for a long time. It is not the answer to do things for the poor, yet to leave them in a state of poverty. I am convinced that many of our welfare programs, and many of the other things we have done, do only that. They are things we do for the poor, but after we have done them they are still poor. As a matter of fact, statistics show that for all we have done to raise the economic standard of the lower groups in our society we have raised the standards of those at the upper end to such an extent that the gap is wider than ever.

Some might argue that the poverty that is experienced down at the lower end is therefore psychological. It is still very real, and I believe a great deal of the tension and chaos and uncertainty in social life today stems from this feeling of frustration, injustice and unfairness, arising from the fact that we have so much poverty, and I am convinced it is not the answer just to do things for the poor but to leave them in that state.

The second thing, Mr. Speaker, that I think is not the answer is for us to continue to believe that we can enjoy the hierarchical economy that we have accepted as a matter of course. Since the days of Adam Smith it seems to have been the notion that if there are more rich at the top some of that wealth will filter down and the poor will somehow manage to survive.

In fact, I think it has to be said that in many of the efforts that we make to improve the conditions of those at the lower end of the scale we keep saying to ourselves that we can do this without interfering with still higher standards for those at the top. I think we will have to get

to the place where we realize that if we are going to abolish poverty for those who are in it, it is going to cost us something. There may actually have to be some levelling of the living standards of our people, including our own.

We may have to come to a day when instead of making wage and salary increases always on a percentage basis, so that those at the top get a whole lot more and those at the bottom get very little, we may have to recognize there is a better way to do it. I know that my hon. friend from Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) speaks on this at times. He does not like us to talk about any levelling up of incomes because he says that means we are going to take from those that have and give it to those who have not and, in his inimitable way, he says we will end up having nothing but have-nots.

It is always enjoyable to listen to him say it, but that is one of the fallacies we have to recognize, that we cannot expect to get rid of poverty if at the same time we want to maintain the gap between the poor and the affluent, if at the same time we want to make life richer and still more bountiful for those at the top. Our concern must be not just to do something for the poor without it hurting us. Our concern must be a new order of values, a new approach to society that says that the right to a guaranteed livelihood is an essential part of living in this country.

We have criticized the Speech from the Throne for some of the rhetoric that is in it. We always do that. We always criticize the other fellow's rhetoric and then we turn around and try our best to match it. I join in the criticism of the rhetoric, but at the same time I like the phrases in the Speech from the Throne about the kind of society we ought to have, with love and compassion, and so on.

I like the sentence that is in there somewhere about our needing new attitudes and new values. Mind you, that sentence was not defined or explained, but it is there. I believe, and I hold to it very strongly, that one of the values we have got to weave into the fabric of our society is that this business of a wide gap between the poor and the rich must go and that in its place we must really concern ourselves with the economic well being of all our people—and I mean that—of all our people.

• (3:10 p.m.)

I repeat that it is not economic well-being for the poor to be given only enough welfare to keep them alive. They may stay alive on that basis, but in psychological terms they are just as poor and just as far down the ladder as was the case years ago when people had far less. I spoke in this vein during the debate on the address in reply in 1969. On that occasion I put some statistics on the record. In particular, I pointed out that approximately two decades ago 1½ million Canadians were reporting incomes of less than $2,000 a year. Yes, conditions for them have improved. The statistics now show that approximately 1½ million Canadians are reporting incomes of less than $3,000 a year. They are still at the bottom of the ladder. This is what has happened in two decades. Those people have had their position improved. The figures do not tell the story for everybody, but they suggest the picture, an increase from $2,000 to $3,000 a year. But $3,000 a year today is much more serious poverty than $2,000 a year two decades ago.

In the meantime incomes for other people have increased to $15,000 and $20,000. Salaries such as those are no longer surprising. I am not against people having the affluence and high standard of living that is possible today, but I accept the words of the Speech from the Throne that we need a new scale of values. I want those at the bottom to be brought up first.

If we are going to talk about human dignity we need a determination of national resolve, not just that we are going to help the poor, but that we are going to get rid of poverty even if it means that we have to curb some of the higher incomes and adopt a policy of narrowing that gap, helping those at the bottom rather than just having an increase on a percentage scale for everyone.

A few moments ago, I alluded to the world's situation. I think the same holds true there. Our international life will not hold together if we try to go on much longer with two thirds of the world's population hungry and one third enjoying relative affluence. The same is true for our country.

We must apply ourselves to the task of using the great wealth we are able to produce, not for a hierarchical standard of living, but for a good standard of living for all our people. As a matter of fact, that idea is in the Speech from the Throne. It has to be read carefully and between the lines to find that idea, but it is there, for the Speech from the Throne does say that we must use our capacity for production of wealth to produce as much as we can, but we must see to it that that wealth, having been produced, gets through to all our people.

There is a suggestion that there will be legislation in the field of income maintenance to meet that goal. That is good. I am glad I am not preaching to the unconverted. I am glad to know there are people who share with me in philosophical terms this notion I am now trying to spell out, namely that our job in the seventies is not to raise the incomes of those people earning $3,000 to $4,000 while the upper limits increase to $40,000 to $50,000. Our job is to achieve a greater approach to equality. Our job is to achieve the kind of society in which we accept the principle that a guaranteed livelihood is a natural right of every person in this country.

I recognize the fact that it will take time to reach this goal, but it may not take as long as some people think. I remember being told when I first came here that some of the things I advocated were idealistic but could never be achieved. They have been achieved. I have seen the elimination of the means test from the basic old age pension. I have seen hospitalization and medicare and other things of that sort enacted in this place. It may be that for no other reason than sheer necessity we will get to a guaranteed income for all Canadians sooner than some people think. But it will only come if we make it a high national resolve.

At this time we are thinking in terms of national purpose. We are disturbed about what is happening in the fabric of our lives. We are particularly concerned over the assassination Saturday night. It must not be in vain. The ideals to which Mr. Laporte dedicated his life must be carried on. I submit that we should include in those ideals the new attitudes and new scale of values referred to in the Speech from the Throne. That new scale of values must not be just a few more dollars for the poor and a few thousand dollars more for those at the top, but a society in which the first principle is that everyone in Canada is guaranteed a decent livelihood as a natural right.

Having emphasized the fact that we may achieve our goal faster than some people think, I now wish to mention one subject in particular and two or three other subjects in passing. Because it takes time to achieve a broad ideal like that is no reason that while we are seeking to attain it that we should not look carefully at what we can do along the way.

I welcome the fact that in the course of this session a standing committee will study the white paper on unemployment insurance. I do not think for a moment, and neither does the government, that unemployment insurance is the answer to poverty or that it achieves the justice and dignity that are our destiny. However, it is a step in that direction. I welcome the changes that were made last session in connection with the pensions of retired civil servants, retired members of the armed forces, retired members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and others receiving federal pensions. I also welcome the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications that the same be done for the Canadian National pensioners. I welcome the veterans legislation that has been promised for the present session. I wish we had more details as to what will be in that legislation, and I hope it will contain more than the administrative changes that were called for by the Woods Report. I hope that there will be a scaling up of the pensions paid under the Pension Act and that there will be something for those who receive war veterans allowances. The point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that these are ideals we want to see carried through in the final achievement. There are some who want to see a guaranteed income for all our people. I recognize that we have to take certain steps along the way, and I welcome those steps which have been taken recently or that are being contemplated at present.

• (3:20 p.m.)

This brings me to another phase of the matter, namely, the whole question of old age security to which I made a passing reference moments ago. I confess that in this area I have a great deal of concern. We were told a couple of years ago about the studies being made by Dr. Willard, the deputy minister of welfare in the Department of National Health and Welfare. For a while we thought we were to see Dr. Willard's report; it is now obvious that we will not see it. Then there was a white paper on pensions, which apparently was based on the Willard report. For a while it seemed that we were to see it in the last session. That commitment was not kept. Now, we are told that another white paper is to be produced in the present session which will be different in some respects from the white paper that we did not see during the last session. Until one sees the white paper, and until one sees the legislation to be brought in, one cannot know what is coming.

I confess that I am terribly worried that euphemism has taken over and that we are to get selectivity as the basis of dealing with the pensions of our senior citizens. I say that euphemism has taken over, because I think that is all it is. When you talk about selectivity you are talking about a pension based on some kind of means test or income test. We have been over this argument a good many times, Mr. Speaker. The point I want to make is that it is not consistent with the principles I have been advocating, namely, that a guaranteed livelihood, or a guaranteed income for the people of this country should be a natural right, should be the right of every one of our people.

It is still my view that one of the greatest steps taken in the years I have been in the House, and certainly the greatest step in the field of social security, was that step taken in 1950, in 1951 and in 1952—in one year the matter was before the committee, the next year we had legislation and the year after that the legislation was put into effect—by which we abolished the means test from the former old age pension and by which we said to the group of people of this country who were 70 years of age and over, "Nothing else matters; you are now 70 years of age, and this kind of pension is yours as of right."

The pension was only $40 then, but the universal basis on which it was paid was a tremendous victory for the concept of natural right in this field. We raised the pension from $40 to $46; then to $55; then to $65, and then to $75. The $75 in relative terms now is not much better than the $40 was in 1952 or the $20 was back in 1927. However, during the years when we were raising the pension from $40 to $75 we did not do anything to alter the principle under which it was paid. It was given to our people of 70 years of age and over as a matter of right. Later on, thank heaven, we got the age down to 65, and that is where it stands now. I still think, Mr. Speaker, that paying a pension of $75 a month to every citizen in Canada over the age of 65 as a matter of right is one of the best things we have put on our statute books. It is the kind of beginning toward the sort of society the Speech from the Throne anticipates that we must not go back on.

The reason I am speaking, the reason I am making this plea at this time, is that I am afraid that the government will bring in an increase, not in the basic pension, which is $75 a month before you add the 2 per cent bonuses, but rather in what the government calls the guaranteed income supplement. I know all the language in favour of it. I know of all the talk about using our money to give it to those who need it. But if you do that, Mr. Speaker, you are doing the very thing that I said at the beginning of my speech will not work. You do not solve poverty by doing things for the poor and leaving them poor; you do not solve poverty by singling out a particular group,

those who are poor, and giving them something special because they are poor. You only solve poverty by abolishing it; you only solve it by providing your income level as a natural right. In due course I want to see this done across the board, for people of all ages. I am as convinced that this will come as I am sure I am standing here, if we hold the country together. But I am concerned in case we retreat from the extent to which we have protected that principle in old age security. So, my appeal to the government at this point, before it brings in either its white paper on income security or its legislation on pensions, is that it not take a further backward step by a further use of the means test or income test but that it increase the basic old age security pension to at least $150 a month across the board.

Let us do the same thing that we did in 1950, 1951 and 1952, when we said to our older people, "we will not treat you any longer as second class people, some of whom are well off and some of whom are poor. We will treat you as Canadians of a certain age. This income is yours as a matter of rights." Let us continue so to say to our old people, and by saying it to these people, let us give hope to the people in their working years, to the young, to the children, and to all Canadians, that the day will come when we will have the kind of society that respects human dignity—not just by rhetoric; not just with fine speeches; not just by talking about equality of opportunity—oh, how cold that phrase leaves me—because it will be the kind of society in which the dignity of all our people is established by there being no more poverty. In that society all will enjoy their share of the immense amount of wealth we are now capable of producing. When that day comes, human dignity will be real.

As I have already said, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the improvements which have been made in the last few years in increasing the pensions of retired citizens. I welcome the improvements that are coming in unemployment insurance. I welcome the veterans legislation that is coming. I am still proud of what this Parliament has done over the past decade or two in the field of old age security, hospitalization and medicare. But we have a long way to go before we have a society that is really just, before we have a society that truly recognizes human dignity. We shall take an important further step in that direction if, during the present session, we raise the old age pension for all people who are 65 years of age and over to a reasonable figure—I suggest $150 a month—and if we restore the principle that all our older people shall get it, as they should, as a matter of right. This will be a step of which this Parliament could really be proud.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Mr. Raymond Rock (Lachine): This is a difficult time at which to deliver a speech, bearing in mind the events of the past week. It is sad, indeed, it is tragic for all Canadians that these events should have ended in the brutal murder of the Quebec Minister of Labour and Immigration, the Hon. Pierre Laporte, a great Canadian and a good personal friend of mine. My sincere sympathy goes to his loved ones.

First, Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the mover of the motion for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, the hon. member for Bourassa, (Mr. Trudel) and the seconder, the hon. member from Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas). It was indeed an excellent choice—an hon. member representing an eastern urban metropolitan area and another representing a western agricultural community.

I had the honour of being a member of the Lachine City Council for close to 13 years. At one point during this time, the Hon. Lionel Chevrier, then in charge of the Seaway construction, stated at a banquet organized by the Lachine Chamber of Commerce that all craft using the old canal system would be allowed to use the new canal. After the official opening, the St. Lawrence Seaway authority banned all craft under 20 feet from using the new canal, thus preventing thousands of people from travelling from Lake St. Louis to Lake St. Francis, to the Thousand Islands, the Great Lakes and eastward, to Lake St. Pierre and the Richelieu Rivers, Lake Champlain and the Hudson River.

Since the Seaway has been completed, the Seaway authority has attempted to close the old Lachine Canal completely, without regard to its probable future use. Many times I have stated that this canal should be used as a marina for pleasure craft. Last year the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) appointed a firm of planning consultants, Jean-Claude LaHaye et Associés, to study the future use of the Lachine Canal. In August last this firm submitted a report in two volumes, Tome I entitled "Navigation" and Tome II entitled "Other Functions". In the report it is mentioned that past studies made in 1964 by the federal Department of Public Works, in 1968 by Lalonde, Valois, Lamarre, Valois and Associates, in 1968 by the City Planning Department of the City of Montreal, Urban Development Division, in 1969 by Sorès Incorporated and in 1969 by N. D. Lea and Associates, all admitted that the one problem basic to all the studies and still remaining unresolved was the difficulty of communication between the three waterway systems within the Montreal area. The three waterway systems to which I refer are the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes system, the Ottawa River and the Lower St. Lawrence-Richelieu. The majority of pleasure craft in the Montreal region are held captive because of the cutting of the communication by closing the Soulanges and Lachine canals.

Before the redistribution of the federal electoral districts I represented Ste Anne de Bellevue, one of the 17 municipalities in the old constituency of Jacques Cartier-LaSalle. During this time the Department of Transport repaired and beautified the St. Anne's locks and made a park area there. For several years, I have been requesting the department to do the same at the Lachine locks but my request has been repeatedly refused because the locks were under the jurisdiction of the Seaway authority. I also asked for the old Lachine Canal to be transferred back to the Department of Transport, but this request has also been refused. At least my request to have the whole question studied by engineers was granted, and for this I am very grateful.

When a Member of Parliament from the Montreal region spends a great deal of time in Ottawa and notices the millions of dollars which are spent in the capital area, and realizes that these are in addition to billions of Canadian tax dollars already spent in projects such as the beautification and reconstruction of the Rideau Canal system, it makes him sick to his stomach to return to his riding to see property such as the historic Lachine Canal go to waste and look like a garbage heap.

The planning consultants hired by the St. Lawrence Seaway authority, Jean-Claude LaHaye and Associates, made certain recommendations which gave me hope and made me happy. They are to be found on page 75 of Tome II of their report, and I quote:

It is recommended that the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority take the necessary measures to ensure that any construction work done on the Lachine Canal over the next few years will in no way hinder the possibility of developing the canal for recreational purposes at a later date. In particular, the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority should ensure that:— bridges to be built or replaced have at least five feet clearance above water level, over a minimum width of 30 feet; work on dams and other control structures allow for future construction of locks, whenever warranted; any change in these structures allow for a two-foot drop in water level, if required. It is strongly recommended that the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority make representations to the Department of Regional Economic Expansion to conduct an overall study of recreation in the Montreal region. The development of the canal and its immediate surroundings should form an integral part of this study.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate this firm of engineers for their excellent work. I agree fully with their recommendations and I hope that the Minister of Transport and the St. Lawrence Seaway authority will accept the recommendations they have made. The historic Lachine Canal could, in its entirety, become a large marina providing facilities for the population of southern Montreal, people who have for years been hemmed in and denied all water rights to the St. Lawrence River because of the Port Authority.

An overall study such as this would take in the total needs of pleasure craft for Des Mille-Iles River, Des Prairies River, Lake of Two Mountains and Lake St. Louis. If the Seaway Authority and the Department of Transport are not interested in providing services for pleasure craft users, a federal responsibility, the old canal system could be transferred to the jurisdiction of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. The Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chretien) could then create a federal canal park system which would bring pleasure and beauty to the Montreal and Lake St. Louis district.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has often stated that people should participate in making decisions. Well, many of us in the constituency of Lachine, as well as in other constituencies along the Lachine Canal and in the Lake St. Louis district, will be organizing a seminar in the near future to study the needs of pleasure craft in the Montreal and Lachine canal area. It is my hope that the member for Laval (Mr. Roy) and Terrebonne (Mr. Comtois) will join us at this seminar.

I have heard a news report concerning a statement made in Toronto by the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) that the situation which exists in Canada is international in scope; that organizations are out to break the democratic system in many countries. I will go further and say that the members of the FLQ and members of similar groups are out to break our free enterprise system which has resulted in affluence and a very high standard of living. In fact, our standard of living is usually regarded as second highest in the world.

• (3:40 p.m.)

It is no accident that the very able premier of the province of Quebec, the Hon. Robert Bourassa, visited New York state lately to interest the Americans in a $2 billion power project which would produce 36 billion kilowatts of electricity in the James Bay area and would open up this area for development of its natural resources. This power project would create a surplus of electrical power which would be sold to the Americans, our friends south of the border. The plan could even include Thomas W. Kierans, grand canal system which would divert these waters, after their being fully used, to the Ottawa River and Great Lakes system. This water surplus would thus create more power potential for the power plants along the Ottawa and the St. Lawrence valleys, and there would be enough water to allow the Americans to use it south of the border, where it is much needed.

It was during the time Premier Bourassa was asking the Americans for a $2 billion loan for a development which would provide thousands of jobs in our province of Quebec that the FLQ went out on a wave of kidnapping, possibly to sabotage Premier Bourassa's plans for economic expansion. When we celebrated our 100th birthday of confederation, the FLQ did everything to sabotage the celebrations in our province. So this is nothing new; it as been going on and on.

There were in the past many important projects which were national in scope, some of which were realized while others, for some reason, fell by the wayside. For example, there were the great railway systems from east to west; the Alaska highway; the Trans-Canada highway; the communications microwave system; and then, lately, Telesat. However, many others fell by the wayside, such as the causeway to Prince Edward Island.

In 1855 there was much talk of building a telegraph system across Canada to Alaska, then across the Bering Strait to Asia and Europe. This suggestion was made following the break in the first trans-Atlantic line. However, the plan was abandoned when a second cable was laid successfully across the Atlantic ocean.

Then, about 1861 there was much talk of building a railways system from New York to Denver, via Alberta—then known as the Northwest Territories—and on to Alaska and across the Bering Strait by ferry to Siberia. This was a feasible plan in those days when people had vision.

In 1965, we had Thomas W. Kierans' grand canal proposal calling for the diversion of the Harricanaw River to develop power. In 1967 Acres Research and Planning limited published a report called "Canada North Development Corridor". This was a plan to co-

ordinate a system of communications, highway and railway networks from Newfoundland, by subway under the Strait of Belle Isle, and across the northern part of the provinces to Alaska. This is an excellent study, and I hope that included will be a causeway across the Bering Strait to Siberia, connecting North America with Asia. These projects I have mentioned were all excellent. Some have been developed, some not. Some of the later ones hopefully may be implemented.

I hope that Premier Bourassa's plan to open the James Bay and Hudson Bay areas for development purposes does not fall by the wayside. This proposal should be taken up by the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, as well as the federal government in order to realize the grand canal project and to consider development of Canada north corridor plan. It is to be hoped that the recent disturbances in Quebec will not cause American financiers to lose interest.

If development of the James Bay area took place, it is to be hoped that our aboriginal Indians and Eskimos would be given the opportunity to become totally involved in the economic benefits flowing therefrom, along with other Canadians. Hundreds of Indian and Eskimo children are presently completing high school. Many will take up professions and trades, but their talents may not be needed in the northern regions unless these areas are developed.

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to congratulate both the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, the hon. members for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel) and Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas). Both members have made their constituents proud as a result of their presentations.

Like my colleagues on both sides of the House, I should like also to express my most sincere and heartfelt compassion and sympathy to the family of the Minister of Labour of the province of Quebec, the Hon. Pierre Laporte, in their hour of bereavement and extreme sadness which is shared by the whole country. I also extend my sympathy to the family of the British diplomat, Mr. James Cross, and I am sure it is the prayer of the whole nation that he, at least, is still alive. I have little to add to the multitude of public pronouncements of indignation and horror that have been levelled against those social misfits who have been directing a campaign of physical violence and murder against our society.

May I thank, you, Mr. Speaker, for the opportunity of commenting on the Speech from the Throne, I did think we would never come back to it. I must confess at the outset that I am going to find it difficult, to say the least, to respond favourably to the attempt in the Speech from the Throne by the government to allay the fears and concerns of the Canadian people.

It is unfortunate that the Throne Speech was not delayed until the government had wrested control of this country from the FLQ. I say this in view of the recent dastardly act, specially the murder of Pierre Laporte, by the FLQ which has taken the heat off the Throne Speech. In a few days or weeks from now the government will be out of the woods as far as the Throne Speech is concerned, having not had to face the full weight of just criticism from the outraged members of the House.

For this reason, I was prepared to move a motion, seconded by the hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. Scott), that the House rules relating to the debate on the Speech from the Throne be suspended in order to allow additional time for members who wish to speak on the many economic and social problems that beset Canada. However, it has come to my attention during the last hour or so that some discussions along these lines are presently taking place among the House leaders. Therefore, on the assumption that the House leaders will arrive at a formula that will provide ample opportunity to those hon. members who would like to speak on the Throne Speech, I will withhold my motion for the time being.

The Throne Speech has been upstaged by the recent horrible events that have affected the lives of us all, and I cannot help feeling that the government would welcome an opportunity to fill some of the vacuum created by the speech. I cannot help feeling that the government would welcome the opportunity to explain to this House, and to the Canadian people, why there was so little in the Throne Speech in the way of specific programs designed to clear away the enormous backlog of serious problems that face this country. The problems of unemployment of housing, of unfair competition in our markets from foreign goods and from low cost labour are only a few.

• (3:50 p.m.)

I think I express the sentiment of my colleagues on this side of the House, and possibly a few in the backbenchers on the other side, when I say the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) would surely welcome the opportunity to explain to us what he really meant when he said we were standing on the threshold of greatness. We are all intrigued by the prospect and I for one would like to know whether the Prime Minister was speaking objectively or subjectively. Does he mean that he and his cabinet ministers will soon soar up into lofty heights? If they soar high enough it will delight a multitude of people from one end of the country to the other. I might suggest that if the Prime Minister does not wait too long he might be able to accommodate his cabinet in one of these new jumbo jets. After the Prime Minister and his cabinet have soared out of sight in their futile search for greatness we can employ few more jumbo jets to send his proteges after him. I am speaking of the hordes of hippies, yippies, draft dodgers, deserters and assorted freaks that the present government welcomes to this country from across the border.

I will not dwell on this at length, because the indignation of most of us has been expressed in this House, except to say that people who have shown clearly they do not respect the laws and traditions of their own society and country could not be expected to have a very high regard for the laws and traditions of our country. It

should be abundantly clear, even to our present government, that we do not have to import revolutionaries, freaks and malcontents; we have a substantial number of our own. I think it is time we stopped coddling these people in the name of the Prime Minister's new permissive society.

The majority of responsible citizens of this country have the right to expect protection from a lunatic minority that has been bombing, shooting, robbing, murdering and terrorizing innocent Canadian citizens and foreign dignitaries. I cannot believe that we are being led into greatness by a group of gangsters who have grown so powerful they can virtually paralyze every level of government.

As the Prime Minister emphasized last Tuesday, we are faced with a situation where a small group of arrogant gangsters is trying to establish a parallel power in this country in direct contravention of the traditional political system we have built up over the past 100 years, and in clear contravention of the wishes of a majority of Canadian people. The shock and horror expressed by people all across this country should serve to remind us anew that we are one country, with one society and one set of aims. We should realize now as never before that any attempt to impose the will of one culture group or one language on all Canadians will only serve to divide rather than to unify our one society.

It should be obvious to all of us now that the FLQ and other organizations of its type are not so much interested in the wellbeing of Canada as a nation as they are in furthering their own narrow, bigoted and self-serving aims. When I mention other organizations of this type, let me remind hon. members that we are confronted with other bodies besides the FLQ which are out to seek the dissolution of this country. For a very long time these groups, and especially the FLQ, have managed to enjoy relative immunity from public censure by pretending to be legitimate political organizations, seeking to change our social and political system by legitimate political means. We know now they have been sailing under false colours. We know now that the permissive policies of the last two governments have, whether they meant it or not, helped these bodies along in their policies of subversive activity.

Even the Prime Minister, who for years has dismissed the FLQ threat with a smile and a shrug of his shoulders, has finally awakened to the danger to our national security posed by the revolutionary and militant phonies whose only reason for being is the so-called liberation of one province from this great country. At long last, apparently aware that these gangsters represent a threat to his own power, the Prime Minister has publicly stripped from the FLQ the cloak of political propriety they have enjoyed for so long. It is unfortunate that the Prime Minister waited so long to take a stand on the question of revolutionary activity in this country. He waited until a crisis arrived and it became necessary for the government to invoke the War Measures Act, the most extreme measure presently possible under our constitutional system of government. I contend that the government long ago was warned of what was going to happen. The government was warned of developments that have culminated in the terrible events of the last few days.

As late as January, 1966 a tri-continental conference of all the so-called liberation movements was held in Havana, Cuba. Its objective was to co-ordinate all the Communist subversive and guerilla activities throughout the world. This conference was made up of delegates from Red China, which we have just recently recognized, the Soviet Union and Cuba. The conference was financed by Red China and Russia. Cuba was the host. The Soviet and Chinese delegates co-operated fully at that time and the Hon. Paul Martin, then Canadian external affairs minister, was apprised of this.

This year the tri-continental secretariat in Havana—that is the permanent secretariat of this tri-continental Communist conference—published a Brazilian mini-manual for urban guerillas which, among other things, deals with political kidnappings and assassinations. This mini-manual was distributed in Canada and in the United States by the thousands, and in many languages. It is now the main FLQ textbook on urban guerilla warfare. Very likely this was the literary instigation of the evidence given by Lucien Saulnier here, in the West Block, at a committee meeting last November 27, 1969. Mr. Saulnier was an able and well-versed witness and he gave this House, through the committee, an account of the subversive activities going on in Montreal and throughout Quebec. He said, as reported at page 10 of Volume 14 of the Committee evidence:

> We also find on the premises officially occupied by the Company of Young Canadians and paid for by the Canadian taxpayers, newspapers and pamphlets showing how to fabricate molotov cocktails, paint bombs, flasks and vials devised to disrupt police work in the maintenance of public order.
>
> These documents recommend fighting men, dogs and horses with pepper, ball bearings and slings and even promote the use of potassium cyanide by way of injection, and these recipes are printed and distributed by the thousands.

This is an association that should have been investigated. The government knew about this as did the Hon. Paul Martin, who has gone to his permanent reward in the other place. The Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) knew about these moves in French Canada. He knew about the conditions in the CYC. He knew, and still knows, about the Communist infiltration of the CBC. He has done nothing and for these reasons I ask for his resignation.

• (4:00 p.m.)

It is a little puzzling to me that the people of this country should have been surprised at this latest move of the FLQ, the dual kidnapping and murder. It is also a little puzzling that there should have been such general acceptance for so long of the claim of the FLQ to political status in our society. How could we as Canadians have tolerated any group of people who employed methods such as bombings, murder, bank robberies, public condemnations of our traditional political system and more recently kidnapping and murder of innocent public officials in the name of political expediency? I have long been convinced this has largely been due to a lack of leadership in our federal system and a lack of real interest in Canada as a nation.

Over the past years it has appeared to me that the governments of Lester Pearson and Pierre Trudeau, in their policies of loose permissiveness, have been more interested in establishing a permanent power base for their Liberal party than in establishing a distinctive Canadian power base through sound policies.

Mr. Anderson: Nonsense.

Mr. Alkenbrack: They have had all the ingredients of a strong, productive country that could have provided adequately for all its citizens. They have played a foul game of politics with the issue of French Canadianism versus English Canadianism rather than of French Canadian and English Canadian side by side in one society. In this, to our sorrow, they were well aided by Charles de Gaulle, one of the leading actors on this stage not so long ago. As a result, organizations such as the FLQ are able to come into being to flourish like a cancer in the body of an otherwise healthy being. As a result, this great country has the largest percentage of drifters, dissolutes and unemployed in the western world. As a result of the playing off of one culture against another, we are experiencing a state of turnoil in our civil service. People with long service in our government fear for their future because they have lived and worked all their lives in only one language.

We are faced with a situation wherein our two founding races are beginning to eye each other suspiciously as they jockey for position in a national power struggle. Up until now, the Liberal party has managed to use these manœuvres to stay in power and to keep the Canadian people off balance as it strengthens its position. The recent Speech from the Throne is the latest case in point. Instead of proposing ways and means to solve our pressing social and economic problems, the government takes great pains to avoid present issues and states that more government departments will be set up and more ministers will be added to the largest federal cabinet in the history of our government. No one would quarrel with a federal cabinet, large or small, if the individual ministers were coping seriously with national issues. If it were possible to solve all or most of our problems, and if Canadians were given an opportunity to work for a living wage without fear of being displaced for purely political reasons, I would even be in favour of a cabinet of 50 ministers. But if 30 ministers in the federal cabinet cannot come up with answers to even the most basic issues facing our country, then I wonder how long we can stand the expense of what appears to be pure political patronage.

I think the people of this country must soon ask themselves what they are doing with the single most potent force in our country, their votes. In my view we must take a close look at where we are going. We must ask ourselves if this is where we really want to go. We must also ask ourselves what has happened to our national goals and aims. It is time that we demanded of our federal government that it begin to give us leadership of a kind that will take us out of the wilderness which the Liberal party appears to find more acceptable than national prosperity and the sovereignty of the Canadian individual.

In the Speech from the Throne the Prime Minister admitted that his much-touted just society is now out of reach. He then followed up with his enigmatic statement that we are on the threshold of greatness. This is contradiction without parallel. Worse, this is evidence of indecision and perhaps even a measure of panic. How much greatness can there be in massive unemployment? How much greatness can there be in a situation where Canadians are penalized for speaking only their native language? How much greatness can there be in a system where a small group of renegades can terrorize the whole country and bring political activity to a virtual standstill while their ransom demands are discussed and negotiated. I am inclined to agree with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) when he said that the Prime Minister's promises of greatness apparently referred to the impending Conservative victory at the polls in the next federal election.

Let us now turn to the thorny issue of bilingualism. There is a growing awareness in this country that the present government is attempting to reverse the tide of Canadian history, and that an attempt is being made to force the great river of Canadian nationalism to flow uphill. Over and over again, we have been told the only road to true Canadian nationalism is through forcing all federal employees to learn two languages and the creation of enclaves throughout the country based on one or other of the two founding languages. We are told these moves are necessary to ensure that the two founding cultures of Canada are preserved and allowed to flourish. No one is opposed to the philosophy that the two founding cultures of Canada should be preserved and encouraged to manifest themselves in private and public life. However, we are being led along a road on which we will see the emergence of a power play between the English Canadian and French Canadian factions in this country. I say factions, Mr. Speaker, because that is what is happening. The country is already being set apart into two factions, each vying for preferred position in the federal civil service.

Almost daily we see increasing evidence that the traditional and ethical merit system in the government service is being compromised in favour of bilingualism. We are told that the merit system is circumvented only occasionally in order to give preference to bilingual candidates for positions or promotions. The mere fact that personnel boards however, are allowed to use this device at all is clear evidence of the government's intent. This past summer Mr. Keith Spicer, who holds the position of official languages commissioner, made a number of comments to the press concerning his mandate. Those comments give us pause for concern. I must admit that Mr. Spicer was candid about his qualifications, but I do not feel inclined to accept his view that bilingualism can be imposed on the country in the span of three to four years. It is interesting to note that Mr. Spicer took pains to state that before he was appointed languages commissioner he had not administered anything larger than a two-hole outhouse. That might be appropriate if applied

only to Mr. Spicer, but we must consider such public statements in the light of the broad mandate Mr. Spicer has been given, as well as the enormous budget assigned his office and the sweeping powers given to him.

• (4:10 p.m.)

The power that has been given to Mr. Spicer in order that he might convert our federal service into a bilingual jungle in the shortest possible time is greater than that of any other official of deputy minister rank. There is a clear indication that from three to four years from now anyone in our federal service who speaks only English will be as out of place as a person who speaks only Ukrainian, Italian or Polish.

We have already reached the point where anyone in government service who dares to object to the encroachment of the official languages bill into his work, whether or not a second language is essential to his job, is subjected to harrassment, intimidation and sometimes even demotion. It is also evident that Mr. Spicer's office is more receptive to complaints from French speaking public servants than from English speaking employees, that is to say, people whose first language is French as opposed to those whose first language is English.

It has been brought to my attention by reliable sources that a device is being employed in the federal service that gives an unfair advantage to one segment of our work force. If it were not such a serious charge I would hesitate to mention it in the House, but it is the sort of thing that the government should be required to face up to and deal with before it gets out of hand. The device I refer to is the process of examining public servants in order to confer bilingual status, and thereby give the applicant an advantage in job placements and in promotion. Employees whose first language is French, and who have less than adequate knowledge of English, have been allowed to state that their first language is English. They are then examined in French; they receive appropriate grading, and to all intents and purposes they are considered bilingual. This is only one of many examples of abuses of the official languages law, and the English Canadians do not have a champion to plead their cause.

It would be specious to suggest that Mr. Spicer, in the light of his mandate, would lend a sympathetic ear to the plight of the English Canadians. I repeat that there has never been a time in our history when the morale of our public service has been as low as it is today, and this condition has been created coldly and deliberately.

Mr. Spicer also mentioned another aspect of his mandate that has not been given sufficient publicity or even any airing in this House. I refer to his statement that he wants to go further than just to make all of the public service bilingual. He stated that in order to promote a harmonious atmosphere for bilingualism in Canada he must also tackle industry. He did not say industry in Quebec, Mr. Speaker, he said industry in Canada. This raises an interesting point. Does Mr. Spicer seriously plan to force the Quebec government to reverse its stand with regard to making French the working language in Quebec industry? No one could be that naïve.

[Mr. Alkenbrack.]

I plan to say more about bilingualism in our federal service and in other areas in our country at a later date, I can only hope that I will get some support from some of my concerned colleagues in bringing this issue out of the dark and into the arena of public scrutiny. We had been on the threshold of success in bringing the two founding races of this country together in harmony. However, the Pearson government, and more recently the present government, have and do consider it more expedient to use the force of the federal sledgehammer to bring the people to heel. It will work for a while, but in the end we could be faced with a continuing situation of trouble and crisis. It is the hope of all Canadians that the government now will get down to work to deal with Canada's many social and economic problems so that she may advance instead of retreat, as has recently been her lot.

Mr. R. J. Orange (Northwest Territories): Mr. Speaker, I join all members of the House and the vast majority of Canadians in expressing shock, shame, dismay and frustration at the events in the last number of days. Many words have been said about the direction in which this country is going and the reasons this has happened. It is not my intention to dwell on this today except to extend to Madame Laporte, her family, the government and the people of Quebec, and particularly my colleagues in this House from Quebec, our deepest sympathy on this Canadian tragedy.

I should like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, the hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel), who spoke so eloquently when he moved the motion for the Address, and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) who is a very able representative of the province of Saskatchewan and has made a great contribution to the House of Commons in the short period he has been with us.

The year 1970 was the year of the north, the year when Canadians and people all over the world paid a great deal of interest and attention to the Canadian north. In addition, it was our centennial year in the Northwest Territories. One hundred years ago we became, as a result of an act of the British parliament, part of Canada, and the Hudson's Bay Company turned over Rupert's Land to the Canadian government for its administration.

There have been many highlights in this past year, and we have had many exciting moments. Her Majesty the Queen, together with members of the Royal Family, spent five days travelling the length and breadth of the Arctic to pay a visit to the Indian, the Eskimo, the Metis and the white people who live in the Northwest Territories. We were honoured by Her Majesty's visit. We saw how she and her family were able to communicate and meet with the people who had never had an opportunity to meet the Royal Family prior to this and probably never will have again, although we are looking forward hopefully to their return. We saw a gracious family who were relaxed during the whole course of their stay with us.

During the year we have had three visits, two of them short, on the part of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), to Frobisher Bay, to the magnificent Nahanni area and an extensive tour of the central Arctic last spring. In addition, we have been honoured by the visit of the Governor General and Mrs. Michener to those areas of the Arctic which did not receive either the Queen or the Prime Minister during the course of the year. Our people in the north have had an opportunity to show themselves in their native habitat to these distinguished visitors.

It seemed to me during the summer that every time we turned around in Yellowknife there was a conference just ending and another one just starting. We had visits from interested investors and people who were concerned about wildlife management. We have seen conferences sponsored by the government, such as the communications conference in September, which will be followed by a transportation conference under the ministry of transport in December. Last March we participated in the Arctic winter games when the Arctic people from Alaska, the Yukon and the Northwest Territories were able to come together to participate in sports activities.

• (4:20 p.m.)

These games were a great success, not only in terms of the people competing but in the opportunities they had to exchange ideas and views on how we should continue to develop and live in the northern half of North America. Our centennial activities included many things in all communities across the north. There were the northern games in Inuvik, and the centennial canoe race down the mighty Mackenzie with about a dozen teams participating, lasting for approximately three weeks.

There was a revival of the old, original mail runs, by dog sled, both in the eastern Arctic and the Mackenzie District. I have before me one of the newsletters published by the centennial committee, which outlines in detail activities that took place all through the north during the past year. Our centennial is virtually over, Mr. Speaker. Now, having built the infrastructure of our Canadian north we face the task and the challenge of implementing this for the benefit of the people who live in the Canadian north, for the benefit of the economy and environment of the Canadian north, for the benefit of the ecology of the Canadian north and, most important, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the people of Canada.

This Parliament last session enacted legislation amending both the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Acts which did a number of things relating to the quality of life in the Canadian north. The amendments to the Northwest Territories Act provided for an increase in the number of representatives who come together on the Territorial Council. The amendments to the Yukon Act provided for the establishment of an executive council which, in effect, is the first step in the establishment of cabinet government in that territory. During debate the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) indicated that as a result of the experience gained in the Yukon the same kind of arrangement would be made in the Northwest Territories.

One of the complaints which many of the people in the north have with respect to the management of their own affairs is that they are still living under a system which does not give them full freedom of expression. We would like to see our elected representatives on the Territorial Council have active participation in the management of government. By this means they will learn the responsibilities and the powers involved in government. I hope that the arrangement to be worked out in the Yukon Territory establishing an executive council can be soon implemented in the Northwest Territories, thereby giving our council a real say in the things which affect our lives.

It is almost redundant to say that we are on the threshold of great developments in the Canadian north. We have talked too often about this in the past. On many occasions we have said that the north is Canada's storehouse of wealth. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the door to that storehouse is about to be opened. There have been great discoveries of oil and gas at a place called Prudhoe Bay on the north slope in Alaska. Canadian territory will have to be used to transport these resources to the United States. We know there are serious problems associated with the building of pipelines through the north, problems affecting the environment and the ecology. However, we believe it is possible to build these pipelines in such a way as to retain most of our environment in its present state.

At the moment, plans call for the building of oil pipe lines through Alaska to the port of Valdez on the southern coast of Alaska. However, it is quite probable that simultaneously with this development pipelines will have to be built through Canadian territory to bring natural gas from Prudhoe Bay to the United States. There are a number of factors which must be considered seriously in this development. The first and most important is that people along the Mackenzie River, particularly the Indian people and the Métis people, should understand the effect and purpose of a pipeline. I ask the government and the oil companies concerned to ensure that there is proper communication between them to enable a full understanding in this respect.

The second important point is to guarantee that when pipelines are built they do not destroy the tender ecology of the north. We believe that through experiment, planning, organization and the expenditure of money, pipelines can be built running from the north slope of Alaska along the coast into the Mackenzie delta, and down the Mackenzie River into Alberta, in such a way as not to affect the cariboo migration, the permafrost, and the way of life of people who are dependent on hunting and trapping for their livelihood.

In this connection the oil and gas companies have already undertaken extensive research work to determine the effect of pipelines on permafrost. The Mackenzie Valley Research Program at Inuvik, which has been in operation for a year and a half, has provided a great deal of information to the pipeliners and to governments, so that when the time comes we may, and I repeat may, be in a position to ensure that these pipelines do not constitute great danger to the north.

Extensive oil and gas exploration is also taking place in the Canadian north, arousing the same nagging worries there. We look to government to prevent a disaster which could occur without proper planning and research. One proposal is to take oil from the Canadian Arctic by tanker. On two occasions the American supertanker, the *Manhattan,* has tested the Arctic ice. In fairness we must recognize that this ship was not built for that purpose. It was only reinforced against ice.

At this stage, Mr. Speaker, knowing the problems connected with Arctic ice, particularly in winter months, the problems of darkness and the problems of wind, I say that until such time as the government can be absolutely assured there is no possibility of oil spills from tankers, Canada must close the Northwest Passage to oil tankers. This is not to say that experimental trips such as those of the *Manhattan* were not useful. We discovered that in certain parts of the Arctic, particularly beyond the Northwest Passage, big tankers and other ships can be sailed without danger for most of the year. We have discovered that some of the minerals to be found in the eastern part of the Arctic islands may be transported south by large ships. Massive iron ore deposits, which were first discovered five or six years ago along the Mary River, have been left sitting there waiting the resolution of a number of problems, not the least of which was the transportation problem. As a result of the voyage of the *Manhattan,* it now appears there is a possibility that large ships can go through the new ice, ice formed during the course of one year. A ship can go through this ice without danger to the ship or to the environment, at the same time providing economic opportunity for Canada, in particular the Eskimo people of the eastern Arctic.

• (4:30 p.m.)

In the course of the growth of the north one of the most encouraging signs for Canadians, and indeed all people in North America, has been the interest in tourism. I am not referring to someone leaving a large city early in the morning and arriving at an isolated, comfortable fishing camp to spend a week at substantial cost. These camps are for a particular group of people. I am talking about the tourist who will travel, with a trailer hitched to the back of his car, up the Alaskan highway or the Mackenzie highway to visit the north that he has only read and heard about. We think more and more people will travel to the north by automobile, in addition to the primary means of transportation, air travel. The communities along our highways are reacting to these visitors. They help our economy. The northern people are proud to show their communities.

In many respects, Mr. Speaker, the infrastructure of northern development has been built. Most of our young people now attend school. As a result of the massive building program during the last five years, new homes are now available to most people of the north. Economic development is reaching the point where there is greater participation on the part of those who were born and continue to live in the northern communities. However, we must ask ourselves, where do we go from here?

Last year the government of Canada made a number of major decisions regarding northern development. The Department of National Defence has implemented a program to establish an Arctic headquarters. This is based primarily on sovereignty. For the time being, this headquarters will be located in Yellowknife. Armed Forces personnel will be scattered through the north for varying periods of time. The Armed Forces have a number of Arctic training projects covering construction, living in the Arctic, and other matters.

The Department of Justice has moved closer toward giving responsibility for justice to the territorial governments. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) has announced the establishment of an Arctic administration to be located in the north. I understand this will be a headquarters for the administration of all forms of Arctic transportation. The Department of Communications, through the Telestat operation, will improve communications for the people of the north.

Bearing all this in mind, I suggest to the government that it is time to develop a plan for the north. I am concerned when I see the various departments of government each working in its own direction. Although they are working with concern and interest, they are not necessarily working as closely as they might with sister departments of government and the territorial governments.

I like to think there is some means whereby planning might be done in advance, with a series of priorities established for the use of the resources, the lands, and to ensure that there is participation on the part of human resources, the people of the north. This could be accomplished by a planning council, strengthening the advisory committee on northern development, a white paper or task force. I am not sure what the answer is.

I strongly believe it is time for this government to compile a total plan, a design for the development of the northland of Canada. We must consider the criterion for investment in the Canadian north as well as the question of ownership of land and the use, either multiple or exclusive. When I say land, I am talking about conservation of areas and the development of proper planning for communities.

We must consider the human resources of the north to determine if the programs to this point have been satisfactory and meet the needs. Does the education program which has been developed really meet the needs of the people, the old and the young? We must look at the present social development programs to see if the people who are participating in these programs understand them. Do these people understand that they are on the threshold of great changes? Although these changes may have started 15 years ago, they are now being escalated. We must also determine the system of government that is best for the Canadian north. Do the territorial governments have enough power and strength to carry out those things which affect the quality of life of the northerner? What is happening with respect to the development of government?

I feel very strongly about the grand design for northern Canada. It is an opportunity for Canadians to transcend in many ways the regionalism that so often affects our country. The Canadian north offers Canadians a unique challenge to use their talents and abilities. Canadians from all parts of Canada must work to develop the human and natural resources in this vast expanse of Canada. Possibly this should be the melting pot of languages, races and skills, not only working for the benefit of the north, but the entire country.

In the process of talking about this country that I love so well, I cannot help but point a finger at some of the pressing and urgent matters that affect Canadians in the north and in the south. As our north changes, as our people come out of schools and as some of our people understand more and more of what is happening to them, they are saying to us, "We want to be involved; we want to be part of the action." The Canadian Eskimo, the Indian and Métis as well as the white man, is concerned and wants to participate in this growth and development. We have seen examples of this earlier this summer.

• (4:40 p.m.)

The people of Banks Island, hearing that oil companies were coming to their trapping grounds to undertake seismic work, objected; the news of their objection was picked up and carried by the media. We have seen how the government, with intelligent planning, was able to speak with the people of Banks Island and work out a program which was satisfactory. It is unfortunate, damned unfortunate, that before any decisions were taken the people involved were not consulted as to planning and programming. The solution that has been arrived at apparently is satisfactory to all concerned. I hope this is a lesson, Mr. Speaker. I hope that this is the silver lining and that from this time on the Indians, Eskimos, Métis and white people involved will be consulted before major economic decisions are taken in the north. They must understand the "why, how, when and where" of any decision.

Organizations such as COPE, the Committee on Original Peoples Equality, have taken the forefront in pointing out to industries, businesses and governments concerned the very point to which I have just alluded. They are saying, "You had better make certain that we know what is happening, because we will not be quiet any longer." In the process of change and development, the native peoples of the north must face a number of questions. Until they are resolved, I do not think they will really feel they are part of the Canadian dream.

I am talking primarily about aboriginal rights of Indian and Eskimo peoples of the north. By way of background, may I say that in 1921 most of the Indian people in the Mackenzie valley signed treaties with the government of Canada. These treaty documents are a disgrace. If people had been as greatly concerned about human rights in those days as they are now this matter would have been brought into the open. In no way could a government today get away with the kind of treatment that was meted out in 1921. Be that as it may, those treaties have not been upheld. The Indian people have not received the full benefit that they were entitled to under the treaties. Those benefits include land settlement benefits. At the same time there are many other people, primarily Eskimos in the north, who have never entered into any agreement or arrangement with the government of Canada. And this is what aboriginal rights are all about.

Up to this point the government has taken a fairly strong line with regard to aboriginal rights. First, I believe the term itself must be clearly defined. Second, if the government is to permit oil companies and others to exploit these lands, I think we shall have to sit down with these native people and say we are prepared to recognize that they have some claims and some rights with respect to participating in these developments. I hope this government will change its stand on aboriginal rights and not say, "We do not intend to discuss them." There seems to be a ray of light here, because the Prime Minister not too long ago said, "Maybe we can do that." If there is to be confidence between the native peoples of the north and the government of Canada, the present issue involving treaties and aboriginal rights must be discussed.

Too often in this House, Mr. Speaker, we hear a certain kind of question posed by hon. members. Often we hear about rumours—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Does the House consent to permitting the hon. member to continue his speech?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Orange: Mr. Speaker, may I express my sincere gratitude to my colleagues here for their courtesy in allowing me to continue. I will try not to be too long. I wish to say many things, and I believe hon. members of the House are interested in hearing them.

All too often in the House we have heard statements made by people, who may not fully understand the situation, to the effect that they have learned by way of moccasin telegraph of rumours of dreadful things happening in the north. By the same token, we seldom hear about some of the progress being made. On more than one occasion the question of the Indian mortality rate has been raised in the House. Statistics show that the Indian infant mortality rate has dropped from 64 births per thousand in 1965 to 24.2 in 1969, which is only two points above the all Canadian rate of 22 per thousand. The Eskimo infant death rate is still high; it is still triple that figure. Those engaged in medical services are doing their best to bring it lower.

The percentage of children born in hospitals has risen from just under 80 per cent in 1965 to 93 per cent in 1969. The natural increase in population—and we are very proud of this figure—in 1969 was at 31.3 per thou-

sand of population, compared with the national average of 10.8 per thousand. There has been a reduction of 23 per cent in new cases of tuberculosis discovered in 1969, as compared with 1968. In the Northwest Territories alone 11 new nursing stations were built in 1969-70 in various communities. The government's objective of having nursing stations staffed by qualified nurses in all communities of more than 100 persons will be attained within a year or so. So, Mr. Speaker, all is not bad. As I said earlier, we have seen a massive housing program undertaken. Approximately 2,000 additional homes have been built. We have seen our children lodged in school. We are on the threshold of truly participating with the rest of society. We have problems. Our prices are high. We are finding difficulty in financing our ski team and in raising the quality of human life.

In conclusion, may I urge one more thing on the government. In the South Nahanni area one can find one of the most magnificent wild rivers in Canada. It is one of the most spectacular sights I have seen in my lifetime. Although I have lived in the north for many years, I saw it for the first time this past summer while in the company of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner). We agreed that this area was worthy of protection for the people of Canada and for the generations to come. I know that there is some concern with regard to mining interests. I also know that the area is not used now, and has not been so used for some time, by the native peoples for hunting and trapping because it has a violent nature. There is only one person living in the area and because of the possibility of it becoming a national park, and being too crowded, Mr. Kraus is planning to move to another area. I urge the government to give serious consideration to a national park in this wild river region.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Mr. Ryan: Would the hon. member suggest assisting this prospector to get past the rapids on the South Nahanni river each spring? Maybe the old boy might find that long lost mine some day.

Mr. Orange: First, he stayed there all year. We are talking about the guy on the site there now, Albert Faille. He has been going up for years. The only way he'll ever make it up there again is by airplane and the Commissioner of the Northwest Territories has promised to arrange this for him. Albert will get his final trip up the Nahanni by airplane, and he might find that mine.

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): It is very difficult to stand in the House of Commons today and speak in the debate on the Address in the light of the situation facing us. It is difficult for all members, and especially for those who have taken part in the discussion today, to ignore at least temporarily, for the sake of responding appropriately to the Speech from the Throne, a critical and serious problem in our nation. Nevertheless, perhaps the events of the last week provide a fitting background to some of the remarks I am about to make and I ask hon. members forgive me if I do not attempt to take a wide national perspective but, rather, direct attention at an appropriate period in Canadian history to the problems which face one part of Canada. I feel it is somewhat futile to say anything at all, and this reflects my disappointement in the effectiveness of debates such as these. The people I really want to talk to are not in the House today, some for very good reasons and others for lack of interest. I should like my words to reach at least some of those who are responsible for decisions affecting spending and programming.

The people I represent on the east coast of Canada are in many ways the least likely to receive consideration because of their seeming inability to draw attention to their problems by displays of unrest such as seem to have become familiar in other parts of Canada. I represent the quietest people living on the continent of North America. The amazing thing is that the people of Newfoundland probably have the richest culture in North America, the only distinctive culture remaining in Canada. The rest all seems to have become the same. Our history goes back a long way. We have had a civilization of great magnificence going back at least to the year 1500 according to the records, and there is archeological evidence to indicate that there were settlements in Newfoundland as far back as the year 900 at a time when the great cities of Toronto, Vancouver and Montreal were not even heard of. It is perhaps a contradiction that some of the representatives of Newfoundland, including the Premier of our province and the Members of Parliament who represent our province, excluding myself, of course, should be so vocal and so aggressive in presenting their case. It is an odd contrast that those they represent should be such quiet people, people who believe justice will be done simply because of the need which exists.

I wish to express appreciation to those hon. members who visited our province in the earlier part of this year. I am referring to members of the regional development committee who had an opportunity to see at first hand some of the difficulties which the province faces. I know they are convinced that Canadians ought to pay attention to the needs of the east coast of Canada, if for no other reason than to honour the pledge which was made in 1949 under the terms of union, that is, the standard of living in Newfoundland would be made to correspond, roughly, to that which prevails in the other provinces.

What does it really mean to be a Canadian, and what does it mean to be making a livelihood in this nation? It might mean you are employed at a salary of $25,000, $30,000 or $40,000 a year, living in a hundred thousand or two hundred thousand dollar home with three or four cars and two colour television sets. You might be as fortunate as the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) who, I understand, has a considerable number. You could be a farmer on the prairies with hundreds of acres of grain, or a fisherman based on Prince Rupert with an average income of $10,000 a year. You could be a tradesman or a technician working in Hamilton or Metropolitan Toronto or one of the other large population centres and earning $7 or $8 an hour. You could be among the 93 per cent who are employed at the present time, or you could be among the 20 per cent of the working population of Newfoundland who are unemployed. This percentage is

about the same as the unemployment level in North America during the years of the great depression. It will make no difference that I put forward these observations in the House of Commons today, because it seems that the process of bringing about social change, to which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) so often refers, has broken down somewhere along the line; that great receiving set, the elected representatives of the nation seems not to be tuned in to the democratic process.

Perhaps this is a reflection of the times in which we live. It might not have anything to do with the particular government which is in power. But it seems to me that the means we formerly used to bring to the attention of the government the fact that there are problems to be resolved, are no longer effective. This is one of my greatest concerns. I do not want to see the kind of unrest that is evident in parts of Canada perpetuated to the extent that it becomes part of the *modus operandi* of people in the rest of Canada. A moment ago the hon. member for Northwest Territories (Mr. Orange) made an urgent plea in this regard and said, in effect, "We are not going to stay quiet any longer".

• (5:00 p.m.)

I hope that what I say to the House of Commons today will be listened to, for surely to God during the last two years the Newfoundland members of this House have on every possible occasion tried to drive home to the Canadian people and to the members of the House, as well as to the government and the Prime Minister, the fact that Newfoundland faces problems, problems that will be solved.

We have not even started on the road toward a just society, yet most Canadians are talking of reaching that ideal. For example, Newfoundlanders know they are paid the lowest wage rates in Canada, with a minimum wage of $1.25 an hour which many companies complain they cannot afford to pay. Very few people make more than $2 an hour. Most people in Newfoundland today earn around $2,000 a year, which is considered a very good income. Although we tell the Canadian people our plight, no one seems to listen. As a matter of fact, we are accused of being parochial when through the House of Commons we tell the country about the severe problems which we face.

The Department of Transport administers one of the most discriminatory pieces of legislation that I have ever seen. The people in my riding who live in the town of Gander and are employed by the Department of Transport are paid wages that are lower than those paid to fellow employees in other parts of Canada. This is because the people in Gander are placed in a certain zone. Certainly Adam Smith knew, as any other economist has known for the past five centuries, that the one way to create a just society is to put money into the pockets of the earning man. Yet, as I say, the Department of Transport pays lower wages to its employees in Gander than it does to employees in other parts of the country, simply because Gander is classified as being in the Atlantic region.

We do not expect to have the just society overnight, but we have hospitals in Newfoundland which do not even deserve that name. There are four cottage hospitals in my riding, and in most cases they consist of poorly designed dwellings with mediocre facilities which are totally inadequate.

There are five or six island communities in my riding where people still have a beautiful way of life, where hospitality and friendship, goodwill and decent living, are still qualities that they understand and retain. These are qualities that in many parts of Canada have long since disappeared. This year many moves have been made by the Department of Transport to eliminate their basic line of communication, the antiquated ferry system, but not in order to bring us some new ferries. I see the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) listening attentively because he represents one of those island communities, Bell Island. We do not want a paved road to Fogo Island, which is 12 miles off the coast, but we do expect that the 5,000 people living there will have adequate ferry transportation.

Twillingate, Greenspond, Bell Island, St. Brendan's, Change Island and other beautiful island communities have populations in some cases of over 5,000 people. This year the Department of Transport has moved to increase the already exorbitant ferry rates and in many cases to cut back on the number of trips that the ferries make. This means that the number of services provided through use of their Trans-Canada highway is actually diminished.

Some members wonder why there is an increase in unrest. I should like to inform them that I have written to the "czar of transportation" in Canada, Jack Pickersgill—who won his war on poverty with a $40,000 salary—about this question. The chairman of the Canadian Transport Commission replied to me that he could not afford to subsidize ferries on a budget of $3,000. That was the amount allowed by Treasury Board, and he explained that the budget was already overdrawn.

Is it any wonder that the people in my riding are coming to the point where they are beginning to exhibit evidence of unrest of the sort that has manifested itself in an ugly way in various other parts of Canada? How can I explain to them that the government is not willing to listen to their demands? Some people in my province do not enjoy the benefit of telephone service, even though some of them are living within 20 miles of one of the biggest international airports in the world—Gander. At the same time, we are able to watch television broadcasts of men walking on the moon.

Last year Canadian National Railways discontinued its passenger services across our province. We campaigned against this for two years but received very little sympathy from other members of this House. It was not only the support of the government that we lacked; we also lacked response and support from other members of the House. Members from other parts of Canada are now beginning to wonder whether there will be rail abandonment in their areas, and they should be a little reluctant to approach Newfoundland members for sympathy and understanding.

Around our coasts we have a few thousand communities whose wharfage and fishing facilities have enabled them to earn their livelihood. Fishing is one of the three major industry-producing endeavours in our economy. I wish I had in the House the letter I received from the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Laing) regarding these facilities, because they are now being allowed to deteriorate. People in Ottawa have decided that no longer should the rural economies be encouraged. That decision has been made in Ottawa, though it has also been encouraged by the province of Newfoundland which is now suffering under a rather insane political set-up.

The Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand), who made such an impassioned plea in the House last Saturday, talks of changing the system through the political democratic processes at our disposal. But he will not accept the fact that continually we try to drive home to him and to the government that the fishing economy of the province of Newfoundland needs to be fostered and developed instead of undermined and allowed to perish.

Since I do not have the letter that I received from the minister, let me try to summarize its contents. It was written by the Minister of Public Works and concerns a community called Salvage, one of a dozen communities in my riding that is urgently in need of fishing facilities. In this community there are 30 boats, fishing craft, and they provide employment for almost every person in the community. In addition there are four long-liners. I do not know the value of the boats in Salvage, but some of them are worth $20,000 and employ five family men. Each man makes a living from the operations of the long-liners; at the same time, these vessels provide much needed employment ashore.

The minister informed me that he could not justify acceding to their demand for a $12,000 slipway so they can pull the boats ashore periodically to repair the bottoms, overhaul engines, re-paint and so on, because there has not been an increase in fishing activity in that community. In other words, he is telling them that the government is not prepared to construct a $12,000 fishing facility to enable the men to continue earning their livelihood.

In Newfoundland there are very few urban communities: we have St. John's, Gander, Corner Brook and Grand Falls. About a dozen communities have populations of around 10,000, and only one has about 100,000. Perhaps 25 per cent or even less of our population is living in urban communities. The rest is made up basically of people living in a rural environment. About 1,000 communities are made up basically of people who are involved in the industry of farming to a very minor extent, in forestry to a very major extent, and in fishing to a very major extent. When we became a province 21 years ago, we did not have a well developed fishery but we were in the midst of great fishing resources. We asked Canada then, and we ask Canada today, to help us develop this resource and make ours a great fishing economy so that when it is developed we may contribute to the wealth of Canada.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Perhaps hon. members do not realize that the fishing industry was the original, staple industry of the Canadian nation, followed by farming and forestry or whichever came first. Perhaps the farming industry came after forestry, because it was the industry which helped develop and spread the nation to the west where the great, primary industry of farming became the basic development. For two centuries fishing was a well developed industry, long before the rest of Canada was even heard about or developed.

Last year there was talk of a great regional development program for the province of Newfoundland. We rose in the House day after day, to the chagrin of most members of our caucus and many members of the House of Commons, and talked about the need for a fisheries policy encompassing the fishing industry. Several months later we heard that the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion was going to announce a major development program for our province. He announced that millions of dollars were going to be spent on it. That money is only now beginning to be spent. The very strange thing about this program is that not a single penny of federal funds is going into the development of our fisheries resources. All this money is being channelled into infrastructure, whoever in God's name manufactured that word.

I should like to know who is making these decisions. They are quiet people in the province of Newfoundland, but I could tell the House a few stories about changes of attitude in the province which will manifest themselves loud and clear in the not too distant future. How can you expect these people to sit back for many generations and tolerate the fact that those planning future development in Newfoundland are not paying one bit of attention to their demands?

This is what is happening because the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, working in co-operation with the provincial government, has decided that in Newfoundland there should be about 50 communities instead of 1,000. Their biggest contribution to Newfoundland, as they see it, is to foster a healthy resettlement program under which people are brought from a rural to an urban economy, because they believe the kind of economy we have now should be modelled on Montreal. Montreal has a great many street lights, a beautiful sewer system, a great deal of smog and pollution, unrest, disturbance, heavy traffic, rented homes and rented houses. They have high-rise apartments where you can live on the fifth or the fiftieth floor.

Last year the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) replied to, I believe it was the hon. member for St. John's East, "who wants to live in a rustic Newfoundland outport where you may even have to tolerate things like outhouses", and called it the "pastoral syndrome" when we suggested he should listen to the people of our province. Perhaps many of them would like to live in rustic outports. Many Newfoundlanders want to live in these areas, carrying on the work of their forefathers. They cherish this attitude which in Newfoundland has been passed down through the last five centuries. Perhaps they want

to live in an environment where people are still Christians, still believe in democracy and still go to church. These people are hospitable and still call their neighbours George, Tom, and so on. Perhaps they want to live in this kind of an environment with God-fearing people who like their neighbours. The Minister of Regional Economic Expansion does not understand the environment of my Newfoundland friends. He wants an environment modelled on Montreal. I was going to tell him what he could do with that Montreal model, but I do not think this is the appropriate time.

We have a problem in respect of our fishing industry and I think I should spend a moment or two discussing it. Earlier today my Nova Scotian colleague who is chairman of the Fisheries Committee presented some of the reasons why Canada should come to the assistance of our fishing industry before it is too late. I contend that had we started a couple of decades ago, when Newfoundlanders first became Canadians, to develop the fishing industry in eastern Canada, we might have accomplished something. Perhaps this development should have been placed high on the list of priorities together with western fisheries. However, I will let the representatives of the industry there speak for themselves.

The fishing industry in eastern Canada has been treated with political bias by a number of governments, including the Conservative government, down through the years. They felt that the east coast was not a valuable political asset because it elected only a few members. Newfoundland has only seven members and we cannot change the government. We are not as powerful as Quebec and Ontario who have enough members to change the direction of government at least to some extent. Governments should have recognized that the people of Newfoundland are worthy Canadians living in a province which has valuable resources. They should not have treated us like Cinderella in respect of priorities. They should have put us high on the priority list to see whether we could make a contribution to the Canadian economy. This was not done.

I plead with the House of Commons to pay a little more attention this year to the question of international fisheries. While we have been sitting back treating with disdain the problems of the Atlantic fisheries, Russia—which is not a democratic state—has put many of its international fisheries eggs in one basket. Today the Russians have about 3,200 vessels, some as long as 300 feet, with crews of up to 5,000 manning the fleet. They prosecute an international fishery. Back in 1964, for example, they did not take a pound of haddock off the east coast. In 1965 they launched a naval war against the haddock fishery off the southeast corner of Newfoundland. That year 249,000 tons of haddock were taken, of which Russia took 129,000 tons. This year that fishery is so depleted that the fisheries products people tell me they do not even record the catches because they are so small.

The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis) had the gumption a couple of days ago to inform the people of Canada that this year, from October 23 to December 31, George's Bank is being closed to the haddock fishery. That is a tremendous move. It is being closed because there are no haddock. Last year the International Commission for Northwest Atlantic Fisheries suggested that we close certain areas of our haddock fishery. Some members of the press gallery came to me and suggested we were getting action already because George's Bank was being closed. Isn't that tremendous! This is the kind of hogwash and gobbledygook being given to people of Canada. They are closing George's Bank because there is no haddock. This year we want assistance, because it is no longer a problem of the Canadian fishery; it is a problem of almost every major nation which has vessels fishing off our shores. Everybody is aware of this problem.

• (5:20 p.m.)

I understand that this weekend a documentary film is being shown on one of the television networks. I understand it is heavily biased in favour of British Columbia. I do not mind if it is biased in any direction so long as we draw to the attention of the Canadian people the fact that we have a great fisheries resource which has only five or ten years left if the Canadian people will not put aside politics. They should forget that we are a long way from Ottawa and are only a few people and should help put the fishing industry on some kind of self-sustaining basis so that it might have a lifetime of more than ten years.

I have suggested to my colleagues that we should have an international conference on fisheries. The minister claims there will be an International Law of the Sea conference in two years. Last year he said it would be two years from now, and this year he says it will be two years from now. Either something is wrong with his mathematics or I am a long way behind in my new maths. In two years' time there will be very little fish left on the east coast of Canada: it will be too late.

The North Atlantic Fisheries Commission is not the proper body to take care of the fisheries. We contend it is not because this commission is not of a sufficiently high level. It can only recommend; it cannot make important decisions in respect of quotas and all the other things, or in respect of international agreements concerning our coasts even as far as the Grand Banks, 400 miles away. Let us not in this House think that Canada does not have some responsibility in the fisheries problem which is becoming more serious. I shall give some statistics to show that over the last two or three years the Labrador fishery has been a complete failure. Why were there occasions this year when fishing crews sailing to Labrador came home with only seven codfish after a summer's fishing? Everyone said it was because of pollution and cold water. In 1968, on Hamilton Inlet banks, 250 miles off the coast of Labrador, one billion pounds of fish were taken 25 per cent of it by the Soviet Union. The largest fishing plant in my area, the Twillingate plant, processed over 12 million pounds that year. The fish taken at Hamilton Banks would have been sufficient to keep this plant operating for 100 years.

This might give hon. members an idea of the extent of the rape of our resources by some nations. In 1964, at the Twillingate plant 94 per cent of all fish taken was the traditional cod. Everybody thought this species was in

such abundance that there was no possibility of its becoming extinct. In 1970, it is estimated that 30 per cent of the processed fish will be cod. This gives a dramatic indication of the situation in the cod fishery especially when one remembers it was possible to catch a basketful by dropping a basket over the side of the boat.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Does the House agree that the hon. member be permitted to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Speaker, I should like to express my appreciation to hon. members for being permitted to continue for a few moments. I was speaking of the international fishery. In 1958, the International Conference on the Law of the Sea reached agreement that a coastal state, which Canada is, had the right to unilaterally impose a measure of management and conservation in the seas adjacent to its territorial seas six months after failing to receive international agreement on conservation measures.

I hope I have made myself clear. In 1958, the International Conference on the Law of the Sea said to Canada that it could unilaterally impose measures in respect of the waters adjacent to its territorial seas, which by definition means the continental shelf, if it could not reach international agreement. We do not even go that far in our plea: we merely ask that Canada take the lead in attempting to obtain international agreement. We can worry about what moves we make after that, because I understand that nations, including the Soviet Union, are very concerned about the amount of capital investment in fisheries and their productivity, which is about one-quarter of what it was five years ago even though the average effort is twice what it was five years ago.

The cod catch in the Newfoundland fishery this year will be 25 per cent less than what it was two years ago. So, Mr. Speaker, I plead with the members of this House and the government of Canada to immediately convene an international conference of the fisheries of Canada which would not get bogged down in matters of pollution, military weapons' discharge, the rights of nations in the air above the seas, oil exploration and all the other ramifications of Law of the Sea conferences.

I am asking that Canada take the initiative in respect of a conference on the Law of the Sea to see whether a little encouragement can be given to British Columbia, eastern Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland—provinces directly affected by the imminent danger of depletion of our great fisheries resources. As a Canadian, I do not think this is too much to ask. Perhaps this plea will fall on deaf ears. If it should fall on deaf ears, the government of this nation will have to assume a great deal of responsibility for the further deterioration of law and order in this country.

[Mr. Lundrigan.]

I wish now to deviate from the subject of fisheries and proceed to another aspect of our economy. As an educator, I believe it is time Canada got off its constitutional high-horse and started paying attention to educational problems, in Canada. I believe the time has come when education must be considered more than a provincial problem. It can remain a provincial responsibility so far as curricula and the basic aims and objectives of our educational systems are concerned. But the government of Canada should take the initiative in becoming involved in the business of developing human resources in all parts of Canada.

In a day and age when there is great mobility of people in Canada, it is time we had more unification in our educational system throughout the nation. I am not speaking of curricula. One of my fundamental beliefs is that Canada must reform its manpower policy in particular, to see what we can do in respect of tens of thousands of Canadians who have reached middle-age and upper middle-age and are in the position where they have no prospects for the future.

I would be the first to admit that I have no answer, but I believe there should be a tremendous review of our manpower policy. In my province there are thousands of people who have never had the opportunity to gain an education. I am sure other hon. members have the same situation in their areas. Many people had to leave school at an early age. A favourite expression in my province is that they were dragged out of school and put in a fishing boat. In our Newfoundland culture the language sometimes is a lot richer than that which I have just used.

People who have had little schooling deserve consideration. I imagine there are many such people in the province of Quebec. I have only studied the situation in Quebec, having been there only 15 or 20 times. Therefore, I cannot pretend to have any knowledge of the situation there. But I imagine that Quebec, with its large rural community outside Montreal, has a tremendous number of men who have never had a chance to receive much education and who are out of tune with the technological society in which we are living.

• (5:30 p.m.)

It seems to me that the trade schools which are available today to some people who leave high school are not adequate to teach them to deal with the kinds of problems to which we have been referring. There have been situations this year in Canada—I will not be parochial by mentioning Newfoundland only—where out of hundreds of people who have applied to enter trade schools, only some have been accepted. I am referring to a situation where 700 people applied and only 200 openings were available. As a consequence, those who got in were high school graduates. Therefore, the people I am referring to, many of whom have only grade 4 or 5 education, or even less, have had no chance. Unless we are prepared to retire Canadians at the age of 45, we should assume some responsibility for trying to make their lives constructive, which I am sure is their aspiration.

I have one last point to make on this topic. It could take me an hour, but since time does not permit me to speak that long I hope to hear someone develop it further. Basically, we are living more and more in a welfare state. I spent hours and hours as a small boy listening to my father and grandfather tell stories in the wintertime about some of their achievements, the odds they overcame and the hard work they did.

They spoke about an age when hard work was held in the highest esteem. They spoke about a period when the protestant ethic, which has nothing to do with religion, basically meant that achievement came through hard work. This seems to be what Newfoundlanders, at least, have cherished throughout the years. You did things by the sweat of the brow. The person who worked the hardest and the longest hours, and who had the most gumption and "get up and go", was held in high esteem.

Our generation of Canadians is responsible for deterioration in the Canadian society because of the emphasis in another direction. I firmly believe that the whole welfare system must be reviewed. I know I am treading on thin ice and I know I am saying something that is not the political thing to say. I know there are people in my own riding who will feel I am on touchy ground, and I know there are some damn lazy Canadians who will think I am out of order. The fact remains that as representatives of the people of Canada we can no longer reward lack of initiative, because we have a responsibility to provide a system wherein people can succeed through their own initiative.

I heard the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall) tell the House a couple of days ago about a man 70 years old who was forced to pay back over $200 that he had earned through selling newspapers because government regulations would not permit him to receive his pension and still earn that kind of money. I know of many people in the same situation. Right now I am trying to draft three letters to people who are receiving war veterans allowance, because of their contribution to society in days gone by, and have to give up their employment because if their annual earnings exceed $1,200 they will have to pay back the difference to the government.

I could speak at length on the subject of welfare and Canadians who are not allowed to obtain employment to supplement their income. I have heard of a man who is 62 years old and cannot provide food for his family. He has little education. He owns a small boat 18 or 20 feet long, and not too far off the coast he can catch 15 or 20 quintals of fish, which are worth $400 or $500. The welfare department told him that this year he is allowed to earn only $20 over and above what he is receiving in welfare and anything beyond that will have to be paid back. That is the declared policy of the department of welfare in the province of Newfoundland—and 50 per cent of this welfare is paid through the Canada Assistance Act. I will not go into the details of the Canada Assistance Act, but a time will come very shortly when, if we do not overhaul drastically the welfare system in this nation so that we give people the opportunity to earn a living and the incentive to do so, we will be heading for a lot more trouble than we have had in the last week.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie)—Post Office—Termination of legal role of Minister of Communications as head of department; the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Skoberg)—Agriculture—Pesticides—DDD—Reason for one year extension on use-notification of changes; the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis)—The Canadian economy—Steinberg wage increases—Clarification by chairman of Prices and Incomes Commission of effect on prices.

* * *

[*Translation*]

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session.

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Ottawa-West): Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to congratulate the movers of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne (Mr. Trudel and Mr. Douglas). They spoke well to the House. We were pleased to listen to them because they are certainly very capable.

[*English*]

This debate, which is unique in my experience in the House, has unfortunately been interrupted by events of a most tragic nature. The special debate on the application of the War Measures Act which took place on Friday and Saturday in the House was an example of a democratic Parliament at its best. Without any question, the full range of views was explored in the House, the implications of what we are doing were solemnly discussed and the measure of unanimity that was achieved as an expression of the wish of the people of Canada is a tribute to members of this House.

Without any question, these are historic days. We hope they have not left such a mark on the character of our institutions that this kind of thing will stay with us. We trust that it will be possible for the present emergency to be adequately dealt with at the earliest possible date, so that the necessary measures are carried out to dispose of the threat to our institutions.

I wish to raise two major subjects in the discussion today, one of which has given me concern for some time. I shall talk about the growth of our Crown corporations and the issue of public accountability that is involved. They have a special application in the constituency of Ottawa West which I have the honour to represent in the House. On referring to the Canada Year Book, 1969

edition, I note that the section beginning at page 108 describes the Crown corporations that have been instituted in Canada. The Financial Administration Act, part 8, which was enacted in 1951 attempts to define and classify these various agencies, corporations and miscellaneous bodies. First it describes departmental corporations, which are supposed to be as follows:

• (5:40 p.m.)

A departmental corporation ... that is a servant or agent of Her Majesty in right of Canada and is responsible for administrative, supervisory or regulatory services of a governmental nature.

The second major classification, which I have great difficulty in distinguishing, is the so-called agency corporation which is defined as follows:

—an agent of Her Majesty in right of Canada and is responsible for the management of trading or service operations on a quasi-commercial basis or for the management of procurement, construction or disposal activities on behalf of Her Majesty in right of Canada.

This second group, which gives me the greatest concern, includes such agencies as Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, the National Capital Commission, the National Harbours Board, and so on. The third group of Crown corporations consists of proprietary corporations. Again I quote:

A proprietary corporation is defined as a Crown corporation that (1) is responsible for the management of lending or financial operations, or for the management of commercial or industrial operations involving the production of or dealing in goods and the supplying of services to the public, and (2) is ordinarily required to conduct its operations without parliamentary appropriations.

Among this latter group are Air Canada, Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation, Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, Cape Breton Development Corporation, and so on. It is my contention, Mr. Speaker, that there is a major problem in public administration which has developed as the result of the extensive growth of employment in this sector. There is a problem in accountability by the Crown corporations to the elected representatives of the people. There is a problem in adequate review of their policies, programs, and in many cases their budgets. There is finally, in my opinion, a development which gives me the greatest concern—the type of agency or corporation that considers it is responsible to no one and which in fact, in my opinion, has come dangerously close to committing contempt of Parliament.

Crown corporations, Mr. Speaker, are not exactly small fry. Again according to the Canada Year Book, page 117, total federal government employment on March 31, 1968, comprised 369,354 persons. Employment in Crown corporations, agencies and miscellaneous bodies at the same date comprised 210,505 persons. In other words, the sector which I feel is not subject to adequate, shall we say, supervision by elected representatives is now substantially approaching in magnitude—payrolls or any other way you want to measure it—the regular public service of Canada.

In addition to the Crown corporations we have two or three special cases. For example, Mr. Speaker, the Auditor General is responsible only to Parliament itself. I suppose that members of his staff would be similarly regarded. We all know that the Parliamentary Library, Parliamentary counsel, people who are employed on Parliament Hill under the direction of Mr. Speaker, again are responsible to Parliament in a very broad sense and not to any minister.

We recognize the need for the independence of the Auditor General. But Parliament in its wisdom has a Standing Committee dealing with the Auditor General. The Standing Committee perhaps does its work well, perhaps not so well. Sometimes it does it more conscientiously than others. Sometimes its meetings are more frequent than at other times. But it is a Standing Committee of this House.

The Chairman of that Standing Committee is not one who sits on the government side of the House. He sits on the opposition side, thereby to guarantee greater impartiality in the conduct of its proceedings and scrupulous concern for review of the report of the Auditor General, which must be one of the first concerns of every member of the House. But it may come as something of a surprise to hon. members to learn the Public Service Commission, which claims that it is in precisely the same status in relation to Parliament as is the Auditor General, reports through a minister, not to a minister, and in this case the minister is the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier).

I have been told by a member of the Public Service Commission that their view is that the minister is something of a post office. They drop their report with him and he gets it over to Parliament without doing anything to it, without entering into the policy, without in any way bringing about the type of ministerial supervision which is the normal part of governmental activity.

Mr. Nesbitt: It's a nice theory, anyway.

Mr. Francis: Mr. Speaker, an hon. member on the other side said something which I am sorry I did not hear. If he cares to rise I would be prepared to answer a question.

Mr. Nesbitt: I said it was a nice theory, anyway.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. member that according to the Standing Orders, if he wishes to ask a question he must do it from his seat.

Mr. Francis: Mr. Speaker, I am not really in disagreement with the interjection of the hon. member. We have a position here where a particular body, in this case the Public Service Commission—about which I want to say a great deal more—takes the view that its activity is an activity somewhat parallel to that of the Auditor General. I noted, for example, that this spring there was a very interesting session before one of the parliamentary committees. The head of the Public Service Commission appeared before it and pointed out that according to the statute the Public Service Commission did the recruiting

for the Auditor General. This is one independent agency recruiting for another independent agency. The statute so requires, and the Auditor General had his own views as to whether he was being well served in regard to recruiting.

It seems to me that the result of this situation should be to call the attention of hon. members of this House to a very basic question: What is the structure of administration? Who reports to whom? Should we not, as a very minimum, have a Standing Committee of this House to review the work of the Public Service Commission, just as there is a Standing Committee of the House to review the work of the Auditor General?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Francis: If the position of the Public Service Commission—and I suspect a good case in law can be made for this—is that it should report directly to Parliament to ensure the protection of the merit principle in the selection, promotion and appointment of public servants, is there not some obligation on the members of this House to provide a little more by way of review of the operations of this body than a 15-minute appearance once per year before the Miscellaneous Estimates Committee? The problems in the growth of the Public Service are well recognized. The problems in the growth of Crown corporations and miscellaneous agencies have not been recognized to the same degree.

I think that anyone looking at the record will agree, for example, that what has been said before the committee of the other place reviewing science policy is most revealing. A tremendous commitment of public funds has been made in the atomic energy field without adequate review by parliamentary process. The amount of money that has been spent in the name of Canada for the CANDU reactor is a commitment that may yet turn out to be a wise one. But on the basis of the evidence presented to the Senate Committee on Science Policy, it might have, shall we say, benefited from legislative review of a more careful nature than at present is extended to this whole sector of Crown corporations. The commitment here is not in millions of dollars, or tens of millions of dollars; it is in hundreds of millions of dollars. The problem is not only lack of review; it is lack of uniformity of standard, lack of a logical, coherent structure.

At one time, Mr. Speaker, I had the honour to be the national president of an organization of public servants. We attempted to organize public employees in the Crown Corporation sector. It was quite revealing to see the lack of uniformity of personnel policies and selection policies. There was a great variation in policy with regard to collective bargaining. When a Crown corporation received its charter through an act of Parliament and gained the right to recruit, select, promote and operate its own budget, it was more than just a symbol of status.

• (5:50 p.m.)

With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I think that the hiring freedom which has been given the Company of Young Canadians should be studied. Without any qualification, they have been given the right to hire whom they wish. Funds are provided by Parliament to do so. That privilege in such a blatant and unrestricted form has been given to very few Crown corporations, mercifully so.

All members of this House become concerned when the head of the Public Service Commission states over television that he is "not dancing to the tune of any political master". It is fine to use casual language in an exchange, especially with a little provocation from a journalist, but when the head of the Public Service Commission further states that a solemn undertaking given by a former Prime Minister and repeated by the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is such that he does not think he can implement it, it is indeed a matter of concern. He used a television program to tell the nation that those are his views concerning the statements of two Prime Ministers of this country. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this is dangerously close to contempt of Parliament. This kind of thing cannot be permitted to continue.

The head of the National Capital Commission was quoted in the press as saying that he thinks he might move the Prime Minister away from Harrington Lake. I do not know if that is an accurate quotation but it is what was printed. Such a statement is dangerously close to contempt of the executive branch, if not the legislative branch of Parliament.

Most of us have thought about this subject to some degree. It has been said that it is unfortunate there has to be the Crown corporation device for certain things. Polymer Corporation is conspicuously cited as a successful example. Few of us want to be negative in our criticism. We do not want to be accused of destroying what others have built. All hon. members have an obligation to look at what has happened to the over 200,000 people engaged in the sector of Crown corporations. I regret that the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart) is not in his seat at this time, but no one can be expected to be here all the time. This member has placed 38 private member's bills before the House, all of which would have the effect of putting a member of the House on the board of directors of one or more Crown corporations.

I commend the hon. member for Cochrane for two reasons. First, he is now focusing attention on the fact that we need reform in respect of private members' bills. Each member of this House should be given a quota of possibly two which would be placed in the draw. When a member submits 42 private member's bills, the whole process becomes ludicrous. What would happen if 264 members each submitted 40 bills? We deal with only 50 in the course of a session. It would be similar to a reward in a lottery if a bill of a private member were dealt with in the session.

A simple reform of the rules is an obvious need. I hope we will have the co-operation of a particular group in this House which prides itself on private members' bills. This group has been responsible for far more bills than any other, despite their limited number of M.P's. I hope the members of this group will join with us in seeking a

reform of the rules with regard to the number of private members' bills to be submitted in one session. If the hon. member for Cochrane had this in mind, it is worthy. It draws attention to this situation. I know the proposal to have members of Parliament on the boards of directors of Crown corporations will be resisted, not the least of which resistance will come from the corporations concerned. That can be taken for granted. The force of inertia will be one of the things. It will also be resisted by those who do not think any new ideas have a possibility of working.

It has been said that the role of a private member is not clear if he is placed on a board of directors. He would be either snowed under by the establishment or a thorn in the flesh of somebody. The possibility that it would be useful or constructive has not come through to them. In the province of Ontario this device has been used effectively. I have spoken to a number of members from both sides of the House and to a number of members who serve on the boards of such corporations. It is my personal opinion that it is a useful device and creates a bridge between the elected representatives of Parliament and the Crown corporations. It manages to achieve a degree of autonomy that is not inconsistent with the electoral process.

Some members say the relationship of the private member to the government would be anomalous. They say the member would be in an impossible position, his duties would be too great, and so on. Those who say this ignore the experience in the province of Ontario which should be carefully examined. Hon. members will possibly have 38 opportunities to examine whether members should be on the boards of directors of 38 Crown corporations which have been enumerated. I hope hon. members will ask what devices are available to Parliament to bring in a greater degree of accountability of the Crown corporation sector to this place.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. It being six o'clock, I do now leave the Chair. The sitting will resume at eight o'clock p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Francis: Mr. Speaker, before the House rose at six o'clock I was talking about the problem of public accountability of that sector of the public service generally called Crown corporations and agencies. I pointed out that over 200,000 persons are employed in that sector; that there are immense variations in the degree of accountability to Parliament for the activities of the sector with respect to personnel policies, hiring and promotion rights and collective bargaining policies.

I pointed out, too, Mr. Speaker, that some Crown corporations and agencies have now developed to the point where, in effect, there is little if any supervision of what they are doing by the elected Members of Parliament. I pointed out, for example, the problem in the science sector. The Senate Committee on Science Policy has pointed out that in one case hundreds of millions of dollars were spent without any tight or adequate review of priorities or national objectives.

I also pointed out my concern that the head of a Crown corporation says he does not report to the minister, but that through the minister he reports directly to Parliament—thus claiming a status, and I think with good legal basis, similar to that enjoyed by the Auditor General. The difference in the case of the Auditor General is that there is a Standing Committee of this House to review his activities. In the case of the head of the Public Service Commission there is no comparable arrangement for review.

I was pointing out, too, that the same kind of problem seems to have developed in regard to the National Capital Commission. I note that the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Andras) who is designated as the Minister of Housing and Urban Affairs was recently made responsible for this sector. I am confident that one of the things he will do is to review the program of the National Capital Commission. Those of us who have followed its activities have been pleased with the fresh ideas, vigour and renewed emphasis which have come as a result of the appointments in the past year. We look forward to action on a new bridge to Hull, which I am sure will be welcomed by all people in the area. We know it is very much needed.

We are only asking that there be adequate consultation with the municipal authorities on both sides of the river which will have the responsibility for guaranteeing the access points and approaches. This involves a very substantial project when one considers the planning which has taken place over a number of years and the reports, the making of which the federal government has participated in and consented to, of previous years. We have now seen the recognition that changes are necessary. I think there is a great deal of merit in the proposals. We ask only that there be adequate and prior consultation in an orderly way.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the suggestion which has been endorsed at other times and places, namely, that there should be a joint committee of this House and the other place to review the work of the National Capital Commission in this area, will be considered by the government at an early date. I sincerely hope, as the member representing Ottawa West, that among the items which will be profitably considered by such a committee will be an examination of the recommendations of volume V of the report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, in which some very serious charges were made concerning the administration of the national capital, the city of Ottawa.

I hope that in such a way the recommendations will be examined and that the city and other groups which feel they have been unjustifiably attacked in the report—one which is altogether different in tone from previous

reports—will have their say, so that these administrations will have a forum in which they can reply to the charges which have been levelled against them.

• (8:10 p.m.)

I can see nothing but good coming from the creation of a forum in which this matter could be weighed and the necessary recommendations made by an all-party committee, representing all parts of Canada, to this House to do what it considers right and proper in our capital. I would be the first to say, Mr. Speaker, that in this respect the record of the city of Ottawa has not been as good as it should have been. This does not mean I am prepared to accept a number of the statements made in the report, and I would welcome an opportunity to lay the record before members of this House for close examination.

I hope such a committee could look at the whole question of pollution in the national capital region. The pollution of the air is painfully evident in the area when the wind blows from the east and the mill down at Thurso is changing its process; the sulphuric fumes are breathed by all those in this city when the atmospheric conditions are unfavourable.

The pollution of our waters is scandalous. The policy of the federal authority in regard to assistance in the creation of sewage treatment plants in this area needs strengthening. The time for that is long overdue. One of the things I would welcome at an early date is assistance which would help la communauté Outaouaise to develop a sewage treatment plant. I hope the city of Ottawa will carry its service beyond that of primary treatment, which is grossly inadequate. Secondary and other treatment must be provided.

Mr. Speaker, the agenda for such a committee could be long and very fruitful. I would hope such a committee could tackle its responsibilities in keeping with the sense which we all feel, that the national capital belongs to all of Canada, not just to the people who live in it.

Mr. Speaker: I have no intention of rushing the hon. member—he still has about 45 seconds left—but I would bring to his attention that the hon. member for Battleford-Kindersley (Mr. Thomson) wishes to ask a question, if the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis) will accept it.

Mr. Francis: I will be glad to do so.

Mr. Thomson: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would tell us whether he feels the National Capital Commission should move the E. B. Eddy plant out of the Ottawa-Hull environment into another locality.

Mr. Francis: That is a very complicated issue and I cannot give an off-the-cuff answer. Two thousand jobs are at stake. I think a program for the relocation of its facility has to be undertaken, but nothing can be done abruptly; one cannot abruptly terminate so many jobs. But I think we have an obligation to clean up this corruption and give the company notice of the kind of planning necessary to eliminate pollution.

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): In my opening words, Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply. As a member of the Finance Committee I got to know the member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel). He struck me as a very sensible fellow, one who did not pay too much attention to the strange notions on taxation which exist in the minds of his leader or the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) but was inclined to follow the mainstream of Canadian thought on tax reform. I believe this will stand him in good stead when later in this Parliament we get down to the nitty-gritty of our discussions about changes in taxation.

I believe we shall get round to doing this. As some have pointed out, though, there are other areas in the Speech from the Throne we might not have an opportunity to deal with, because I suspect the schedule of this Parliament has been rewritten by events, more particularly by a shot into the head of an innocent man, Mr. Pierre Laporte. I should like to make a few comments on that matter and on the Cross kidnapping, since I knew Mr. Cross in Halifax and I suppose that when one knows victims of such senseless behaviour the message becomes all the more potent.

During the kidnapping, but before the death of Mr. Laporte I thought about presenting a notice of motion on the subject, to the effect that the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs be empowered to examine and report upon terrorist activity in Canada, and specifically to study: (1) the penalties which now exist in the Criminal Code as they relate to crimes committed by terrorists, (2) the efficacy of counter-terrorist activity, (3) the matter of compensation for victims of terrorism or their families, (4) the relationship of the Canadian terrorist movement with foreign influences, (5) the existing legislation dealing with emergency powers and to make recommendations thereon.

The events of the last couple of days have completely outstripped anything I had set forth in the resolution, though I believe that when the legislation to be brought forward is being examined, consideration will have to be given to the points I have advanced. I have spoken to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and understand the legislation will go to the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. I am a member of that committee, so there will be an opportunity for me to follow up some of my points of view.

We must not lose our perspective. This kind of terrorist activity is really like the slow emergence of an iceberg from the sea. We are witnessing a very small part of a kind of activity which is likely to grow worse as time goes by. We might as well know what we are up against, and we do not have to look far back in history to find out. The ideas we are up against here are taken from Algerian Popular Front activity, these in turn from Chairman Mao and his ideas in China, and these in turn from Mr. Lenin and his ideas in Russia.

In fact, the first real philosopher of terrorism in our time was a Russian named Nechayef. We do not have to go to ancient history; we can stay within the history of this century in our study of these baleful activities to learn exactly what we are up against. This gives us an opportunity to study the philosophy of terrorism, decide whether we have taken appropriate measures to deal with it—I suspect we have not—and whether we have to declare a set of principles upon which we shall stand. I think we have to do this.

When I say "Declare a set of principles" I am thinking of the situation which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) or his colleagues would face if one of their number were picked up and held. One must decide what bartering, if any—and I hope it would be minimal—would be engaged in, so that terrorists would know in advance the kind of society they were dealing with. I believe we should also make certain, when the legislation is before us, that it is tough legislation—none of this "Ten years' imprisonment and then you go free, Mr. Murderer." I hope there will be none of that. I hope that from one end of Canada to the other people who wish to engage in terrorism will know exactly the type of revenge a thoughtful society intends to wreak upon them.

• (8:20 p.m.)

We have been soft and permissive for far too long. I suppose terrorists can be expected to think: Oh well, nothing very much is likely to happen to us or to our allies. I think we have now passed that watershed and have entered a new age, one that has to be tough. It is an age that has to assert the value of human life in a way we have not asserted it in the past when dealing with those who have taken human life. We will have to decide whether our Criminal Code measures are strong enough.

I should like to put on the record some of the proceedings before the Broadcasting Committee last year when Mr. Saulnier of Montreal made his famous appearance. I do so simply to show Canadians from coast to coast the pattern—if they have not seen it already—that has been set. My first reference is to the fourteenth report of the committee's proceedings for November 27, 1969, where Mr. Saulnier says:

> We now know that in Canada, individuals and groups are working actively to implement a plan which will carry the destruction of freedom, of our form of democratic government and, in this plan, the people's will, as expressed in the ballot-box, is excluded.

Then as reported on the same page, Mr. Saulnier says:

> The partial revelations to which I will limit myself today are but a small example of things I know and of which I have privately informed the Prime Minister of Canada a few times in the past year.

A little further on in the report is the evidence of Mr. Michel Côté, chief city attorney for Montreal, who was speaking about a document entitled "Revolutionary Strategy and Role of the Avant-garde", which was seized during police investigations in the city of Montreal. Talking about that document, Mr. Côté says that this revolutionary strategy comprises three stages. The document states that the first stage is that of bringing a radical element into spontaneous social agitation.

The second stage is the organization of the exploited classes on a vast scale and, third, the organization of the exploited classes must be brought into effect, when the time comes, with a direct view to popular insurrection which will be characterized by the armed occupation of factories, universities, schools, public services and the national territory.

A little later on in his evidence, as reported at page 17 of the report, and again quoting the document, Mr. Saulnier says:

> Since 1963, ever since the explosion of the first FLQ bombs, we have been in that first stage of the revolutionary struggle which will be pursued until agitation becomes widespread and culminates in a general political, social and economic crisis. We are now approaching this crisis very rapidly, and this has been particularly the case in the last six months.

The bottom of page 18 lists the main tasks of a revolutionary movement, which are three in number. The first is:

> —the organizing of a true popular power based on the rural, the student and the industrial class, by setting up conscious and active cells.

The second main task, again quoting the document, is:

> The ideological training, the moral training and technical training of militants.

You can well imagine, Mr. Speaker, when speaking of moral training, that in this context we are not referring to the lessons one learns in a Christian society. The third task is defined as follows:

> With regard to action, in the immediate future, we must pursue and extend action, propaganda, and permanent contestation at all levels of social life, so as to unveil, unmask, demystify and weaken further and further the gears of the system which imprisons workers and students in a strangling slavery. Excellent work has already been achieved in this field and we must continue this work.

A little further on the document contains this paragraph:

> We must not be afraid of being outside the law. We must take maximum advantage of the bourgeois democracy which grants the right to demonstrate.

In other words, they would use the rights of free speech and all the things that we in Parliament cherish very highly as their means to a particular end. One can imagine how "free" speech would be if its custodian were that villain who shot Mr. Laporte in the head. My last quotation from this volume of the minutes is at page 77, where Mr. Saulnier is again giving evidence and requesting a royal commission of inquiry. As reported on that page, he says:

> —I may add that a royal commission of inquiry would also show as an added advantage, that these activities are not necessarily limited to the province of Quebec, but that they extend perhaps over all of the Canadian territory.

We have had some indication during the last few days that it can reach as far as our most westerly province.

Then comes this exchange between Mr. Saulnier and Mr. Sheppard, our counsel, who asked:

[*Translation*]

Do you have, without disclosing secrets, some indications on which to base that statement? It is a problem ...

Mr. Saulnier: Yes.

Mr. Sheppard: ... which is not peculiar to Quebec?

Mr. Saulnier: It is not peculiar to Quebec.

[*English*]

I now turn to the report for the next day's proceedings and make reference to a question I asked Mr. Saulnier about the costs being incurred by the citizens of Montreal, who up to that time had pretty well borne the brunt of the battle against terrorism, or a disproportionate load of the battle. The rest of us were thinking that perhaps it was a Montreal problem only, with no relevance to the rest of Canada. As reported at page 26, I asked Mr. Saulnier this question:

What is the estimated cost in the Montreal budget of the increased expenditures due to the escalation of your war on subversion?

Mr. Saulnier: It is in the order of millions of dollars. I could not quote a figure right now. We will know for sure when we come up with our annual financial statement.

Then I asked:

Have you had to add many more bodies to the Montreal police force as a result of this situation you are facing?

Mr. Saulnier: We increased the number of men on the force, but in many cases, if not in most cases, we had to divert a substantial number from other duties.

Finally, I refer to the conclusion of the Broadcasting Committee with regard to all this evidence, as set forth at page 9 of the sixteenth volume of the minutes. Part of the conclusion is as follows:

In view of the necessarily limited amount of evidence presented to your committee, and in view of the restrictions imposed on your committee's inquiry by its terms of reference, Your committee suggests, with respect, that Mr. Saulnier's evidence and representations be given further study and consideration by the appropriate ministers of the Crown.

I hope that was the case, and I hope we will find out exactly how effective that study was when we deal with the new legislation that is to come before us. I said that I suspected the program set out in the Throne Speech for this session of Parliament would undergo pretty severe alteration as the result of the murder of Mr. Laporte. Obviously, we will have to concern ourselves with emergency legislation, that is, legislation dealing with emergency situations such as are created by reason of subversion in our time.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Parts of the Throne Speech which we will consider include major items that will occupy our attention. The idea of a ministry of urban affairs appeals to me. I for one think the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Andras) responsible for housing is an earnest fellow and makes this a full-time job. I cannot for the life of me see why he has to be penalized to the extent of thousands of dollars because he does not hold a portfolio. Other members of the cabinet do not have to work any harder but they have portfolios. This is a distinction I would be glad to see removed. Apart from that very human consideration, since he has to raise a family on the money he takes home from Parliament—just as I do; and we both know it is inadequate—the guts of the matter is whether we will create better housing legislation as a result of the measures we pass.

I suggest there are several areas that must be tackled if we are to have a better housing program. We cannot solve the problems of people earning $5,000 or less until we get into the subsidy field for rental, which we now have in the case of public housing, and the subsidy field in respect of ownership. That may strike one as a very revolutionary idea, but I do not see why we cannot do it through a greater use of technique. This system is used to an extent in Ontario and, I think, in British Columbia where there is forgiveness in respect of some mortgage principal payments if the owner who is being helped stays in his house for a specified period of time. I think that is a good, practical way of getting into this field, and it should be done more often.

I would extend that principle to those now living in public housing, giving them the opportunity to get out therefrom—even if it means massive subsidies—if they can show responsibility in dealing with what would be their own property. There should be more incentives along the line of the so-called Andras formula by which people in public housing can retain more of the extra money they earn in order to buy their own property. Serious consideration must be given to cutting down the cost of housing. This could be done in several directions. Technical ones commend themselves, but the removal of the sales tax on building materials is important.

The new premier of Nova Scotia says he will get rid of this tax at the provincial level, and he thinks his federal friends will listen to him. I hope he can put that feather in his cap, though we have tried here by pointing out over and over again that the sales tax adds thousands of dollars to the cost of a home. Those thousands of dollars break the back of many Canadians before they even get to the position of owning their own home. They know financially it will always be beyond their reach.

Then, sir, undoubtedly we will be dealing with taxation and the report of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson). The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) called the suggestions "proposals." I do not know in what sense the Prime Minister used the word "proposals" because I have not heard the right hon. gentleman make the proposals that one normally makes. In that regard the House of Commons committee provided a most useful base for an approach to taxation. The committee of the other place also had its innings in regard to taxation and found just about everything wrong with the White Paper or the proposals. That committee is a long way removed from accountability to the people, but a committee of this place is accountable.

Tax reform is never a very pleasant topic to deal with, and it might even seem strange that a member of the

opposition should be waxing eloquent about it while inviting others to join and do as we do, put themselves under the headsman's axe. The point is that for nine years tax reform has been discussed in Canada, by a royal commission and by the government. The white paper has been presented and the people have had an opportunity to deal with it. Considerable concern is arising because four or five different schools of thought have emerged on major issues. The senior government makes its decision, brings it in and leaves it to the people to suggest improvements. I would be happy if the Minister of Finance would not wait until spring but would do it now. The sooner certain issues are dealt with so the people know where they are, the better will be our economic climate. Finally, Sir, on the general topics that will engage this Parliament I hope that veterans legislation will be introduced at an early stage and that we will have an indication of the proposals of the government in the fields of income and social security.

I should like now to turn to several topics of particular interest to Halifax-East Hants. I will have an opportunity later to speak in greater detail about the Shubenacadie River crossing, because in the luck of the draw I think my notice takes position No. 15. Because the discussion is now going on between the government of Nova Scotia and the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, I should like to put in my oar for the Shubenacadie River crossing, which I think will do very much for northern and western Nova Scotia. The government of Nova Scotia, on Thursday, August 27, approved it in principle, that is, to include it in proposals now being studied by the federal government for a five-year plan. I am confident that the government of Nova Scotia will want to retain this crossing as part of its program.

In correspondence with the federal minister I noted that truck traffic into and out of the Annapolis Valley, to the east, is increasing, and because transport trucks are becoming heavier and heavier either bridges on existing routes will have to be improved or the crossing will have to be provided. There was evidence from the Annapolis Valley spokesmen, who are very knowledgeable about transport, that the crossing would indeed be a great boon to the agricultural interests in the Annapolis Valley.

Another point I made was that Valley agriculture would benefit because of a shorter haul to the Truro area. If a causeway were decided upon, a great inland freshwater lake would develop, thus providing a logical northern playland for metropolitan Halifax-Dartmouth as well as an extension of the metropolitan growth centre. Another argument I used was that Fundy tidal power will be developed. In light of hundreds of millions of dollars of construction work, no doubt important savings would be made by having a shorter link with Truro. Yet another argument was that there would be educational and health benefits for the people on the west side of the Shubenacadie River whose natural capital is Truro. I also suggested that the crossing is a logical link in a Fundy Trail.

I will have an opportunity to pursue this point in a couple of weeks time; my resolution will provide the vehicle. I thought I would mention it now just to note that even with the change of government in Nova Scotia, that crossing has to be kept in mind by the federal government or I will be haunting both the federal government and the provincial government about it.

• (8:40 p.m.)

I should also mention that the time has come for a northwest arm bridge for the city of Halifax. I was stuck in a traffic jam the other day which could have been avoided had a bridge been in existence. It reminded me that sometimes conditions become so intolerable that strange voting patterns may develop. If I had not already voted on that day, I think I would have wreaked my vengeance on somebody for there being no northwest arm bridge, since I felt so keenly about it. People believe that transportation in the Halifax-Dartmouth area must be improved. That is one method.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): How did you vote?

Mr. McCleave: I also suggest that when the Department of the Regional Economic Expansion commences its long-range plan for the metropolitan area of Halifax-Dartmouth, the most obvious way in which Halifax could become a super city, a real metropolis of, say, three-quarters of a million or one million people, would be the redevelopment and relocation of the city watershed. The watershed now is like a plug in the neck of a bottle; all the development goes out one side of the plug or out the other side of the plug, but does not go straight through the watershed. Unless a decision is made by all levels of government to relocate the waters bed so that land may be used as judiciously as possible for housing and industry, Halifax will simply not realize its potential.

Mr. Speaker, I am left with two topics and about one and a half minutes, although some of my time may have been cut into by an exchange involving the previous speaker. I will make one point and leave the other for a later date. It concerns containerization development as it affects Halifax. This is a noble idea and I have no quarrel with it. The difficulty, however, is that the stevedores and longshoremen are being hurt because the amount of labour associated with containerization is very small indeed.

I promised the waterfront workers I would find out what the federal government could do for them. I find that the following shipments of food will be made from Halifax. There will be 500 metric tons of canned fish for South Viet Nam. We are a long way from South Viet Nam, but we are glad to be handling canned fish. That shipment is for October. In November, February and May there are to be three shipments of 500 metric tons each of canned fish for Nigeria. From December 1 to March 31 there are to be 60,000 metric tons of wheat for Turkey. This shipment may go to Saint John rather than Halifax. Four shipments of 300 metric tons of food for Saigon are being arranged for November, February and August. If I did not have to gallop breathlessly down the home

stretch I would have time to explain how people are hurt rather badly by the technological age but I shall, hopefully, do this on another occasion.

Mr. Norman A. Cafik (Ontario): First of all, Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, the hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel) and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas).

Today, of course, is a sad day in the history of this country, just as the last few days have been. Before beginning my remarks in connection with the Speech from the Throne, I think it is only fitting that I should say a few words about Mr. Pierre Laporte. I believe all Canadians owe him a great deal because in a very special way he gave his life in order to protect the freedom and rights of all people in Canada. I think we owe him a great debt. I hope that tomorrow, on the day of his funeral, all Canadians will take the opportunity to express our debt of gratitude to him and to his family. I wish also to express my most sincere sorrow to Mrs. Laporte and her family.

The tragic events of the last few days I think remind all of us that law is the basis of democracy. Today this point is often forgotten. Without a society based upon law we must have the other alternative, a society based upon people. A society based upon people and upon their whims and feelings from time to time is really a society based upon tyranny, because if the person in charge should not be a man of goodwill, or even if he should be, we are subject to the caprice of his views and feelings.

We in this chamber and, I hope, all Canadians realize the very purpose of a democratic society is to formulate and pronounce laws for the benefit and common advantage of all people. Unless we abide by and have some respect for these laws, society itself is in great peril. It is true that all of us in a democratic society have the right at any time to advocate changes in our laws and adjustments to those laws so that they may constantly be up to date and improved and thereby we may have a better, freer society.

We must always remember, however, that untrammelled freedom is not freedom at all. Law, by its very nature, is restrictive in one way or another. There is law such as the criminal law which involves our following norms of conduct which are not acceptable to the whole society and which certainly, by its nature, is restrictive. Even permissive laws, or laws which would grant benefits of some kind to people, impose obligations. In such cases it is necessary that the people fill out forms to the letter of the law in order to comply. This breeds red tapes, bureaucracy and all kinds of unpleasant things. But there really is no alternative. We must have a society based upon laws.

To many people in our society, laws on the surface appear to be a burden of oppression. I believe that unless people in a democratic society have a strong, effective voice in the formation of those laws they can be interpreted as oppressive measures. Participation of the people in a democracy is not a political gimmick; it is a necessity.

If we do not allow people to become more and more deeply involved in the issues of this House, then in the long run we will create conditions which cause anarchy. We must find a way to reach the people of our country and give them a genuine hand to assist us in the operations of Parliament, otherwise our system will not and cannot survive. That was not true in days gone by, but in our age of rising expectations Canadians are more sophisticated and demand more. We also owe them more. We must allow them an effective means of communicating with us, so there will be an effective two-way street between we whom they look upon as the governors, as it were, and those who elect us to office.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Alienation between the governed and government has been increasing at an alarming rate in the last few years. Consider for a moment the attitude of many people in this country. I am not saying that they are wrong; I am saying that the attitudes which I will outline should warn us that there is an urgent need for something to be done. First of all, "politics" is a bad word, not only in Canada but perhaps throughout the western world. Why is it a bad word? Why is politics not an honourable profession? Surely it really is, but why is it not viewed as such by the people in the street, those who vote us into office? Far too many believe that politicians are dishonest and are only out for personal gain. Far too many of them feel that politicians do not really care, that we are not interested in anything outside this chamber, that there is not much point in communicating with us because we will not do anything about it anyway.

I believe that in our homes and in our schools this attitude is indirectly and unconsciously fostered. I think it is not uncommon to find parents—I know this is true because I have done it myself and I am sure all of us, if we are honest, have done it at one time or another—talking about local provincial or federal politician and saying, "Ah, he does not care." We so often imply a great disrespect for people who are trying to serve the public.

Is it any wonder that parents who have done this year in and year out in a very subtle and unconscious way find their children take their words quite seriously and grow up to have no respect at all for the institutions that we all know are the basis of everything good in this country? In this time when we have such unrest in the country, I think people should sit back and reflect upon the example that we set for each other and our own children.

I have spoken in nearly all the schools in my riding and I have been shocked and amazed at the lack of understanding students have of what goes on in this country. But more than that, I am absolutely astounded that those whose very profession it is to teach political science often know very little more than the pupils they teach. It is amazing to me that so many people in our federal society have no realization of the distinction between the powers of the municipal, provincial and federal governments. How can anybody vote intelligently if they do not know who is responsible for what? It is not very useful to go across this country speaking about

federalism when no one knows what it is. It is obvious that some people do, but there are far too many who do not. We have to do something positive to change this situation.

I think, also, that in our schools and on our radio and television broadcasts there is a tendency to oversimplify very difficult problems, such as pollution. I have been to schools where people cannot understand why we do not immediately outlaw cars because they pollute the air, or why we do not outlaw anyone who puts any kind of sewage into the Great Lakes.

An hon. Member: Good idea.

Mr. Cafik: It is a good idea. But if you did not think of all the consequences of such action you would find yourself standing up to your forehead in the very thing you want to prevent. So we have to do something, and these are urgent problems. But it does not really help anyone if we speak to a group of little kids and tell them these things can be solved tomorrow morning, and show them photographs of sewage running into the Great Lakes instead of discussing all the relevant problems surrounding pollution. They want us to do away with pollution and do away with cars, and yet unemployment is too high. If we did these things in the way they have in mind, probably the vast majority of people in North America would be out of work. I think that it does not really serve any useful purpose to frustrate our youth by giving them half-baked answers to very complicated issues, and I think it is doing them a disservice to try to do so.

I think, also, that one of the causes of the difficulty—I am not speaking of the difficulties that we are having with the FLQ, but these are all things as lead up to the condition that makes it possible—is that we as politicians are far too political. I think that sometimes, if not all the time, we should put this country and its unity ahead of political ambition or political expediency. Far too often I have seen, as I am sure we all have, people stand up on political platforms and say, "What has my opponent ever done for Canada?" or they have said, "The two old parties have never done anything".

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Cafik: Or they have said, "The NDP are a bunch of communists". This is not what we should say. Let us be responsible and talk about the things that they really are. If we keep knocking down our neighbour and our fellow politician, surely we are only causing a condition of animosity within our society. Perhaps we think these things are humorous or are not important. I do not believe any one of us has not gone campaigning, knocked on doors and tried to explain who he was, and then run into the odd person who seems to be motivated more by hate and distrust than anything else because he belongs to a different party.

They say, "You are no good. Only the NDP are any good," or if they are Liberals they say the Conservatives are no good, or whatever it may be. I do not think we are beyond blame for this condition, and I do not think it is a very useful attitude or a very useful feeling to foster and spread throughout Canada. Something has to be done to create proper conditions for the development of national unity rather than national disunity.

In an age of mass communications I submit that no democracy can survive unless these tools are used, not for political or partisan purposes but to inform and involve our people in the democratic process. In this field we have failed miserably.

I believe that Members of Parliament should be given the facilities and the means to truly involve the people within their areas. Unless we do, one cannot blame people for feeling alienated from us and from everything we represent. To achieve this end I believe that every Member of Parliament, certainly in the federal House and perhaps in provincial Houses, should have an office in his own riding, paid for by the government of Canada or by the government of that province, so they could communicate with the people they represent. I do not think the cost would be very great, because there are many public buildings in every riding and I believe they should be made available to those who represent the people, so they may represent them more effectively and learn their views and feelings regardless of their political persuasion.

• (9:00 p.m.)

I also believe that Members of Parliament should be given adequate staff to carry out their work in participatory democracy. I remember saying about a year and a half ago that if the people of my riding participated any more, I would have to shovel it out the window.

An hon. Member: What?

Mr. Cafik: I had a great many letters coming into my office because I encouraged people to write and let me know their views. But there was so much mail that I could not possibly do anything with it when I got it. When you say that you want participation, you are doing a disservice if you do not supply facilities to members of this House so they may do something with the participation when it arrives.

I believe we ought to have proper, adequate staff and quarters in these buildings so that we can deal with involvement by the people in our riding. In addition, we must have two-way communication with our ridings. We all know how hopeless are the facilities in that regard. From the House of Commons we can telephone to our ridings, but if a member happens to be in his riding—where he should be from time to time, if not each weekend—he cannot communicate with the people except out of his own pocket; he has to pay for these calls himself. I do not mind, but many people who become members of this House cannot afford it. I would like to give an example of this. Last Easter weekend I was in my riding and had a telephone call from a person who said that his daughter was in jail. I will not name the place because the people involved may read this speech. The daughter was in jail in the United States. Later

there was a call about a second person in jail. I received this information on Good Friday night. That night I phoned Washington, and Dallas and other areas. I phoned all over in order to try and have these people released. They were finally released, but due more to the help of the Salvation Army than to the help of the government. Where we failed, they succeeded.

Later on, when the telephone bill came in, I knew I would not be reimbursed but I decided to apply anyway because it was a fairly dramatic case which had received national publicity. By the way, it was quite a considerable bill. What happened? I was not paid because I had phoned from my riding instead of from the House of Commons. I gather I should have got into my car and driven back to the House of Commons in order to make the phone calls. If that is not the height of stupidity I do not know what is. It is absolutely absurd that a member cannot work on behalf of his own people and charge the cost to the government or, to you Mr. Speaker, with all respect, to the House of Commons. That type of thing just should not be tolerated in an age when we are trying to get people to participate yet deny members the means to do anything when they do participate.

In addition, I believe the work schedule of the House of Commons should be arranged in such a way as to allow us more opportunity to get into our ridings and find out what our people are really thinking. If we want participation, we have to be there at first-hand to make it a reality. I believe there are steps that could be taken. Whether we sit three weeks out of the month, have two days off, or whatever the arrangement might be, we should be able to visit our ridings more frequently in order to do a job for our people. In our complicated society there is more to being a Member of Parliament than sitting here in the House of Commons. There is more than just passing legislation. We have to communicate and deal with our people so that we know what they want. If they feel they can tell us, and that this has some effect upon us, we will rid ourselves of a great deal of unhappiness and dissatisfaction in this democratic society.

I also believe that the federal government, perhaps in conjunction with the provincial governments, should establish information offices across Canada to help cut through the terrible rolls of red tape and confusion surrounding the federal system, and the complications it has for our citizens. Many people, when they have a problem, do not know whether they should come to the federal government, to the provincial government or to the municipal authorities. I believe well-publicized offices should be established, with zenith numbers, so that members of the public could phone them free of charge to find out where they may lodge complaints or offer advice and get through the kind of red tape that exists in our society.

In addition, I believe that schools and other institutions should be supplied with educational materials, films etc., dealing with the nature of our government and the provincial and federal areas of jurisdiction. As I said before, there is not much use talking about federalism if we do not communicate to our people precisely what it is, its benefits, how it operates and how to deal with the system.

We also need constructive public affairs programs on television to sell federalism and the democratic process. We have seen too much on television that tends to divide and destroy this nation and its institutions. Surely it is not too much to ask the CBC to do something more positive for society, rather than to carry on as it has so often in the past. I think we have been too authoritarian in the past on small, unimportant issues and have not spent enough time looking at the direction in which our society is going and trying to do something to change that direction. Perhaps we need some kind of a research centre to study the problems of democracy and Canadian unity so that we may really know what to do about them.

There are other ills that cause general disrespect for those in authority in Canada. As an example I mention the Quebec medical strike. Many people in our society—this has nothing to do with politics—have a feeling that professional people, doctors, lawyers, you name it, really do not care for anything but themselves and their own pocket-books. I am afraid they are often right. The Quebec doctors' strike gave us an indication that they had in mind motives other than looking after the sick of that province.

When medicare was introduced in Ontario I was revolted that doctors were charging 10 per cent more than the rate paid by the provincial government. I said to one doctor when I was in his office, "You should put up a sign and we will take up a collection for you poor fellows. Perhaps in that way we can do away with this 10 per cent charge." All you have to do is look at the statistics to find out how much doctors earn. They are not very poor. The same applies to the banks. Everyone has the impression that if you need money you can get it from anywhere but a bank. If you have money, you can borrow more money from a bank; but if you do not have money a bank will not look at you. The man in the street has lost faith in banking institutions as being of any meaningful help to him.

When the white paper on tax reform was issued I attended quite a few meetings in my riding. People continually rose and said, "Look, Mr. Cafik, if we thought that our tax dollar was being used for a constructive purpose we would not mind paying higher taxes, but we feel it is being wasted." If people in our country feel we are squandering their money, surely to God it is of national concern to us because such a feeling is bad for a society such as ours. If we are wasting money—and I have been on the Public Accounts Committee when it has been discovered that we have wasted money, not in this but every other government—we should do something about it.

• (9:10 p.m.)

We should adapt a stance where we as a government care about the public purse and really intend doing something about it. When we find mistakes in spending, surely we as a responsible government ought to say that we recognize it and will do something to change it,

because we are as concerned about all these matters as you. If our society is ill, let's all do something positive to remedy the situation. I will now leave this topic and deal specifically with the Speech from the Throne.

I welcome the Speech from the Throne and I support it. I agree with what it states. I also realize there are many things that the Speech does not say. It cannot go into everything in great detail. It is not legislation. We must look at the bills that will be introduced. I particularly welcome the strong emphasis on pollution and the fact that a new department of environmental control will be set up. It is badly needed. I support that move very strongly. I hope something is done to make our environment safe, not only for Canadians but for all people. We must play our part in making our air and water safe. I agree with the statement in the Speech from the Throne that our society should be measured in terms of quality and not quantity.

I also welcome the emphasis on urban affairs. I am happy that a minister has been appointed to study the problem of urban affairs. Approximately 1½ years ago I wrote to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) on the subject of urban transportation. I outlined the need for legislation affecting the CNR and CPR which would make railbeds available for the purpose of commuter transportation. I suggested that the railroads be forced to give preferential time schedules for such purposes, even though it may require adjustments to their freight schedules.

I also suggested the railroads should be forced to charge reasonable wheel-mileage rates for commuter transport purposes. Many people feel these are excessive at the moment. Permission should be granted for these railbeds to be used by provincial and other governments or institutions for the purpose of establishing commuter transport facilities where the CNR and CPR refuse to do so. I hope these suggestions will be considered seriously by the ministry of urban affairs. If we change the pattern of urban transportation we will do much to correct air pollution in our large centres. A great deal would be accomplished in getting people to and from their work with less wear, tear and strain.

Although my time has almost expired I would like to spend a moment talking about tax reform. I wish to go on record as thanking the dozens of people in my constituency, many of them experts in the field of taxation, who worked with me for many months on Saturdays to study the white paper proposals on tax reform. Many of them are non-Liberals. I set up this committee because I feel the proposals are probably the most important piece of legislation that I as a member of Parliament will ever have to judge. I certainly did not want to judge it in a partisan way. I wish to thank these individuals for all their work in assisting me to arrive at an objective judgment in respect to these proposals.

The tax committee in my constituency will complete its work on November 10 at a meeting with the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson). At that time we will present our findings to him. I wish to point out some of the main changes we will be recommending. First, the elimination of capital gains on unrealized income. Second, I believe that capital gains should be divorced from regular income. I say this for a number of reasons.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

Mr. Cafik: Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent to continue for another moment or two.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there such unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Cafik: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to divorce capital gains from regular income because I think it imposes a maximum tax rate of 50 per cent for personal income. I do not subscribe to this. I believe that the maximum rate for personal income should be 65 per cent. I see no justification in charging the maximum rate as proposed in the white paper. This rate starts at $26,000 a year. It also applies to someone earning $100,000 or $1 million a year. It does not sound much like equity. I believe that rate has to be increased. I think the tax rate for middle-income groups arrives at the 50 per cent rate far too soon. It ought to be adjusted and the rate of incline decreased so that the 50 per cent rate is reached at perhaps $35,000 a year.

The Minister of Finance stated—this has been quoted numerous times in the press—that he really does not want to see capital gains on private homes. If he does not want them, I suggest he eliminate them from the proposals and any legislation which may be introduced. I also believe that capital gains tax liability on death should be considered in the estate before the application of estate tax. At present there is a dual taxation in this regard. Something should also be done for the small businessman, who is hit harder than he should be. I suggest a 20 per cent tax deferral for five years for small businessmen.

I wish to thank my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me an extension of time. I do not want to abuse that privilege. There are many other proposals I would like to make, but I will make them at a later date.

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, the terrible events of the past few days have made a deep impact on all of us. Our thoughts go out to Madame Laporte and her family in their grief. We are in deep sympathy with the head of the Quebec government and the citizens of that province as they attempt to root out the cancer of violence and terrifying hatred which is threatening them and all Canadians. However, in the midst of this we cannot neglect our duty in the House and sidetrack any longer discussions on the Speech from the Throne and the matters it contains. After all, the Speech from the Throne presents the view of the government as to the situation existing in Canada and a forecast of the government's program to deal with it.

• (9:20 p.m.)

The previous speaker made a number of very good and very interesting points. I agree with his idea that we

must have respect for law in this country, but I point out that respect for law through democratic participation can only be achieved if people feel that the laws are based on social justice and that there is a chance for everyone to share the good things in the country. I cannot agree with him that the big lack today is in mass communications. I think we could do far more if we in this House were to succeed in getting through a few concrete measures involving social justice—measures which would redress the balance between those who have more than they need and those who have pitifully little. To my mind this would do more to build a foundation on which law could be established and respected than anything else we could do in this House.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Speaking at the commonwealth conference in Australia on October 8, a distinguished woman delegate from India declared that the world today consists of two types of people—those who are content, and those who are discontent. She went on to indicate the reasons for this division in terms of civil rights and economic security. In some measure, the same thing is true of Canada. Whether we like it or not, we are divided far, far too much into the content and the discontent, pretty well along the lines of the "haves" and the "have nots." I am not talking of the terrorists at all. Those people we must root out and get rid of completely. I say again that terror does not flourish and cannot flourish in those countries where there is a fair and even sharing of the economic and social benefits available. You do not find such terrorist activities, not on a large scale at least, in places like Britain or the Scandinavian countries. That is no accident.

I am afraid that this Speech from the Throne foreshadows increasing affluence for the "haves" and little but very pious hopes for the "have nots"—bits of tokenism which fall very far short of action in redressing that balance. I know there are good things in the Speech from the Throne. There is the establishment of a department of the environment, and emphasis on urban affairs and other like matters. Those things have been pointed out by other members and I have no wish to denigrate them at all. But I would say that the speech as a whole is packaged in soothing generalities which all too skilfully conceal its content or lack of it and continue to foster the expectations of the Canadian people that this government, while it has left so many of them in want for so long, cannot fail to come through with the things they need and must have for modern living.

Once again, the expectations of those in poverty, of those without employment, of those on low, fixed incomes, of great numbers of young people and old people are minority groups like Indians, Métis and Eskimos, are doomed to disappointment. I say that because in this speech there is little or nothing for them. This government is still riding high, far above most of the storm clouds that hide the jagged peaks of the mountains. Nevertheless, I warn the government that many rulers in the past have miscalculated their ability to provide affluence for the elite while leaving the masses in misery. During those centuries few of the mass had any idea what they were missing. They lived and died without knowing how the affluent lived. Such is no longer the case. Modern communications such as radio and television have depicted clearly for everyone the manner of life enjoyed by the elite. Advertisers have created the clear impression that this is possible for everyone. The revolution of rising expectations can no longer be denied with impunity.

Delaying those programs that would create the just society in Canada, and utilizing verbiage about its desirability, will merely compound the floodwaters when the dam breaks. Insurrections and revolutions happen when governments do not know enough soon enough, or will not do enough soon enough. In my opinion, what is most lacking in this Parliament is its ability to produce actual measures of improvement for those large sections of our population which need help to obtain an income and some of the amenities that go with modern life.

Now I want to talk about something very specific and concrete, about a problem which has been mentioned once or twice but not dealt with at length in this Throne Speech debate. Out in Vancouver we are not in a state of insurrection, notwithstanding the impression one might gain from our lively mayor. But we are faced with serious problems which, if neglected too long, are bound to lead to trouble. I point out that some of these problems which are very serious today, and which we are hearing about as relating to other parts of Canada, have been neglected for many years. The storm signals have been flying and have not been heeded. They have been ignored for far too long.

During the past months very great numbers of young people have been drifting to Vancouver from all over Canada. Vancouver now has far more than its share of young people who are idle, without prospects and without jobs so far as the coming winter is concerned. The people of Vancouver are becoming up-tight and upset about this situation. I know this well because even during the summer months there was great concern and worry in the city, and there are indications that the situation is now worsening.

I say that we are getting for more than our share of restless, unoccupied and unemployed young people. A survey taken in the Beatty Street armoury showed that of the young people in the armoury, only 11 per cent came from inside the province of British Columbia; the rest came from other parts of Canada, a fairly small percentage coming from the United States. They came there for many reasons, one being that British Columbia has the only climate in Canada where a person will not freeze solid if he ceases being active. It is the only place like it in Canada. You may be very, very miserable but it is the only place where you will not freeze to death.

I know the situation because I went to the armouries and talked to the young people. There are all sorts of young people in Vancouver. We have the hippie type. We have the type that is trying to foment trouble with doctrines of various kinds. We have young people who began looking for work in the Maritimes and went steadily across Canada unable to find it. We have students. We have young people who ran away from home, and so on. The group is not monolithic; they are not all

of one type. This government, I believe, is committing an error if it believes that these are summer travellers, or that the majority of them are summer travellers, out to travel from hostel to hostel as young people do in Europe. The vast majority of these young people could not find work or an occupation no matter whether they are students or not. I am convinced that that is the case.

Why is it that the people of Vancouver are worried and upset? For one thing, they are worried and upset—this applies particularly to many people in my riding, to those in the eastern part of the city and in the central part as well—because they feel they are terribly overburdened with taxes and simply cannot face the idea of keeping these young people housed and looked after in ever increasing numbers, especially since only 11 per cent of them come from British Columbia. As I say, only 11 per cent of them come from British Columbia. These people are angry and upset. They feel it is unfair. I think it is unfair, too. I believe the federal government has a responsibility to help provide shelter and work, because we are dealing with Canadians from right across the country. The people of Vancouver are worried financially, and they are worried because they do not know what so many young people, penned-up in idleness and subject to the propaganda coming from a small number of them, will do in the line of riots, disorders and trouble in the city.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Frankly, I think the attitude of our mayor has been anything but responsible and helpful. From the beginning he has assiduously sought to avoid taking action. He has taken the attitude that these young people should be driven out of town. This attitude has been fomented carefully and insistently among the population of Vancouver. Then, to add insult to injury, when the young people were moved from the armoury out to Jericho, the mayor remarked conversationally to the media, "Well, I see the brothel is being moved to Jericho." This is not the kind of comment the first statesman of a city should make. I consider that the inflammatory talk, the explosive elements around Vancouver, taken with the fact that there has been no action of any kind, are dangerous in the extreme.

I know that shelter is being provided to a certain extent. The Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) told me after the House met that about half the young people were being accommodated, for the time being at least, by the federal government and that the other half were being looked after by private citizen groups. This may be all right as a temporary measure but it is not a long-range solution. The students who were going to open the university administrative buildings to these young people felt strongly, after investigation, that this was not the solution, and they rejected it. The YMCA and other organizations are trying to pinch-hit, together with some of the church groups, but this is not the solution and in my view it is a very shortsighted policy for the federal government to decide not to intervene at the present time.

Then there is the challenge of finding socially useful work these young people can do. I know hon. gentlemen opposite are likely to say this is not a federal responsibility. I remember that at one time the federal government took the attitude that unemployment of any kind was not their responsibility and that it should be left strictly to the municipalities to deal with. This attitude had to be abandoned in the face of mass unemployment. Responsibility for providing work for these young people can no longer be evaded.

The taxpayers will not stand for these young people lying around in idleness without any chance to contribute productively to their own keep. In any case, this is bad from the standpoint of the young people themselves; it is demoralizing in the extreme to deny them the opportunity to do something useful to earn their daily bread. The government's summer program for youth provided an estimated 36,000 jobs of which about 10,000 were in the militia. If the federal government could provide 10,000 jobs in the militia, paying $700 to each person who took part in that program for two months, I suggest it can find money to pay wages to young people for socially useful tasks now and in the springtime.

These are not just my views, Mr. Speaker. Speaking on September 23, Mr. Reuben Baetz of the Canadian Welfare Council stated that 665,000 Canadian students were looking for work this summer and few had found it. He predicted there would be 750,000 looking for work next year. A release from the Department of Manpower showed that 179,000 students were registered across Canada for employment at the peak of last summer. Sixty-eight per cent of them found jobs, 32 per cent were still seeking work, and of these 27 per cent were post-secondary students and 73 per cent were high school students. It is the high school students who have had to bear the brunt of the unemployment catastrophe.

I have talked with the manpower people in Vancouver about student placement and learned that by the end of August there had been 29,212 registrations in British Columbia and only 9,595 placements. The figures for greater Vancouver are 13,900 registrations and 2,023 placements. No record was kept of the duration of the employment provided or the conditions under which young students were required to work. In sum, I was told by the manpower officials that there are not enough jobs to go round and that only the most aggressive or persistent of the students can hope to get jobs in the circumstances.

I should like to suggest several steps which I believe Ottawa must take. First, the government must recognize that the employment of young people is a federal problem. They have to recognize British Columbia in general and Vancouver in particular as a disaster area as far as the provision of work for young people is concerned, and should be prepared to provide jobs and programs to deal with the situation. It is not a summer thing; it persists all the year round. Private enterprise can help. I have talked with the Chamber of Commerce people and I know they have helped. But Ottawa has to take the initiative and provide a comprehensive program. The Vancouver city

council has been urging that work of a suitable character be found for these young people. A private organization has found 5,000 jobs to Canadian young people in Germany next Summer. I do not think we should have to depend on Germany to find work for our young people.

Programs we should consider ought to include such work as cleaning up pollution. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) has received a letter urging that the National Harbours Board help Vancouver clean up driftwood and other materials from the harbour. Why cannot the young people do this kind of work and get paid for it? Young people would do this kind of thing because they would realize it is useful to the community. Again, there are opportunities in forestry. Only one acre out of seven of our timberland is being reforested. Why cannot we employ our young people on work of this kind, replanting our forests? It will be 75 years before the new growth is ready for cutting.

Here in Ontario the cutting down of diseased elms is a task which might be done by our young people, or we might use them to trim the bushes along our highways instead of using dangerous chemicals. These are some of the things which could be done. It is too important a matter to be left to casual supervision by the young people themselves. We should put our topflight management in charge of such programs, people who are used to working with youth and who can manage these schemes with success. The alternative to such a program is to leave these young people cooped up in idleness, or roaming the streets. They will be sitting ducks for the type of propaganda which led to the disaster existing in one of our eastern provinces.

• (9:40 p.m.)

I have been told that young people will not work. I should like to suggest that a great many of these young people would work if they were offered the chance to take part in such a program. This is an opportunity they should be given. If there are some who will not or cannot work, then other solutions must be found for them, other types of program. But we owe such a program to those who will work.

Like other speakers before me, I know that my time has just about expired and there are many other things I should have liked to say. May I say to the new minister of the environment that we are pleased to see him trying to move in regard to the Skagit River. We hope he can do something to save that valley for the recreational use of the people even at this late date. But the hour is very late, with the timber now cut down and the victim prepared for sacrifice. I hope the minister will act, and quickly.

The other things I should have liked to mention will have to wait for another time. In the meantime, I urge that we save our ecology and eliminate pollution and destruction. At the same time we must save our young people. Federal programs must be initiated and financed at least in part by the federal government in order to put our young people to work and to save our environment. Saving the environment will save a lot of our young people in the process.

Mr. Steven Otto (York East): Mr. Speaker, I shall say no more about the situation in Quebec; more words on my part will not help. A lot has been said with great sincerity by members of the House. But if in the course of my remarks I allude to situations which might have a bearing on the grave situation in Quebec, this is intentional.

I should like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I was particularly impressed by the remarks of the seconder, the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas). Since he has come to the House I have been pleased to hear him ask questions during the question period, placing barbs into the government from time to time when dealing with the economic situation in the west. I had a sort of kindred relationship with that gentleman, but suddenly, having read his speech seconding the Address it seems either that all the wheat in western Canada has been sold or he has changed his mind and now regards this as the most wonderful government ever to have existed, though of course there are one or two problems to be dealt with.

Perhaps the explanation is the honour bestowed upon him of seconding the Address. I have never had that honour and in fact I am sure I will never have it. However, though his was still a good speech I would prefer to see the hon. member in his old stripes. I now feel alone in the House, though I am sure the hon. member, now sitting in his seat, will revert to his sharp, controversial but interesting self once again.

My remarks tonight were supposed to be directed to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) but I see that neither he nor his Parliamentary Secretary are here. However, I imagine that somehow the word will get to him, though on the last occasion I had a chance to berate a minister apparently his executive assistant, noticing that I had made a speech about his minister, said to him, "You had better see Otto and say, 'Good speech, Otto' ". So when the minister came into the House he said to me "That was a good speech you made". I thought that strange because by rights, in view of what I had said about him, he should have taken an axe to me. In other words, no one had read what I had said. In fact, I did not praise the minister at all.

This will be the context of my speech tonight. A lot of sense has been said and a lot of remarks have been made having great bearing on the situation in Canada today. In summary I would say that our malaise is that we now have two factions in society—the established and the disestablished. All of us in this House represent the established—the small businessman, the big businessman, the union, the organized man, the wealthy, the middle-income group. But who speaks for the disestablished? The disestablished is the man who does not care about income tax on $30,000 at the rate of 50 per cent because in his whole lifetime he will never make that much money, not even half or a third of that sum. The dises-

tablished is the 65 per cent of our people who do not care about the white paper recommendations or the committee recommendation that no tax or succession duty be levied on estates of less than $150,000, because in their whole lifetime these people will never know anybody who leaves an estate of $150,000. Indeed, they do not know anyone who will leave any estate.

The disestablished is not the homeowner, the man who sits in his private property enjoying the view and fighting apartment developers to the last breath. After all, the apartment dweller is not the established; he must face the railway tracks or the glue factory. So we have this division in our society, and if you examine history carefully, Mr. Speaker, you will find that the preamble to all revolutions is this friction in society. Consider today's position. We have structured our society not only into age groups. We never talk about our young people as "us" or "we", we talk about our young people as "they". Indeed, even the hon. lady from Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) referred to the young people as "they". We no longer speak of our older people as "we"; we refer to them as "they". It is "they" who must be put into homes; "they" must be given low-rental apartments; "they" must be given nursing care. They are also the ones we shove out into the suburbs. Because after all, "they" are not "we".

The only thing we have in common is that, as sure as we are living, we will progress from one to the other. We have a stratified society, not only in age groups but in the ease with which we may be entitled to go up the ladder of economic success or material gain. It was not a new thing when lawyers were stratified into a very tight little group—for the public good, mind you, and for the public good only. I see in the House a member who was a member of the benchers association of Osgoode Hall, the Law Society of Upper Canada. However, we must not have too many lawyers available because this would not be good for the public. Nor must we have too many doctors or too many engineers. Although these professional groups were self-governing, they also had a responsibility. That responsibility has somehow vanished. Instead, we now have many other calcified groups.

• (9:50 p.m.)

It is not longer possible to build yourself a dwelling or a shelter; you must follow certain restrictions. You must buy expensive property, if property is available. You cannot be a garage mechanic without going through all the stages of apprenticeship, journeyman and so on. You cannot even work up to owning or leasing a service station, because a licence is not granted. You cannot be a welder, a bricklayer or anything unless you go to this little, established group. I am speaking not only of professional groups but of unions. It takes a long time before you can get that vested position in a union where you will be the last to be laid off and the first to be taken on. In the meantime, 60 per cent of the population wants to get ahead. They are ambitious, they want to work but every avenue is blocked. History will show that when a society reaches that stage, violent revolution is the next step. Unfortunately, we read and know history but we are absolutely positive it will never repeat itself. It does repeat itself, however.

In the cities of Toronto and Vancouver—especially Toronto, because I know that area very well—in order to get decent accommodation one must pay 50 per cent of his take-home pay. A man who started out as an ambitious journeyman thought the time would come when he would make $9,000 or $10,000 a year—a fantastic amount. When he finally reached that stage he felt he would have a better life; he might take a little trip, his children would be better dressed and his family would eat better. After 13 years of hard work he finds he is rewarded by reaching the stage where he makes $9,000 or $10,000 per year, but he takes home less than $600 per month and out of that he has to pay over $300 for, not palatial accommodation but simple, decent accommodation. He hates our guts. He is at the revolution stage. It makes him enraged because he does not eat well, he does not dress well and his children do not have the things he thought they would have. All those years have disappeared. This is the situation. Can you blame people who are in that position for grasping at a manifesto or anything that will appeal to them?

The fact is that society is ill. The question, then, is: Will this government recognize the need for reform in giant strides? In other words, were we elected to be daring or were we elected to be cautious? The hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Cafik) said we must protect our institutions. I say to him that all institutions become calcified, all institutions become stagnant over a period of time and this House is no different. What I am saying today is really irrelevant and the people know this is so.

Consider the people we have in our communities. The people do not have any respect for the M.P., the alderman, the planning director or the works commissioner. In each society you have a shadow administration. In society you have people who have come from the ranks of the responsible and who dispute the findings of planning commissioners and boards because there is no communication. Within the unions you have shadow executives who have no faith in the union leaders.

An hon. Member. Give us the answers.

Mr. Otto: I will give you the answers in just a little while. I am sure the hon. member is listening very, very patiently for those answers.

An hon. Member: I am.

Mr. Otto: I say that before we protect these institutions we must realize whether they are worth protecting or they should be changed. Let me refer to the speech of the Minister of Finance. I could really revise the whole speech, or summarize it. But in brief he says that he is happy to see the businessmen of this country now getting lower profits. Isn't this a brave new world? I thought this was a new world, a new place of adventure, a place of opportunity where people could get greater profits. The minister says he is happy that profits are lower; indeed, he hopes that they will go still lower. He is happy, or

seems to be, that national productivity will just ease in a nice, gentle movement downward so there will not be any disruption. I thought this was a country where we wanted more production.

Dr. Young, the great adviser, says that if inflation is put under control, prices will stabilize. Of course prices will stabilize. Most businessmen are selling their inventories at cost. When it comes to replacing that stock, I anticipate an inflationary cycle of approximately 10 per cent because the cost of replacing those goods will increase. There is no way the cost will decrease, under the present system.

Let me review some of the facts of the economic situation in Canada. Our capital equipment, machinery and tools of production, is absolutely decrepit. We have the most inefficient accumulation of capital equipment of any country in the world, bar none. It has been said, and I think this from a very reliable source, that if our capital equipment were replaced we could increase productivity by 28 per cent. I have no doubt about that. I visited many plants belonging to friends and business associates. I am amazed that they can produce anything. So to blame labour for something which is entirely the fault of the government is really not right.

The cost of money is not going down; it is going up. So far we have not dealt with this problem at all. Our category of executives is not the best or the second best in the world; it is about tenth best. There is a great lack of executive ability both in junior and senior positions. This is no fault of ours. I think one of the great evils of having foreign-dominated industry is that there is no room for our own executive category to receive training. One of the great advantages of controlling our industry is that our junior executives have room in which to train and expand.

May I call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

POST OFFICE—TERMINATION OF LEGAL ROLE OF MINISTER OF COMMUNICATIONS AS HEAD OF DEPARTMENT

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to launch the late-night show series for the third session of this Parliament. Perhaps to retain the shipyard analogy I should say "to sound the first toot." Doubtless my position at this time and place is some sort of bitter-sweet reward for being such a great contributor to this series in preceding sessions. I enjoy the packed galleries, the crowded House and the great anticipation of all my colleagues as we debate these matters at night.

I asked a question the other day about the Post Office Department because I was concerned about its administrative structure. As hon. members are aware, I have had some concern about this department in the last few years. I found it interesting to read the Government Organization Act in connection with the announcement by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) following the almost gentle and timid cabinet shuffle of a few weeks ago. On reading the two together, it would seem to me there is a great deal of room for uncertainty. The statute is clear. Section 3 (2) of the act as amended reads:

• (10:00 p.m.)

> The Minister of Communications is the Postmaster General and has the management and direction of the Post Office Department.

That is pretty clear. But we were advised that the Minister without Portfolio from Longueuil (Mr. Côté) has responsibility for the Post Office Department, according to the press release. Yet that minister of harmonious, efficient administration, the Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans), retains the title and portfolio. Who, then, is in charge? Who is the responsible minister?

One recalls very vividly an incident during the first session of this Parliament when the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) was being assisted in certain aspects of administration by the present minister in charge of housing. When conflict arose, questions were asked in the House more than once—and I have turned them up—concerning which minister prevailed. We received the answer quite clearly that in the case of any conflict between the minister without portfolio and the minister with portfolio, there was no question but that the minister with portfolio would prevail. So with regard to the Post Office today, who has and who has not the portfolio? If the minister from Longueuil, who said recently that he always tried to handle personnel in a reasonable way—and I believe him—should handle policies and people in a way not acceptable to the Postmaster General, what will happen? I imagine the employees of this important department would like to know.

The present situation is very far from clear. The Edmonton *Journal* the other day, in language less eloquent than I would put it, under the heading "Chicken with its head off" said:

> Many Canadians will cheer the removal of Mr. Kierans from responsibility for the Post Office. But the re-appointment of Jean-Pierre Côté to the job—but not the title—of Postmaster General leaves the Post Office in a kind of limbo. It is not a regular government department since it is headed by a Minister without Portfolio. But neither has the government decided whether to turn it into an independent Crown agency.
>
> The government should move quickly to end this uncertainty which is bound to affect staff morale and efficiency, already shaken by labour controversies and management clumsiness.

I presume the proposed amendments to the Government Organization Act will deal with this matter. But will we have the incredible situation of the movement of mail removed from the ambit of section 9(b), which refers to the Minister of Communications, being in charge of the development and utilization generally of communications undertakings, facilities, systems and services for Canada? The postal service has lagged, it has been slow; but surely it still deserves to be classed as

communications. Or is the Post Office Department to become a Crown corporation, to disappear as a government department, and is the minister from Longueuil merely conducting a holding operation? If this is the case and he is merely conducting a holding operation, I think it is too bad because neither he nor the department deserve such an ignoble end.

I think that if the minister from Longueuil would read the speeches of the Minister of Communications and his strictures upon his predecessors, including the minister from Longueuil, he might be extremely well equipped to take on the long-harrassed department. With the ability he professes to have, and which I believe he has, he may make great improvements. I hope the status of the minister and the department will be made clear as soon as possible so that the remedial operation may soon be undertaken by the minister from Longueuil. In his earnest efforts and heavy task I wish him well.

Mr. Barney Danson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it is with particular respect that I make my maiden speech in this role—apart from a dramatic performance the other day in the question period—to reply on behalf of my minister to the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) whom we all regard so highly.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That is a good beginning.

An hon. Member: Keep it up; you are doing fine.

Mr. Danson: The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) himself, when the question arose, answered the hon. member adequately in the House. It is true that the portfolio of the Minister of Communications and the Postmaster General is still a united portfolio. But in the speech from the Throne and in the Prime Minister's reply to the hon. member on October 9, which is recorded on page 19 of *Hansard* of that day, the Prime Minister said:

> ... we did announce yesterday through the mouth of the Governor General that we should be asking the House to approve a minister of state system, and it would be my intention to ensure that my hon. friend from Longueuil shall at that time be a minister of state in charge of the Post Office.

I think it is agreed by all members of the House that he is an excellent one. The ministers without portfolio have been assigned rather imaginatively by this government because they have not been locked into inflexible positions. Perhaps this degree of flexibility is unknown or inconceivable to some hon. members opposite, but it reflects the flexibility and imagination of this government.

As I indicated legislation will be introduced, as I believe the Prime Minister indicated, at the first opportunity and, hopefully, before the end of this year.

Of course, this is subject to urgencies that might arise, and we hope we will not have any more of the type we are now experiencing. It is also, of course, subject to the co-operation of hon. members in all parties in the House. However, I do not think we need have any real concern about that matter because following the Prime Minister's comment in the House on October 9 which he ended by saying: "I hope the opposition will co-operate with us in expediting this arrangement", the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees) said: "Don't you worry about us". So I suggest we have nothing to worry about, and I thank the hon. member for Hillsborough for raising this matter.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): You have learned the lingo awfully fast.

AGRICULTURE—PESTICIDES—DDD—REASON FOR ONE-YEAR EXTENSION ON USE—NOTIFICATION OF CHANGES

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, on October 13 a question was asked with regard to the extension of time given to the pesticide DDD. I think in *Hansard* it appears as "DDT." The relation between the two chemicals could be considered to be one of sister to brother or brother to sister, but the pesticide in question is DDD and I hope that whoever answers my question has that in mind.

The press release was printed on October 10 in the Ottawa *Citizen*. It contained the first information we had obtained that the government intended to extend the period for the use of DDD by one year, to January 1, 1972. At that time it was pointed out that in the United States there had been an investigation in 1969 and a decision that these pesticides should be eliminated within two years, for public health reasons.

The Canadian Department of Agriculture put out a news release on April 5, 1968, which set what they considered to be the national example for the use of DDD. It was pointed out that science did not yet know enough about the properties of this poison to allow its regular use, and the hope was expressed in the news release that a new and less dangerous chemical could be found. This indicated that the officials of the department were well aware in 1968 of the dangers of DDD which they themselves were using.

I suggest that civil servants cannot be blamed in so far as the use of DDD is concerned because, after all, they take orders from the government and sometimes the government does not know the hows and the whys of pollution problems and does not take the advice of the civil servants. It has been proven, also, that the use of DDD has resulted in the killing of water birds which had eaten fish contaminated by DDD.

• (10:10 p.m.)

It has also been proven that in many cases governments know the harm that can result from the uncontrolled use of poisons like DDD, and not only do not condemn them but the public is left completely unaware of the danger. This is one of the reasons the question was asked at that time. Why was the public not made aware of the situation, and why was advice not given by the government? It is the government's duty to let the people know the dangers of all pesticides, including

DDD, because the whole nation could be poisoned through their uncontrolled use.

Why has the Department of Agriculture taken this regressive measure, extending the use of DDD to January 1, 1972? Has the department been taken in by the poison manufacturers so that they may get rid of their existing stocks? The news release suggests this is what has happened and that after that date new stocks will be denied registration. The government should not allow the continued use of existing stocks of this poison, in the interests of human life, wildlife and marine life.

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to commend the hon. gentleman for raising this question because it gives us an opportunity to put the record straight. The article in the Ottawa *Citizen* of October 10 was based on a false assumption.

With regard to the questions raised by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave) concerning the pesticide DDD, also called TDE, I may say that this product had a limited use and has now been largely superseded by newer and more effective products. Thus, in the continuing assessment process that goes on for all pesticides it was decided that DDD should be phased out. This decision was communicated to the trade under date of August 27. Unfortunately, the wording of the notice was such as to imply cancellation of registration status as of January 1, 1971. This notice was replaced by a further notice dated October 1, 1970, which clarified the phasing-out schedule and outlined provisions for normal disposal through sale of remaining stocks, and indicated that there would be no registration of DDD stocks manufactured in the year 1971. In other words, as of January 1, 1971, the department will not approve the manufacture of DDD.

With regard to the question raised by the hon. member for Moose Jaw (Mr. Skoberg), I can assure the hon. member that there is no change in our intention to keep the public informed on the status of pesticides. Indeed, we are currently reviewing our information procedures with a view to improving communication and understanding. We are assessing the relative roles of letters to the trade and of broader information statements to the public.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY—STEINBERG WAGE INCREASES—CLARIFICATION OF CHAIRMAN OF PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION OF EFFECT ON PRICES

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, on October 7, Mel Dobrin, President of Steinberg's Limited, sent the following telegram to Dr. John H. Young of the Prices and Incomes Commission:

> I am astonished at the contents of a news bulletin released by your commission today and carried on radio stations and reported to the press wherein you are reported as having denounced pay settlements in major grocery chains including Steinberg's Limited as being "excessive, unjustified and inflationary", and in which you are also reported as having said that "customers will have to pay the shot in higher food prices." As far as Steinberg's Limited is concerned the settlements referred to were made with the collective bargaining agents for our Ontario division store employees after lengthy and conscientious negotiations. The extent of the settlements was made known to you in advance of the signing of the collective agreements and your commission was given both verbal and written assurances that Steinberg's would do everything possible to avoid increasing prices as a result of such wage increases. Your representatives have met regularly with members of our organization and have been kept informed concerning our prices and operating margins. You therefore must be aware that at no time repeat at no time has Steinberg's Limited increased its prices directly or indirectly as a result of these negotiated increases. We have in fact reduced prices further since such wage settlements and are now operating at lower gross margins than those in effect prior to the settlements.
>
> Your comments in so far as our company is concerned are inaccurate, misleading and unfair. We would appreciate your issuing a statement which would make the facts clear to our customers and the public at large.

On October 14 I asked the minister if he would discuss with Dr. Young the necessity of issuing a statement to set the matter straight and to make amends for the inaccurate statement he had made. The minister brushed off my question with a quip and a reference to the consumer price index which had just been released. More important, no answer has been received by the Steinberg firm since that time. I checked this today; I have been keeping in contact with them. The facts are that Steinberg's went through the proper collective bargaining procedure with employees who received wage increases; Steinberg's did not raise prices as a result of those wage increases. Dr. Young's statement is not in accord with the facts, and a correction should be issued.

I again ask the minister whether he will take action. His responsibility is clear. The Prices and Incomes Commission reports to Parliament through the minister. What is his objection to using moral suasion on Dr. Young to persuade him to set matters right? Surely both of them should be glad to find a firm prepared to cut their profit margin in order to give better wages to their employers without raising prices to the consumer. This is a matter which should be given publicity instead of inaccurate statements being made.

In any event, it is highly debatable whether Dr. Young has exceeded the terms of his authority in denouncing the actions of Steinberg's. In outlining the proposed terms of reference of the commission two years ago, the minister stated:

> It is particularly important to stress that the commission will not, except in cases involving the national interest in a vital way, be expected to report on the specific price decisions of individual firms or the wage decisions of particular collective bargaining situations.

In outlining the terms of reference of the Commission, the minister made it perfectly clear that it was not within the purview of the chairman to make statements regarding individual firms. If this was in the mind of the minister when the commission was set up, it is doubly important that the minister exercise his responsibility and ensure the public is not left with the impression that the statement was correct.

The minister said it was peculiar that I should be defending the Steinberg firm. I will defend any firm,

individual or consumer that feels there has been an injustice. An injustice has been done to the Steinberg firm, a firm which has lived up to the terms of the guidelines and in addition has enabled its employees to get a fair deal without harming the consumer. I suggest that the minister make no further attempts to hide behind Dr. Young in this matter. He should exercise his responsibility as the minister responsible and give Steinberg's the credit due them.

• (10:20 p.m.)

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, I must apologize to the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis). The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) cannot be here tonight, so I am stepping in at the last moment with no knowledge especially of the particulars of this case.

I do, however, think that the hon. lady has accomplished one of her objectives. During her intervention in the question period, and again in the late night show, she has given a certain amount of publicity to the achievements of the Steinberg company. They have done the impossible. They have given wage increases to their employees, increases which were sufficient to result in a satisfactory settlement with the unions in question, and at the same time they have held their prices; indeed, in some cases they have cut them. So Steinberg's I would think, have received much of the publicity they sought.

Also, I think the hon. lady gave to the House and to the nation one example, at least, of where the Prices and Incomes Commission has been successful in its objective of trying to hold the line on prices. This example is an important one, namely, a food chain which sells a great deal of food to very many people in one part of the country. She said it is not the job of the chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission to comment on individual firms. I am not sure that he commented on Steinberg's. He is reported in the press as having done so; I do not know whether he did. In any case, I doubt whether the hon. lady thinks that he should comment on the affairs of Steinberg's individually and publicly in answering them and in publishing any retraction.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, October 20, 1970

The House met at 11 a.m.

• (11:10 a.m.)

PRIVILEGE

MR. WOOLLIAMS—WAR MEASURES ACT MOTION—STATEMENT BY MEMBER FOR GREENWOOD ON VOTE OF CERTAIN MEMBERS

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege affecting all members of the House of Commons and in particular those members who took a strong position that the government should have brought in and should bring in a special bill to cover a special situation, namely, the crisis created by the FLQ in the province of Quebec and indeed elsewhere. This morning's *Globe and Mail* contains the following statement under the heading "War Act Supported 190-16":

"they have swallowed their own convictions because of fear of political consequence," Andrew Brewin (NDP Greenwood) said.

"We know the stand we were going to take was an unpopular stand—but do you abandon your principles because of that?"

This statement is reported to have been made by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin). The statement is false and implies wrong motives. It reflects on the voting position of many Members of Parliament and particularly on the position taken by many members of the opposition, including my leader, in reference to this serious situation. We voted in accordance with our principles for what we considered to be a solution, for unity and I hope for the good of Canada. We asked for a special bill for a specific purpose. When that request was accepted I considered, like many other hon. members, that the principles we had enunciated had been effectively assured. I personally voted accordingly and in accordance with my conscience, as indeed I am sure other members did, with the sincere hope that the course followed would promote justice and unity. I am sure all members followed the same course.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has given the Chair the notice required by the Standing Orders. The Chair spent some time reflecting on the very important and serious matter raised by the hon. member. I would take from his statement that he took the opportunity of raising the question of privilege to restate what he considers are the correct facts in relation to the vote taken yesterday. I assume that the hon. member does not wish at this time to press the matter further. There is no suggestion of a motion being submitted to the House. In the circumstances, the matter will not be considered further by the House, and no ruling will be made whether there is or is not a prima facie case of privilege.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

TABLING OF EXTRACTS OF MINUTES OF MEETINGS OF COMMISSIONERS OF INTERNAL ECONOMY, FEBRUARY 9, MAY 5 AND JUNE 23, 1970

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to lay before the House extracts from the minutes of meetings of the Commissioners of Internal Economy of the House of Commons held on February 9, May 5 and June 23, 1970.

ADJOURNMENT FOR FUNERAL OF PIERRE LAPORTE

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, in view of the funeral of the late Mr. Laporte, I should like to suggest to the House that we might make arrangements to adjourn the House for the afternoon to provide an opportunity for hon. members to attend the services either in Montreal or in Ottawa. This would mean we would rise at one o'clock and return to the House at eight o'clock, with the understanding that this day be regarded as one of the appointed days for the debate on the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It is so ordered.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

INTRODUCTION OF PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS—STATEMENT BY MR. SPEAKER

Mr. Speaker: As hon. members know, it has been the practice at the outset of the past several sessions to give, by unanimous consent, first reading in a group to the numerous public bills standing for introduction by private members and thereby allow such bills to proceed to the second reading stage with a caveat to the effect that every bill would be examined by the Chair before it was proposed for second reading in order to ensure that each bill met the requirements of the rules and practices of the House. The reason for such a procedure is of course the great number of bills which have been received and which, on this occasion, has reached an all-time record. Time did not afford an opportunity to examine the bills in detail.

Before suggesting to the House that this procedure and practice be followed again this year I should like to make a few references to certain procedures which seem to be evolving in connection with such private members' bills. In the first instance, the number of bills being introduced far exceeds the number of opportunities that will be provided for the consideration of such bills in this session. In like manner, some members have given notice of several or more bills. Indeed, in one case an hon. member has filed notice of more than 40 private members' bills in his name. I would not like to suggest in any way that it is not the hon. member's right to do so. The rules as they stand at present allow any hon. member to propose for consideration by the House any number of private bills. Inevitably, however, the bills proposed by that hon. member will take up a disproportionate share of the time allotted for the consideration of private members' bills.

Another related factor is that a great number of bills that cannot be reached at this session will be printed at considerable cost. It is for hon. members to determine whether it is advisable to continue the practice whereby so many bills receive the usual pro forma first reading and are ordered for printing at substantial expense when the Standing Orders will prevent most of these bills from ever being considered in the House.

It is obvious that in many cases there is much value in having private bills circulated and considered by hon. members of the House and by interested members of the public. There are arguments on both sides of the question. But the fact remains that from year to year there is an ever-increasing proportion of private bills proposed by hon. members that will never come before the House for consideration and debate.

The Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization may wish to have a look at the situation to determine whether a more equitable procedure can be devised for the consideration of such bills.

Another aspect of the matter is that there is an increasing tendency to include money provisions in private members' bills. Hon. members know that the time-honoured practice has been to include such proposals in the form of a private member's motion rather than in a bill.

In many cases in the past, in order to meet the convenience of hon. members the consideration of the second reading of such bills was entered upon. It seems to the Chair that this procedure is not good parliamentary practice.

May I enumerate a number of bills which, at first glance, appear to include money provisions. Initially, there is a bill entitled "an Act respecting the employment of women in federal jurisdiction before and after childbirth", standing in the name of the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway. Then there is an act to amend the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act and also an act to amend the BNA Acts 1867 to 1965. Then there is a bill to amend the Canada Pension Plan, standing in the name of the hon. member for Hillsborough; a bill to establish a Newfoundland tunnel authority, standing in the name of the hon. member for Humber-St.George's-St. Barbe; a bill to amend the Atlantic Freight Assistance Act, standing in the name of the hon. member for Moncton; a bill respecting fares for disabled persons on federal modes of transport, standing in the name of the hon. member for Oxford; a bill to amend the National Housing Act, standing in the name of the hon. member for Hamilton West, and a bill to provide for the constitution of a federal transport commission of inquiry, standing in the name of the hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East. There are many other such bills. I am sure hon. members would not want me to go through the whole list, so I will stop my enumeration there.

The Chair considers that in the drafting of bills more care should be exercised to ensure that financial provisions are not included in such bills. When the aforementioned bills and any others which, on closer examination, appear to contain financial provisions are called for debate, I propose to examine the question of whether or not such bills are in order from a procedural standpoint. At that time hon. members who have sponsored these bills will have an opportunity to satisfy the Chair that the bills are in order from such standpoint before proceeding to substantive argument on the merits of the bills.

I apologize to hon. members for taking up so much of their time but this is a matter which, as they know, has given some cause for worry to a number of hon. members interested in the procedural aspects of the matter.

• (11:20 a.m.)

Finally, may I refer to the practice which has been developing in some cases of including as purported explanatory notes to the provisions of such bills that are, in reality, matters of debate. In one instance there is included as an explanatory note a statement of some length made on April 20, 1970, by the occupant of the Chair. That statement may have a place in our proceedings but it does not strike me as providing an explanation of any provision of the bill to which it refers. In another case there is an interesting quotation of six or more paragraphs from a statement made in 1796 by George Washington. With all due respect to that late, great and honoured gentleman, I suggest that the inclusion of such material under the guise of an explanatory note offends the rules of the House.

I conclude by asking the House whether there is unanimous consent to an order that all private members' bills listed on today's order paper be deemed to have been introduced, given first reading, ordered to be printed and allowed to stand for second reading at the next sitting of the House subject, of course, to subsequent examination as to the regularity of each bill? Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PUBLIC BILLS

FIRST READINGS

Bill C-6, respecting the employment of women in federal jurisdiction before and after childbirth—Mrs. MacInnis.

Bill C-7, to amend the Canadian Commercial Corporation Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-8, respecting Sir John A. Macdonald Day—Mr. Macquarrie.

Bill C-9, to amend the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1965 (financing of private members' public bills)—Mr. Baldwin.

Bill C-10, to amend the Canada Council Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-11, to amend the National Capital Act (National Capital Commission)—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-12, to amend the Canada Elections Act (qualifications of electors and candidates)—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-13, to amend the Statistics Act—Mr. Robinson.

Bill C-14, respecting tobacco as a health hazard—Mr. Robinson.

Bill C-15, to better assure the public's rights to freedom of access to public documents and information about government administration (administrative disclosure)—Mr. Mather.

Bill C-16, to amend the Criminal Code (abolition of corporal punishment)—Mr. MacDonald (Egmont).

Bill C-17, to amend the Canadian Wheat Board Act (Advisory committee)—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-18, to amend the Farm Credit Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-19, for the protection and humane treatment of animals used in scientific research—Mrs. MacInnis.

Bill C-20, to amend the Canada Labour (Standards) Code (notice and payment to employees in case of discharge or lay-off)—Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).

Bill C-21, respecting the Electoral Boundaries. Readjustment Act—Mr. Robinson.

Bill C-22, to amend the Bills of Exchange Act and the Interest Act (off-store instalment sales)—Mr. Orlikow.

Bill C-23, to amend the Financial Administration Act (parliamentary commissioner for administration)—Mr. Thompson (Red Deer).

Bill C-24, to govern, license and regulate the operation of rainmaking equipment in Canada—Mr. Peters.

Bill C-25, respecting Canadian national pollution awareness week—Mr. Goode.

Bill C-26, to amend the National Trade Mark and True Labelling Act (octane rating of gasoline)—Mr. Francis.

Public Bills

Bill C-27, to amend the Canada Labour (Safety) Code (marine workers)—Mr. Skoberg.

Bill C-28, to amend the Criminal Code (battered child)—Mr. Southam.

Bill C-29, to amend the Broadcasting Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-30, to amend the Divorce Act—Mr. McCleave.

Bill C-31, to amend the National Museums Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-32, to amend the Criminal Code (abortion)—Mr. Chappell.

Bill C-33, to amend the Criminal Code (Control of motor vehicle)—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill C-34, to amend the Canada Pension Plan (pension index)—Mr. Macquarrie.

Bill C-35, to amend the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-36, relating to the control and management of the water resources of Canada—Mr. Baldwin.

Bill C-37, to amend the Government Organization Act, 1969 (Royal Canadian Mint)—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-38, to prevent the invasion of privacy resulting from the misuse of information stored in data banks—Mr. Goode.

Bill C-39, to amend the Food and Drugs Act—Mr. Allmand.

Bill C-40, to amend the Interest Act—Mr. Chappell.

Bill C-41, to amend the Canada Labour (Standards) Code (three weeks annual vacation after three years)—Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).

Bill C-42, to amend the Canada Labour (Standards) Code (provision for a ninth general holiday with pay)—Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).

Bill C-43, to amend the Farm Credit Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-44, to amend the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act—Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).

Bill C-45, to amend the Criminal Code (Vagrancy)—Mr. Robinson.

Bill C-46, to restrict the tar and nicotine content of cigarettes—Mr. Robinson.

Bill C-47, to amend the Railway Act (Notice of accidents)—Mr. Skoberg.

Bill C-48, to amend the Canadian Film Development Corporation Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-49, respecting environmental control—Mr. Goode.

Bill C-50, to amend the Criminal Code (adjournment for accused to obtain legal representation)—Mr. Allmand.

Bill C-51, to amend the Small Loans Act—Mr. Orlikow.

Public Bills

Bill C-52, respecting the designation of the Speaker of the House of Commons as the Member for the Electoral District of Parliament Hill—Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).

Bill C-53, to establish a National Capital Region Planning Board—Mr. Francis.

Bill C-54, to amend the Canadian Citizenship Act (time off without loss of pay for appearance in Citizenship Court)—Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).

Bill C-55, to amend the Food and Drugs Act (labelling of dates on perishable commodities)—Mr. MacDonald (Egmont).

Bill C-56, to amend the Government Organization Act, 1969—Mr. MacDonald (Egmont).

Bill C-57, to amend the Fisheries Prices Support Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-58, to amend the National Film Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-59, to establish the Office of Parliamentary Commissioner—Mr. Thompson (Red Deer).

Bill C-60, to amend the Air Canada Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-61, to amend the Criminal Code (company-censored housing)—Mr. Orlikow.

Bill C-62, to control air pollution—Mr. Haidasz.

Bill C-63, respecting the labelling of detergents and cleaning agents containing phosphate compounds—Mrs. MacInnis.

Bill C-64, to amend the Public Service Employment Act (age discrimination)—Mr. Forrestall.

Bill C-65, to amend the Criminal Code (attempted suicide)—Mr. Robinson.

Bill C-66, to provide for the constitution of a Federal Transport Commission of Inquiry (impartial investigation of transport accidents)—Mr. Forrestall.

Bill C-67, to amend the Hazardous Products Act—Mr. McGrath.

Bill C-68, to amend the Criminal Code (young offenders)—Mr. Woolliams.

Bill C-69, respecting the presence of the National Flag of Canada in both Houses of Parliament—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-70, to amend the Fisheries Act—Mr. Barnett.

Bill C-71, to amend the Combines Investigation Act (floor penalties, criminal joint tortfeasors, and moieties)—Mr. Orlikow.

Bill C-72, to amend the Public Service Staff Relations Act—Mr. Allmand.

Bill C-73, to establish a Newfoundland tunnel authority—Mr. Marshall.

Bill C-74, to amend the Bank of Canada Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

[Mr. Speaker.]

Bill C-75, to anend the Bills of Exchange Act (instalment purchases)—Mr. Peters.

Bill C-76, respecting Human Rights—Mrs. MacInnis.

Bill C-77, to amend the Indian Act (Rights of Indian woman upon marriage)—Mr. Rock.

Bill C-78, to amend the Freshwater Fish Marketing Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-79, to amend the Telesat Canada Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-80, to amend the Economic Council of Canada Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-81, to amend the Livestock Feed Assistance Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-82, to amend the Canada Elections Act (publication of the result of election polls)—Mr. Coates.

Bill C-83, respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act—Mr. Béchard.

Bill C-84, to amend the National Defence Act (Defence Research Board)—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-85, to amend the Criminal Code (kidnapping)—Mr. Caouette.

Bill C-86, to amend the Criminal Code (preventive detention)—Mr. Orlikow.

Bill C-87, to amend the Victoria Day Act (last Monday)—Mr. Scott.

Bill C-88, respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act—Mr. Mather.

Bill C-89, to amend the Science Council of Canada Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-90, to amend the Canada Labour (Standards) Code (increased minimum hourly wage)—Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).

Bill C-91, to amend the Saltfish Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-92, to amend the Company of Young Canadians Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-93, to designate Major's Hill Park—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-94, to amend the Criminal Code (Air and water pollution)—Mr. Allmand.

Bill C-95, to amend the Regional Development Incentives Act—Mr. MacDonald (Egmont).

Bill C-96, to amend the Criminal Code (Wire Tapping, etc.)—Mr. Orlikow.

Bill C-97, to amend the Atlantic Region Freight Assistance Act—Mr. Thomas (Moncton).

Bill C-98, to amend the Official Languages Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-99, respecting the protection of endangered species—Mr. Watson.

Public Bills

Bill C-100, respecting the metric system—Mr. Peters.

Bill C-101, to amend the Canada Fair Employment Practices Act (age or sex discrimination)—Mr. Forrestall.

Bill C-102, to amend the Broadcasting Act—Mr. Mather.

Bill C-103, to amend the Criminal Code (cruelty to animals)—Mr. Mather.

Bill C-104, to amend the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1965, with respect to the quorum of the House of Commons—Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).

Bill C-105, to amend the Navigable Waters Protection Act—Mr. Barnett.

Bill C-106, respecting Little League Week—Mr. Whelan.

Bill C-107, to amend the Broadcasting Act (cigarette advertising)—Mr. Mather.

Bill C-108, respecting the hunting and fishing rights of Indian Canadians—Mr. Simpson.

Bill C-109, to amend the British North America Act, 1867 (National Capital of Canada)—Mr. Isabelle.

Bill C-110, to amend the Criminal Code. (attempt to commit suicide)—Mr. Watson.

Bill C-111, respecting the labelling of hazardous household products—Mr. Mather.

Bill C-112, to provide for the protection of news sources (press privilege)—Mr. Fairweather.

Bill C-113, to establish the area of the Gulf of Georgia off the west coast of Canada as a national underwater park—Mr. Goode.

Bill C-114, to amend the Surplus Crown Assets Act (Crown Assets Disposal Corporation)—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-115, to restrain the use of Tobacco—Mr. Mather.

Bill C-116, to amend the Government Organization Act, 1969 (Medical Research Council)—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-117, to amend the Supreme Court Act.—Mr. McCleave.

Bill C-118, to amend the Canadian Citizenship Act (freedom of conscience)—Mr. Peters.

Bill C-119, to amend the Canadian Dairy Commission Act (consultative committee)—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-120, to amend the Immigration Appeal Board Act—Mr. Haidasz.

Bill C-121, to amend the Public Service Staff Relations Act—Mr. Orlikow.

Bill C-122, to amend the National Arts Centre Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-123, to amend the Cape Breton Development Corporation Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-124, to amend the Food and Drugs Act—Mr. Mather.

Bill C-125, respecting noise in factories—Mr. Mather.

Bill C-126, to amend the Municipal Development and Loan Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-127, to amend the Canada Labour (Standards) Code (severance pay)—Mr. Peters.

Bill C-128, respecting fair credit reporting—Mr. Rose.

Bill C-129, respecting the disclosure of financial interests by Senators, Members of the House of Commons and certain other persons—Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).

Bill C-130, to amend the International River Improvements Act—Mr. Goode.

Bill C-131, respecting the control of lobbying—Mr. Mather.

Bill C-132, to amend the Canada Elections Act (publication of straw poll results)—Mr. Peters.

Bill C-133, to amend the British North America Act, 1867 (abolition of the Senate)—Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).

Bill C-134, respecting the protection of records of Canadian business concerns—Mr. Mather.

Bill C-135, to provide for the establishment of the Alaska-Yukon Highway Authority (Alaska Highway)—Mr. Thompson (Red Deer).

Bill C-136, to amend the Unemployment Insurance Act (age or sex discrimination)—Mr. Forrestall.

Bill C-137, to provide for the protection of news sources (press privileges)—Mr. Peters.

Bill C-138, to amend the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act (charity versus closed-shop union dues)—Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).

Bill C-139, to amend the Criminal Code—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-140, to provide for the humane treatment of vertebrate animals used in scientific and industrial experiments, tests or training by recipients of grants from the government of Canada, by agencies of the Government of Canada and by persons manufacturing or testing pharmaceutical or biochemical products for sale to the government of Canada or to any of its agencies—Mr. Groos.

Bill C-141, respecting rate fares for disabled persons on federal modes of transport. (Free or reduced rates)—Mr. Nesbitt.

Bill C-142, to amend the National Research Council Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-143, to amend the Adult Occupational Training Act—Mrs. MacInnis.

Bill C-144, to amend the British North America Acts 1867 to 1965, (duration of House of Commons)—Mr. Peters.

Bill C-145, to amend the Atomic Energy Control Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Public Bills

Bill C-146, proclaiming the Canadian Flag Day a National Holiday—Mr. Haidasz.

Bill C-147, to amend the Fisheries Research Board Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-148, respecting disclosure of names of drug addicts—Mr. Haidasz.

Bill C-149, to amend the Canada Evidence Act (incriminating statements)—Mr. Orlikow.

Bill C-150, concerning the exportation of the growth and produce of Canada—Mr. Peters.

Bill C-151, respecting Canada Day—Mr. Gibson.

Bill C-152, to amend the Canadian Overseas Telecommunication Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-153, to amend the Canadian National Railway Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-154, to amend the National Library Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-155, to amend the Statistics Act—Mr. MacDonald (Egmont).

Bill C-156, respecting research on drug use—Mr. Goode.

Bill C-157, respecting the Port of Toronto—Mr. Chappell.

Bill C-158, to control the tar content and nicotine level of cigarettes—Mr. Howe.

Bill C-159, to amend the Identification of Criminals Act—Mr. Hogarth.

Bill C-160, to amend the Northern Canada Power Commission Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-161, to amend the Farmers' Creditors Arrangement Act—Mr. Baldwin.

Bill C-162, to amend the National Housing Act, 1954 (municipal water and soil pollution projects)—Mr. Alexander.

Bill C-163, to establish a National Capital Region Pollution Control Board—Mr. Francis.

Bill C-164, to amend the Export Development Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Bill C-165, to amend the Criminal Code (abortion)—Mrs. MacInnis.

Bill C-166, to amend the Canada Assistance Plan—Mr. Lewis.

Bill C-167, to amend the Inquiries Act (publication of reports)—Mr. Baldwin.

Bill C-168, to amend the Immigration Act (mental retardation)—Mr. Mather.

Bill C-169, to amend the Juvenile Delinquents Act—Mr. Robinson.

Bill C-170, to amend the Small Loans Act (advertising)—Mr. Orlikow.

[Mr. Speaker.]

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

NATIONAL SECURITY

WAR MEASURES ACT—PROCEDURE FOR DISCLOSURE OF NUMBER AND NAMES OF PERSONS ARRESTED, CHARGES, ETC.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister whether he would make a statement, not today of course but at the first opportunity thereafter, indicating the success of the operations under the War Measures Act, what procedure we may expect to be followed with regard to disclosure of the number of persons arrested, their names, and what the charges are, and also what assurances there may be with regard to the right to counsel and the arrangements with regard to review? Would the Prime Minister consider making such a statement?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will gladly consider that suggestion. I am sure it will be most helpful to the House to know how the procedures under the Act are being applied. Perhaps I may have one of my ministers make a statement rather than myself. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition realizes that the regulations under the Act foresee that it is the provincial Attorney General of course, who is entrusted with the application of the Act. It will be our role to co-operate with him and to ensure that we can give him any assistance required in making certain that the regulations and the Act are interpreted along lines that the members of this House would desire.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a supplementary question to the Prime Minister.

As several people have lately drawn attention to the fact that following possible arrests they have no idea where their children or relatives are, could the Prime Minister request the Attorney General of the province of Quebec to publish daily the list of people taken into custody as well as the place where they are held so as to reassure their families?

Mr. Trudeau: The suggestion seems to have merit, Mr. Speaker. I will make sure that the Attorney General of the province of Quebec, who is responsible for enforcing the regulations in that province, is informed of the hon. member's suggestion.

[*English*]

ASSOCIATION OF FOREIGN EMBASSIES WITH FLQ ACTIVITIES

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Prime Minister is in a position to tell the House whether or not any foreign embassy or embassies have been associated directly or indirectly with the activities of the FLQ? I realize there may be some dif-

ficulties in this regard, but can the Prime Minister indicate one way or another whether this has taken place?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have no information that there is any association of foreign embassies in this activity.

ADDITIONAL ORDERS IN COUNCIL UNDER WAR MEASURES ACT

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the right hon. Prime Minister whether any Orders in Council other than the one which the House has seen have been passed under the War Measures Act or whether any other Orders in Council are contemplated under the act?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The answer to both questions is no, Mr. Speaker. I would remind the hon. member that we did undertake, I believe in my statement on Friday, that if or when we had to make amendments to the regulations we would bring them before the House forthwith so that the House could take cognizance of them.

[*Translation*]

LACK OF FRENCH-SPEAKING MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES ASSIGNED TO SECURITY DUTY IN HULL

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, would the Prime Minister inform the House whether the military personnel now on duty in Quebec will come under provincial police authority?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, that is a question of law, but, provided hon. members will bear with me, I would say yes, the armed forces were called out following a request from the Attorney General of Quebec. Therefore, they are under the general authority of the Attorney General, not so much as armed forces but as peace officers.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

The government is giving protection to the leaders of the political parties and to some diplomats. I thank him for this.

Until this morning, I was under the protection of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and Hull municipal police. But this morning the guards were replaced by Canadian forces members. I would ask the Prime Minister whether it is normal that, in Hull, I be given guards who do not speak a word of French, when my wife and my constituents do not speak English? Could the Minister of National Defence not do something so that we could be protected in Hull by someone who speaks French?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, we have taken note of the remarks of the hon. member in that regard. I took measures to have the English-speaking soldiers replaced today by some who speak French. I must tell the House that, as everyone knows, French-speaking soldiers were in great demand in Montreal. That is why English-speaking detachments were sent to Ottawa. However, we have made the change requested by the hon. member.

* * *

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

INTRODUCTION OF ADDITIONAL MEASURES TO DEAL WITH UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Finance regarding the report of the Economic Council of Canada which was released yesterday. In view of the council's statement that rates of unemployment in Canada are unacceptably high, indeed, the highest in any of the more industrially advanced nations of the world, does the government intend in the near future to introduce any other measures to deal with the situation in addition to the items the minister outlined in the speech he made during the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): We are, of course, keeping the matter constantly under review. If there are any further measures we shall announce them in the House.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Having regard to the statement by the Economic Council of Canada to the effect that Canada's rate of growth is less than half what is required to maintain even a reasonable rate of employment, and that this involves a loss in potential wealth production of $3 billion to $5 billion a year, does the government intend to do anything about the recommendation of the council that there is need for growth measures particularly in the fields of housing, pollution control and transportation? May we anticipate some statement from the minister in the near future in line with the recommendations of the Economic Council in this respect?

Mr. Benson: We are, of course, interested in speeding up economic growth in Canada and we do announce measures from time to time in this connection.

SPECIAL ECONOMIC STIMULATION PROGRAM

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Does the government have in effect a program known as the special economic stimulation program? If so, can the minister tell us what this program entails?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have never used that term.

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, may I address a supplmentary question to the minister respon-

sible for manpower and immigration. The other day the minister said he would check and advise whether or not the manpower department had sent out a circular advising manpower offices to curtail additional facilities—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder whether this should be considered as a supplementary question. Perhaps the hon. member might ask that as a separate question. I will come to him in a few moments. I believe the hon. member for St. John's East wishes to ask a supplementary.

Mr. McGrath: Does the government have in effect at the present time a program designed to stimulate employment by pumping additional funds into public works in Canada, and is this program known as the special economic stimulation program?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, it is not known by that name to me. We certainly have a program which I mentioned last week under which we are putting additional moneys into public works.

* * *

HOUSING

INCENTIVE BONUS FOR WINTER CONSTRUCTION

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, may I address a supplementary question to the minister in charge of housing. In view of the increasingly gloomy picture house builders are facing regarding sales this winter, is the minister planning, together with the Minister of Labour, to reintroduce a monetary form of incentive bonus for winter house construction, thereby giving an incentive to builders, realtors and buyers?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Alexander: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Hon. members are trying, I suggest, to ask supplementary questions which do not really relate to the original question asked. I think these questions ought to be asked in due course as separate questions.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA—CANADIAN POSITION ON ADMISSION TO UNITED NATIONS—APPOINTMENT OF AMBASSADOR

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. It has to do with a matter that will come before the United Nations shortly, namely, a resolution to the effect that Communist China shall be admitted to the United Nations. Does the government of Canada intend to follow the course it has followed in the past, that such a resolution constitutes an important question and thereby requires more than a bare majority for acceptance?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State for External Affairs dealt with this question last week.

Mr. Diefenbaker: May I ask the Prime Minister, then, whether there is any basis for the suggestion that the government is giving consideration to or has already decided that Professor Paul Lin will be appointed ambassador to Red China, as he is a Canadian-born Chinese who visits Red China and who, when writing about "our country," refers to Communist China?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, several times in the past year or two the right hon. member has been concerned about this friend of his, Paul Lin.

Mr. Diefenbaker: He is the Prime Minister's friend, not mine.

Mr. Trudeau: I can assure the right hon. gentleman that we do not name ambassadors on a patronage basis, even if recommended by the right hon. gentleman.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, when this government makes appointments one can be assured that they are patronage appointments.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder whether the right hon. gentleman has a supplementary question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I asked whether or not Lin, who has made it plain that he is a revolutionary, is being considered for appointment. That was a simple question. When it comes to friendship, the association between the Prime Minister and this man in the past has been such that I am surprised—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege, I know the right hon. gentleman has said this a few times. I assure him, of course, that I do not know Paul Lin and that I never met him. I should like the right hon. member to state to me, on my question of privilege, where he got this information and why he thinks Mr. Lin is a friend of mine—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Trudeau: —or is he just interested in telling lies to the House?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Edmonton West.

Mr. Trudeau: Is it a lie or not?

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is a most unusual question of privilege.

Mr. Trudeau: Is it a lie or not?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

FINANCE

UNEVEN MOVEMENT OF MONEY SUPPLY—REVIEW OF MONETARY POLICY

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Finance. Would the minister tell us what steps he is taking, along with the Governor of the Bank of Canada to review the procedures and to establish a monetary policy that will avoid the uneven movement in the money supply, as indicated in the report of the Economic Council of Canada, which has led to considerable disruption in economic policies in the country during the past year?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the governor and I discuss this matter every week.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. It may be discussed every week, but what are they doing to even out some of the uneven applications of the policy with the results pointed out by the Economic Council?

INTEREST RATES—MEETINGS WITH CHARTERED BANKS—RESTORATION OF CEILING UNDER ACT

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Inasmuch as the Economic Council of Canada states that the exorbitantly high interest rates in Canada are the main factor in holding back economic growth, may I ask the minister if he is contemplating any meetings with the representatives of the chartered banks to deal with this matter or, failing that, is he considering the advisability of introducing legislation to impose a ceiling on interest rates under the Bank Act as was the case formerly?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): No, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

INTERPROVINCIAL MARKETING—REQUEST FOR REFERENCE TO SUPREME COURT—PURCHASE OF SURPLUS EGGS, BROILERS AND TURKEYS

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the Supreme Court's rejection of Manitoba's application to have certain marketing board regulations respecting interprovincial trade brought before that court for a decision, will the government, through the Department of Justice, now initiate some action to bring these regulations before the Supreme Court?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice replied to a question of that nature last week.

Mr. Baldwin: He waffled on it.

Mr. Thomson: As the federal government has taken no action with regard to the legal question involving marketing board legislation and in view of the urgency of the situation with regard to chicken and egg prices, will the government not consider some form of surplus purchasing of eggs, broilers and turkeys to help to solve the problem immediately?

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, requests have been made for that kind of action. I should draw to the attention of the hon. members that I am ready to pass the marketing legislation any day that the House indicates it is ready to do so.

Mr. Baldwin: Why does the government not use the War Measures Act?

Mr. Olson: Why does the hon. member not help us to maintain unity?

FARM MACHINERY PRICES—INVESTIGATION BY DEPARTMENT—REFERENCE OF BARBER COMMISSION REPORT TO COMMITTEE

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Inasmuch as the move to float the Canadian dollar has not resulted in a corresponding decrease in the prices to the farmer of farm machinery and repair parts, would the minister say whether his department is conducting an investigation into this matter and undertake to make a statement on motions?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, Dr. Barber has indicated to me, and I think I conveyed this message to the House some time ago, that in his final report, which we expect shortly, there will be a chapter dealing with repair parts, services and prices. I presume that he has the very same situation the hon. member alluded to under review.

Mr. Mazankowski: Since the Barber report has been in the hands of interested parties for some considerable length of time and as a fair amount of public debate has gone on, can the minister say whether any consideration is being given to referring the Barber report to the Standing Committee on Agriculture, as well as other matters relating to farm machinery prices?

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, the government has not received the report of the Barber Commission. What we have received are special research reports on specific subject matters. The report and recommendations of the Barber Commission as such have not been presented to the government.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Mazankowski: I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Agriculture. Has the minister received

any representations to the effect that the floating of the Canadian dollar has not resulted in a decrease in the prices of farm machinery?

Mr. Olson: No, not in that exact context—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question is not in order. It is not sufficient to ask whether the minister has or has not received representations.

REPRESENTATION AT AGRICULTURAL CONGRESS

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex): Mr. Speaker, may I also direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the announced intention of the government to hold an agricultural congress in the near future and the importance of that congress in view of the condition of Canadian agriculture, can the minister indicate whether all agricultural organizations will be represented and if an invitation will be extended to the members of the Standing Committee on Agriculture?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that the members of the standing committee will be invited to attend, if not as delegates, at least as observers. I believe that was the arrangement worked out the last time, and it is what the members prefer. In so far as all agricultural organizations being invited is concerned, I cannot give an undertaking that every one of them will be invited. I know that we are trying to arrange for about 350 delegates. These invitations will be distributed as fairly as we can through the farm organizations in the country.

* * *

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL SECURITY

EXISTENCE OF FLQ CELL IN PARIS

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the right hon. Prime Minister.

A few days ago an FLQ cell manifested itself in Paris, predicting that the organization will carry out further acts of violence in the coming weeks, and this, outside the province of Quebec, directing their attacks against air and railway transportation in Canada.

Has the government taken or is it taking steps to locate the Paris cell and does the government also intend to adopt measures to prevent acts of violence and sabotage in Canada's other provinces?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I shall see that the Solicitor General be informed of the facts reported by the hon. member.

Personally I would tend to believe those people belong to the "Pantoufle" cell set up by Michel Chartrand.

* * *

[*English*]

RESEARCH

THE ARCTIC—CO-OPERATION WITH UNITED STATES IN SCIENTIFIC STUDIES

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I have a question arising out of the summary and recommendations of the seminar between Canadian and United States scientists with regard to Arctic research problems recently tabled in the House. I address my question to the President of the Treasury Board who reports to the House on scientific matters unless, because of the fact that social sciences are included, I should more properly address it to the Prime Minister. Has the government made a decision on whether it will accept the recommendation of this report for joint scientific studies by Canadian and United States scientists? If not, is the government seized of this matter? May we expect shortly a government decision on whether we will undertake co-operative research with the United States on the question of the management of the Arctic and the future of its population?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): As I think members are aware, Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions going on for some time with the United States scientific authorities in connection with joint co-operative projects. I think it is realized that we both have a stake in the Arctic. Approaching these larger ecological problems by using the combined resources of both countries is likely to produce more effective results than our going it alone. We are conscious that in respect of the Arctic we have a particular and special proprietary interest. With this in mind we are continuing the examination of possible joint projects.

* * *

HOUSING

ROCHDALE COLLEGE—TABLING OF FEASIBILITY STUDY—AMENDED MORTGAGE ARRANGEMENTS

Mr. S. Perry Ryan (Spadina): My question is for the minister responsible for housing. Is the minister prepared to table the feasibility study with respect to the operations of Rochdale College?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, the situation of Rochdale College is being examined very carefully, in great depth and in consultation with others involved at the present time. I hope to be able to disclose the details of that examination and the possible decisions that will flow at the earliest possible time. That might be a matter of two or three weeks from now.

Mr. Ryan: Will the minister also be prepared to reveal the amended mortgage arrangements with the college at such time?

Mr. Andras: Yes, indeed, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

GRAIN

PROCESSING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMIT BOOKS

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): I have a question for the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration who answers

for the Wheat Board. It is now four months since applications were originally made by some producers to the Wheat Board for permit books and they are still waiting for them. How much more time is necessary before these applications are processed? Will the minister ensure that the issuing of these permit books will be expedited, because these producers cannot now make any deliveries?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): If the hon. member has a specific case where it is taking this length of time, I will be pleased to receive information about it and to look into it. Certainly the bulk of the permit books for which applications were received in good time have in fact gone to the producers. Indeed, many of the late applications have been serviced as well. I will be pleased to receive information on a specific case.

* * *

MANPOWER

ALLEGED CURTAILMENT OF ADULT TRAINING COURSES

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): I wish to ask the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration if he would answer the question I directed to him on October 9 concerning a directive that may or may not have been issued by his department to the Manpower offices asking them to curtail applications for adult training for unemployed people in view of the great burden on the budget.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): I have checked this matter with my officials, Mr. Speaker. Of course they do not know anything about such a directive. The hon. member should know from the announcement by the Minister of Finance to the House some days ago that not only has the budget not been curtailed but that there is additional money available for the purpose of manpower retraining this year.

* * *

HARBOURS

ESTABLISHMENT OF PORT AUTHORITY AT CHURCHILL—LOCAL REPRESENTATION

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Can the minister say whether a port authority has been set up for the Port of Churchill under the national port authority concept?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): No, Mr. Speaker, no authority has been established. However, I have been in communication with the Premier of Manitoba and have indicated to him that we would be pleased to consider Churchill in terms of the application of the new proposals now before various ports across Canada. I will be meeting with the Premier of Manitoba and those whom he designates in a comparatively short time regarding this matter.

Mr. Simpson: When preparations are made to set up this authority, will the minister give full consideration to having local representation on the Churchill port authority?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, one of the main objects of the new plan is to ensure a good deal of local autonomy. That will be the case in Churchill and elsewhere.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

LEGISLATION TO IMPROVE PENSIONS OF HONG KONG VETERANS AND WIDOWS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. In view of the complete unanimity which has been evident at every stage concerning the proposals to improve the pensions of Hong Kong veterans and their widows, can the minister say whether we might expect legislation implementing these proposals to be before the House at an early date?

Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker, legislation is being prepared in that connection. I am not in a position to anticipate exactly when this legislation will be before the House but as far as I am concerned, the sooner the better.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. If there is going to be any unusual delay with regard to the whole question of veterans legislation, could there be early introduction of the legislation regarding Hong Kong veterans?

Mr. Dubé: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there will be any unusual delay. I expect this legislation will be before the House at an early stage. I hope that at that time we will have the co-operation of all hon. members, including the hon. member who asked the question.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): You will.

* * *

TRADE

PROTEST AGAINST IMPOSITION OF QUOTAS BY UNITED STATES ON CERTAIN IMPORTS FROM CANADA

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey-Simcoe): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. This matter was to be referred to him by the Minister of National Revenue on October 14th. Perhaps I can repeat my question. Has the government made any representations to the United States government by way of protesting trade bill H.R. 18970 now before Congress, which proposes to impose quotas on several Canadian imports that are vital to our economy?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, there are a number of bills before the United States Congress at this time. It is impossible to comment on them en bloc because some parts of them are favourable and others are not. With respect to those that are not favourable to our trade relations and, we believe, to world trade patterns, we have made the proper representations and drawn attention to the effect of these possible legislative acts on Canadian trade, in particular with respect to mink skins which the hon. member has in mind.

Mr. Noble: Has the government given consideration to introducing measures to assist industries that will suffer from the passing of the Mills bill?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, I believe it is premature to think of that now, the bills not having been passed.

* * *

TRANSPORT

FERRY SERVICE BETWEEN NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR—ADEQUACY OF SHIP AND FACILITIES

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Would the minister advise the House whether he has had submitted to him a report dealing with the unsatisfactory conditions on the ferry service between Newfoundland and Labrador, and will any corrective action be taken in view of the recent accident?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I have had a report with regard to the seaworthiness of the vessel concerned. My officials advise that they have checked her out thoroughly in accordance with all the procedures of the regulations and that the vessel is seaworthy. The conclusion subsequent to that was that most of the problem arises from the fact that the ship is not wholly perfect in terms of design for ferry service, and there are also difficulties with the facilities at each end of the run. I have asked for a special and further study of these questions and I will be glad to keep the hon. member informed.

* * *

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

ST. JOHN'S NFLD.—INVESTIGATION OF ACCIDENT INVOLVING SNOW CLEARING EQUIPMENT

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transport. Before I proceed, may I congratulate the minister on the honour bestowed upon him last week by Memorial University when he received an honorary law degree.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Carter: May I ask the minister whether he is now in a position to say if the investigation promised last year into the accident near St. John's involving some Canadian National snow removal equipment has been completed and, if so, what has been the outcome of the investigation?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his kind words. I will now have to reduce some of my general mistrust of lawyers, under the circumstances. As for the question, this is a matter for the Canadian Transport Commission. The report has not yet reached my desk, but I will be glad to make inquiries and to provide an answer as fast as I can.

* * *

HOUSING

HAMILTON—AMOUNT OF MONEY FOR LOW-INCOME HOMES

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister without Portfolio in charge of housing. I gave him notice of the question last week. It concerns the $18 million that was promised to Hamilton and district. I believe there has been some indication that the amount has now been reduced to $12 million, the balance having been promised to other parts of the country. Has the minister a statement for me in this regard?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I regret that perhaps due to my absence last week on official duties this question was not brought to my notice. I will correct that situation forthwith and give an answer to the hon. gentleman as soon as possible.

Mr. Alexander: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I would hope that the minister would give this matter his immediate attention because it is causing some problems in the city of Hamilton and district.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

INVESTIGATION OF SHOOTING OF YOUTH NEAR SASKATOON

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Solicitor General. In view of the fact that a 15-year-old youth was shot to death near Saskatoon last week by an officer of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, can the minister say whether his department is conducting an investigation into the incident?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

[*Later:*]

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Solicitor General supplementary to that asked by the hon. member for Yorkton-Melville. When the Solicitor General is investigating the incident referred to by the hon. member for Yorkton-

Melville, will he also investigate changes in the description of the incident in reports which were attributed to the RCMP? I ask this question in view of the fact that I understand it was first denied and subsequently admitted that the death occurred as a result of a shot fired by an RCMP officer.

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be very glad to do that. I noticed one discrepancy of some significance in the newspaper reports, and I will be very glad to see that the question the hon. member has now raised is considered and dealt with when the other question asked earlier is being answered.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

PROTECTION OF CERTAIN PERSONS WHEN THEY LEAVE OTTAWA

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. It has to do with the security arrangements that have been made and have been in effect for several days, under which either armed forces members or Royal Canadian Mounted Police officers are acting as security guards. Do these security measures apply to the individuals to whom that protection has been accorded when they leave Ottawa or do they not apply? I am simply asking for information so that those who are subject to the security measures that have been taken, which incidentally are most commendable, will know the facts.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the arrangements vary from person to person. If the right hon. gentleman is interested in knowing what type of security he deserves, he can consult with somebody in the government.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister shows today that mean truculence that is not in keeping with Parliament.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INDUSTRY

NORTHWESTERN QUEBEC—MEASURES TO DEVELOP NEW MINES

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, there is a question I would like to ask the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, in the absence of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

Is the hon. Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce in a position to say whether the government is taking any action to expand the mining industry in Northwestern Quebec in particular and to open new mines?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): This question is really a little too broad, Mr. Speaker. I will certainly discuss this matter with the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion and report to the hon. member on any mining developments at present being carried out in that area and on whatever action has been taken concerning other projects.

* * *

[*English*]

FISHERIES

GEORGE'S BANK—CLOSURE OF HADDOCK FISHING

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Fisheries whether he knows of any nations other than the ICNAF member nations that are fishing on George's Bank, and can he tell the House whether the government has reached agreement with such countries in regard to closing haddock fishing on George's Bank from October 23 to the end of the year?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, the haddock fishery is closed to all nations. They are all observing the sustained yield quotas instituted this spring.

* * *

LABOUR RELATIONS

NORTHLAND NAVIGATION COMPANY—PUBLISHING OF CONCILIATION BOARD REPORT

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Acting Minister of Labour or the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour. May I ask either gentleman whether he will inquire into the long delay in making public the report of the conciliation board on negotiations conducted between Northland Navigation Company, on the one hand, on the coast of British Columbia and the SIU and the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway, Transport and General Workers on the other, a report that has been hanging fire since mid-July?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to make inquiries and advise my hon. friend.

* * *

GRAIN

AVAILABILITY OF SPACE FOR DELIVERY OF HIGHER GRADES

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration in his capacity as the minister responsible for the Wheat Board. Taking into consideration the fact that we are now entering the third month of the new crop year and that producers have been unable to deliver any of the top three grades of grain because of lack of space, could the minister say what action is being taken or can be taken to alleviate the situation?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the only extent to which the hon. member's question is accurate when he says that the problem is due to lack of space is the fact that the space available is being filled by barley and Durum and lower grades of wheat which are required to be moved to the considerable markets for them. The Wheat Board has under consideration the appropriateness of opening quotas for the higher grades of wheat and is daily watching the space situation and the availability of space for these grades.

* * *

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The House resumed, from Monday, October 19, consideration of the motion of Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel, for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session.

Mr. Steven Otto (York East): Mr. Speaker, while members are leaving the House, may I say that I am sorry to see that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) is leaving as well, as has his parliamentary secretary. This gives me a wonderful opportunity to continue some comments that I started last night in connection with our economic and financial position.

I had been reviewing some of the causes of the malaise that is current in our nation, and specifically the tragic fact that we have stratified our society into small, very tightly knit groups. As a result, the individual finds it impossible to express himself or to gain any position in society without waiting a long time trying to break into that group. I spoke specifically of association such as law societies, medical groups, manufacturers associations, unions, trade guilds and all such things.

• (12:00 noon)

The answer is a very difficult one, but it has to be found and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is in the best position to find it. He said originally that the new constitution would have to include certain rights for individuals. I suggest that of paramount importance for inclusion in the new constitution is the right of an individual to practice a profession, a trade or a calling, and the right of persons to enter into business without asking or begging leave of a small, tiny group. Standards of qualification for individuals in Canada should be set by the state, not by those people who are interested in minimizing the numbers in various groups. This is what must be done, and I hope the Prime Minister includes that in the new constitution.

It has often been said that nothing is so important to the people of Canada as the economic picture, and that is true. We have in the past suffered almost any indignity without too much furore, but our pocketbooks are of prime importance. No matter how strong a leader or how good his government is, if there is unemployment, insecurity and a lack of opportunity that government is going to go down to defeat. This is not strange. We are very cautious people. We like savings, we like life insurance policies and we like security. When the Minister of Finance said there was going to be additional unemployment, that statement struck fear into the hearts of most Canadians because no one knows who is going to be next. In Canada, unemployment is a degrading thing.

Therefore, let me make a suggestion to the minister. He said he was going to lift the monetary restraints and he is trying to do so. I think it would be a drastic mistake to remove all restraints. If financial restraints are lifted, the only result will be more inflation. This is the time for selective lifting of restraints. The Bank of Canada has already reduced the interest rate. There is more money available. What have the commercial or chartered banks done? They have put the red convertible loan advertisements back on the television because this type of lending is more profitable to them. This consumer credit involves a rate of interest up to 32 per cent. For what more could you ask?

This is the time for the finance minister to consider a new approach entirely, and that approach is this. What is it that the banks hold of great importance? I suggest the answer is reserves. In other words, at the moment the banks have to put 7 per cent or 9 per cent into the Bank of Canada for reserves. I suggest to the Minister of Finance that he now consider dividing reserves into two categories. If the banks lend money to business and industry to replace their capital goods or equipment, thereby creating employment, their reserves will be 2 per cent. However, the reserve required in respect of consumer credit will be 20 per cent or 30 per cent. In that way, the Bank of Canada could control the chartered banks so that they would put out the money where it is needed, and at the moment it is needed most by industry for replacement of capital equipment in order to become more productive.

In our economy, the minister should place more emphasis on productivity. I do not think the money he indicated would be used for additional welfare will do much good. I would much rather see that money spent on retraining programs. The money that is to be allocated for giveaways should be transferred to retaining programs through the Department of Manpower and Immigration in order that we can better equip our people to become more productive.

The area development program has always been questionable because it is founded on the idea that the administrators know how and what to do for certain areas in order that those areas can become self-sufficient. I suggest that the emphasis be changed and placed on market and production research. In today's sophisticated research experience, each area in Canada has a certain product that, it can most efficiently produce. Many areas have services that they can best perform. This matter requires the advice of experts in the field, not bureaucratic experts in the government. Such decisions require the advice of manufacturers and people in market research in order to guide development.

Let me give you an example. Some time ago, and I am talking about seven, eight, or nine years ago, a shipyard

was started in the Collingwood area. At about the same time, Mr. Jozo Weider of the Blue Mountain ski area was ordering ski lifts. When we talk about a ski lift, we are talking about a $200,000 investment. The only available source to this day, quite frankly, is France. The ski lifts are manufactured there and brought here. Jozo and I went over to the shipyard and said: Look, you have the steel, the pipes and the welders, why don't you manufacture ski lifts? Jozo said that he would be their first customer. The answer was: Oh, good heavens no. We are boatbuilders, you know, we don't touch ski lifts. There you have a perfect example of the static thinking which is common to many of our industries.

What we require is government assistance to a group that will dare to follow good advice from market research experts. At this time Collingwood would have been as busy as any place in Canada manufacturing ski lifts, not only for Canada but for the United States as well. Instead of that, to this day we are still importing ski lifts from France. This is the type of development that is necessary but it will not come about as a result of the boards and commissions we have, or through the efforts of the department which is now attempting to deal with the problem. This task has to be given to individuals who know the business and the results of market and production research.

Let me now give the minister another bit of advice. At the moment the country, the communities and the people are sitting on a razor's edge. They do not know what to do. If we tell them to anticipate trouble, we are going to have trouble. For the minister and for this government to say that we are completely overshadowed by the United States economy is nonsense. We can survive independently. In fact, we can do better than the United States in every phase but it requires the minister and this government to make a statement and a move of confidence.

Psychologically, businessmen and entrepreneurs are waiting for some sign of confidence. They are not getting it from Mr. Young and they are not getting it from this government. They certainly are not getting it from the advisers to this government. I want to say a word about these advisers. Sooner or later, the minister has to recognize that the present government advisers are old-time economic thinkers. They left their schools and universities some 30 years ago and now find themselves in a static milieu. They talk to each other and not to anyone else. They have firm policies that are ancient, decrepit and absolutely useless. They believe in policies of economic restraints, so called confinement of capital expansion and policies of restriction rather than policies of expansion.

• (12:10 p.m.)

It is up to the minister now to develop new methods and new advisers. We have some in this House. We have the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona (Mr. Harries), a man who is experienced in industry and economics, and who is not hidebound by the old theories that circulate around Ottawa itself. We have the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Smerchanski), who at times is a little radical but nevertheless has proved his theories by himself. He has made a remarkable success of his life and is in daily contact with business as is the hon. member for Edmonton-Strathcona and the minister from Winnipeg South. There are many members here who could advise the minister in a confidential way. The minister must develop a method by which he can take advice from persons, other than those in his department, who will seriously guard the government's position and not allow anyone else to befuddle his mind. This would be a bureaucratic tragedy. We must take into consideration new economists like Miss Cohen and Mr. Weldon from Montreal, people with new ideas, and not the old Bryce ideas. Mr. Bryce has lost his job as deputy minister and will not be financial adviser to the cabinet.

The minister must take a new approach so that he can benefit from the views of people who are active in industry and business. I see that my time is almost up. I should like to remind the government that we need not preach gloom, but that if we preach confidence we must take radical steps. We must introduce reform measures in giant strides and not in little, mincing steps. The Prime Minister must remember he was elected not to be cautious. In the past, we have had cautious prime ministers. He was elected to be daring and it is up to his government and his ministers to be daring.

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, as members of the House know only too well, during the past two weeks the whole country has been deeply shocked by the tragic kidnapping of Mr. Cross and Mr. Laporte and most recently by the cold-blooded, callous murder of Mr. Laporte. As we are aware, on Friday at 4 a.m. the government invoked the War Measures Act to provide the forces of justice with the powers required to rescue, if possible, the two hostages and to stamp out the forces of evil from our country. Mr. Speaker, there are those who say that these sweeping measures should not have been taken by the government because they would have the result of restricting our democratic freedoms. I believe one of the most important democratic freedoms is the freedom from fear; the right of a man and his family to walk the streets and live in their homes free from fear that they could be suddenly whisked away by terrorists and held for ranson, and if that ransom is not forthcoming brutally murdered.

Had the government introduced legislation asking for only the restrictive powers it needed to deal with this tragic and very serious situation before the police forces moved in to make the arrests and apprehend those whom they suspected of having some connection with this series of events, those criminals would have been well advised long before it was possible for the police to make their move. Then, of course, by the time this move was made those criminals would have been many miles away. We in the official opposition believe, therefore, that the sudden invocation of the War Measures Act early Friday morning to give the forces of justice the element of surprise which was so badly needed to assist them in their task was completely justified. It is for that reason we have solidly backed the move the government has made. We hope sincerely, along with all Canadians, that

the invocation of the War Measures Act giving the government very wide and sweeping powers to enable the forces of justice to operate completely freely and effectively will lead to Mr. Cross' safe return to his family in the near future as well as to the blotting out of the FLQ menace from the face of this land for all time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak for a few moments about a matter of great importance to this country. I refer to the fight against pollution. When the Canada Water Act was passed four months ago, the country believed that at long last we would see the government begin to take action to effectively combat pollution, which action the minister assured us was only awaiting the passage of the bill. But, after four months of waiting, there has been no sign of action, nor is there any indication that any will emerge in the near future. In strong contrast to the lethargic attitude of the Canadian government to this very pressing problem is the kind of action taken in the United States. On July 9 President Nixon announced plans for a new super agency to co-ordinate the government's fight against pollution and to clean up and protect the environment. The president put teeth in this new agency in the form of a budget for the current financial year of $1.4 billion. This budget makes it possible for the new agency to immediately implement antipollution measures across the country.

Since the gross national product of the United States is fourteen times that of Canada, a comparable budget for antipollution operations in this country would be $100 million a year. However, our Canada Water Act, a toothless tiger if I ever saw one, provides no funds for grants to finance antipollution projects. Although the act permits loans to be made in certain circumstances, and small amounts of money to be made available for studies, no funds have so far been appropriated for either and there is no indication that any appropriations will be made. A very large part of the $1.4 billion which the United States government has allotted for the first year to fight pollution will be used for loans to be made to industries and municipalities to help them finance the usually high cost of antipollution machinery. The reason such financial assistance is necessary in both the United States and Canada is that small and medium sized industries and municipalities simply cannot afford the large outlays necessary to finance this expensive machinery. Such expenditures are non-revenue producing and therefore are very difficult to justify to shareholders and ratepayers. If the money to buy such machinery is not forthcoming, the machinery will simply not be installed and pollution will continue to run rampant in our country.

• (12:20 p.m.)

In order to make it possible for industries and municipalities which are polluting our air and our water to purchase the expensive machinery they need, I suggest that we employ the same method which we used during wartime to make it possible for industry to convert to war production. At that time the federal government made available low interest loans on a long term basis and allowed industry to write off the cost over a relatively short period of time. This made it easy for industries to switch to war production, and the results were, as we know, spectacular.

Loans bearing 5 per cent interest to be paid off over 15 years with a three year write off period will enable industries and municipalities, particularly small industries and municipalities which have not yet established a high credit rating to purchase the antipollution machinery they need without imposing a crippling financial burden upon them. The government should now announce that $100 million will be made available for such loans during the next 12 months of operation of the Canada Water Act so that an effective antipollution program across the country can become a reality. After the first year of operation, it will be apparent whether this amount should be increased or decreased for the next year.

I, like all Members of Parliament I believe, was glad to learn from the Speech from the Throne that the government intends to establish a department to "co-ordinate and consolidate our antipollution efforts in an effective fashion". It is to be sincerely hoped that this co-ordinating effort will end the overlapping of responsibility and the confusion which have greatly reduced the effectiveness of antipollution efforts in this country.

I am glad to see that the minister who will be in charge of this department is in the House at the moment, and also that he is paying close attention to what I am saying. I say to him that he must not only co-ordinate the antipollution efforts of the five federal departments which presently deal with it but must also work closely with provincial ministers to ensure that the country's efforts are as well co-ordinated as possible.

One of the best ways to bring this about would be to persuade the provinces to adopt a uniform antipollution code which each would put into effect in his own jurisdiction. Such a code would remove the pressure on the province not to crack down on a polluting industry for fear that it might move to another province where antipollution regulations were not so strongly enforced. It would also make it impossible for an industry to play one province against another when deciding where to locate in the first place.

One of the minister's important functions must be to work closely with the U.S. government, and the governments of the States, with which Canada shares common waters to ensure that the legislation on both sides of these waters is as similar as possible. It is obvious that bringing in effective measures by governments on the Canadian side will be ineffective if similar legislation is not enacted on the U.S. side, and vice-versa. As we know only too well, pollution does not stop in midstream.

During the annual meeting between the U.S. and Canadian parliamentarians in Washington last March, the subject of pollution control was given the number one priority for discussion. There was complete unanimity that similar legislation must be enacted on both sides of the boundary if protective pollution control is to become

a reality. Both sides passed on this unanimous opinion to their respective governments.

In conclusion, I would like to say I am confident that if we take the steps I have outlined, we will eliminate a great deal of the confusion which today is making our efforts to clean up the environment largely ineffective and will make it possible for industries and municipalities to start installing the machinery they need to eliminate pollutants from waste before they are discharged into the environment.

Mr. Jean-R. Roy (Timmins): Last week it was my privilege and pleasure to accompany the minister responsible for housing on a visit to most of the huge territory of northwest Ontario. We travelled to many communities and discussed many subjects with many individuals, but the unprecedented events which were taking place in the city of Montreal, the province of Quebec and in Ottawa, could not help but become the most frequent and serious subject matter of our deliberations. Our citizens in that part of the country, as in all other parts, were shocked practically to disbelief at what was happening in Montreal. Not one person who spoke on our tour expressed disapproval of the government decisions that were taken as events unfolded. Indeed, the invocation of the War Measures Act at the request of the Montreal and Quebec governments, was welcomed with the largest possible degree of approval. I was left with the clear impression that these Canadian citizens would have lost confidence in the capability of the government to govern had this decision not been taken at that time.

Even as I detected at times in northwestern Ontario some feeling of detachment and of distance from the problem, I also felt the concern for and the bitterness at the brash and arrogant performance of the FLQ terrorists, the leaders and members in our communications media, and the stupidity of the media in providing these people with a platform from which they could disseminate their hatred and their objectives of destruction. When we returned to Timmins, the feeling of remoteness from the events was completely dispelled because these areas are heavily bilingual with a large number of Canadians who are French speaking. The significance of the frightening events in Quebec touch our people much more directly because these families have direct blood and racial ties which have been established over generations and remain ever so strong, binding them with extraordinary firmness, especially during crisis and adversity.

Here, in the heart of northeastern Ontario, our backgrounds and roots are from Quebec but our characters and mentalities have been tempered and developed in Ontario. Our feelings are of indescribable sadness and gloom in this crisis for our compatriots in Quebec, feelings of a brother who has lost his favourite sister, feelings of a frustrated onlooker's terrible concern for the series of ever worsening developments. This series of developments has lasted for so many years it has created feelings of deep anxiety at the seeming irreversibility of them. There is incredibility at the paradoxical situation of a people in semi revolt against the church which was once their most sacred institution, at large numbers of teachers who prostitute their noble purpose of educating youth for the scurrilous political indoctrination of youth, at students wishing to destroy an educational system which was practically non-existent when they were born, and at labour leaders who are taking away the individuality of the men who were the most individualistic in Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, we French Canadians from Northern Ontario feel deeply confused and concerned about our brothers. We are not ashamed because the FLQ assassins do not deserve to be called French Canadians. They are, as someone said, wild beasts. No other characteristic, be it racial, national or other could have the least importance or supplant this description.

We are rather confused that these events should take place in Quebec. We want to reaffirm our support, our confidence and our encouragement to Quebecers and assure them of our understanding and solidarity.

Quebecers, the people from Northern Ontario always remain sympathetic and grateful to you in these extremely difficult hours. Be assured that you are not alone in your misfortune. Your fellow countrymen, across Canada regardless of race or language are with you.

• (12:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

Along with all Canadians in all provinces, Mr. Speaker, I learned with terrible grief and sadness of the news of the Hon. Pierre Laporte's death. My immediate reaction was one of such anger that I might have been unbalanced. Yet how do you keep a proper balance, reason and judgment, when confronted with such senseless actions? How do you detect justice and order, values and meaning when confronted with such events? How, and when do you return to rational existence? When do you disperse the fear and eliminate the hate? How do you rediscover the meaning and understanding of life, society, humanity, good, evil?

Anger is bad. No human being should have to live with anger and hate in his heart. If I felt deep resentment when some of the opposition leaders and members were playing politics with a situation the like of which we have never seen in this country, when they stupidly refused to see the need for unity and the need for firm, immediate action to halt the destruction of our society, then I must say I felt absolute disgust when I saw the NDP members rise to vote against the motion proposed by the Prime Minister in order to restore sanity in Quebec, in order to crush the insidious revolutionary hands of murdering terrorists active in Quebec and most probably in the rest of Canada. These NDP members will have to answer to their constituents for their vote because by that vote they in fact extended their support to the murderers. They, in effect, encouraged these people—

Mr. Winch: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker; the hon. member has just brought into question the motivation behind not only the speeches but also the votes of members of this House. A vote was taken yesterday. The members of this group did not all vote as one but whether, Sir, as members of the N.D.P. or as members of this House of Commons, we voted one way or the other. We voted according to principle, conviction and conscience. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member says that because certain members of the House of Commons voted in a certain way they have aligned themselves with the murderers in Quebec, I say that that is a shameful statement. That is not permissible in this House of Commons. It should not only be withdrawn immediately but the New Democratic Party and all the members of this House of Commons have the right to insist on an apology as well as a retraction.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. The Chair is in agreement with the main point made by the hon. member, if not with all of his remarks. I take this opportunity to read Standing Order 35, the latter part of which reads as follows:

No member may reflect upon any vote of the House, except for the purpose of moving that such vote be rescinded.

At this time, I think I should remind the hon. member for Timmins (Mr. Roy) that he may comment on the situation and the events that have occurred, but he may not be permitted to reflect on the vote taken by this House or any position taken by members of the House. I think if he sticks to that he will abide by the rules of the House. As far as the other point made by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch) is concerned about the withdrawal of the remarks, I am sure that the hon. member for Timmins in his further remarks might add some comments that might satisfy the hon. member for Vancouver East.

Mr. Winch: I am sorry, Sir; I am very sorry, but I think you will understand that I must get to my feet again. I am not seeking clarification by any further statements. I believe I have the right, and I must insist, that the hon. member now withdraw the remarks which he made, and the insinuations therein contained.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): I see the exact point the hon. member for Vancouver East is making and I think I will agree with him. I will ask the hon. member for Timmins to withdraw that part of his remarks.

Mr. Roy (Timmins): Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to withdraw any part of my remarks that is contrary to the rules of the House, whichever part that may be.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Roy (Timmins): If this satisfies the hon. gentleman I shall try to continue.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The hon. member for Timmins.

[Mr. Roy (Timmins).]

Mr. Roy (Timmins): As I was saying, Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that this party has never been able to obtain support from the electorate of Quebec? They have never understood the people of Quebec. They have never been concerned about them. They would now abandon them and throw them to the extreme socialists; the anarchists, the Maoists and the FLQ. No doubt chaos and disorder in Quebec would help the socialist cause. They thrive on that sort of adversity, but what a price for Canada to pay for the sake of cheap politics.

In addition, they hypocritically hide this gruesome gesture under the cloak of defence of individual liberties. This attitude is taken by people who have on so many occasions denied to others the rights and liberties which they claim for themselves, who on so many occasions would impose on others the morals that are theirs, who on so many occasions have taken unto themselves the decision of what is just and what is not, confusing justice with their own diabolical designs. Witness the civil disobedience of our laws and governments so often proposed by members of that party. Witness their disregard for our laws in so many labour confrontations and strikes. Witness their callousness and lack of human respect for workers who are not of their unions. Witness their fixation for criticism of non-socialist countries while approving by their silence all socialist dictatorships. Indeed, along with such misguided people as Levesque, Chartrand, Lemieux, Laberge, Pepin, and their leftist socialist friends, their leaders and members are the ones who sow the seed that gives birth and strength to the anarchists, the terrorists, the Maoists and the murderers. They are the ones who fan the flames of dissension and confrontation, who constantly twist the truth, who give tacit support to all sorts of extremes by their silence, who condone violence as a sometimes necessary activity in labour disputes—

• (12:40 p.m.)

Mr. Winch: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I am certain you have noted the remarks of the hon. member for Timmins. You have noted his references to the party which I have had the honour to represent in this House for the past 17 years and for 24 years before that in the British Columbia legislature.

An hon. Member: About time you left.

Mr. Winch: Shut up! He implied that because of our policies, our principles and our statements we were responsible for certain things that have taken place in this country.

Mr. Francis: On a point of order—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. There is already a point of order before the Chair. If the hon. member for Ottawa West wishes tc speak afterwards, he may do so.

Mr. Winch: I say that the allegations which have just been made by the hon. member are not such as can be

made in this House of Commons at all, and that they should be withdrawn—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. The Chair cannot permit the hon. member for Vancouver East to make a speech at this time. He should make his point of order if he has any complaint about what the hon. member has said, and that is all. Perhaps I should take the opportunity to say that the Chair listened to the remarks of the hon. member for Timmins and was worried at one point about whether there was not a danger of getting on to thin ice. However, listening closely, the Chair took it for granted that his remarks were not directed to any members of this House or to any party of this House. Maybe it is a question of grammar or syntax, but I think they were related to the group that is called the FLQ or to the revolutionaries. Maybe the Chair should leave it to the hon. member for Timmins to clarify his point; I am not certain as to the conclusion to which he was coming.

Mr. Winch: May I ask, Sir, that you read *Hansard* tomorrow.

Mr. Francis: On the question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I listened carefully to the hon. member who has the floor and while he did retract those remarks to which objection was taken, possibly correctly, by the hon. member for Vancouver East, he has not since that time made any reference to the party or group to which the hon. member for Vancouver East belongs. In those circumstances, it is improper for the hon. member for Vancouver East to make an interjection.

Mr. Winch: Then you read *Hansard* tomorrow—uncorrected.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): As I said before, I would expect the hon. member for Timmins to clarify the point he has made, then we might not have to read *Hansard* tomorrow.

Mr. Winch: I would appreciate that immensely.

Mr. Roy (Timmins): Possibly I could clarify the matter by saying I was referring to the extreme socialists who are causing such disturbances in our country today, wherever they might sit.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The hon. member implies that his remarks might refer to a member of this House, and this the Chair cannot permit. If he means "sitting anywhere in Canada or the world" I might take a different view, but if there is somewhere in his remarks a reference to members sitting in this House, the Chair cannot accept it.

Mr. Winch: Hear, hear.

Mr. Roy (Timmins): I am puzzled by the fact that the hon. member should see himself as an extreme socialist. I will say my observations applied to no member of this House. I will except members of this House—while they are sitting in this House.

Some hon. Members: Oh.

Mr. Roy (Timmins): It is these extreme socialists, as I say, who condone violence as a sometimes necessary activity in labour disputes, who condone the destruction of property in the same disputes and then scream for justice having derided the laws. They may stop short of condoning sedition, they may stop short of condoning insurrection or treason, but there the terrorists start, continuing their work beyond the bounds of civilized society, beyond the intentions of these so-called reformers, but helped by their advance to the brink of disaster and social impropriety.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, the socialists have misread the feelings of our citizens. The vacillation of these people would bring more terror, but Canadians want this terror to stop; their hypocritical, confusing words would bring confusion, but Canadians want clarity; their sinister politics would bring help for the terrorists, but Canadians want these terrorists eliminated; their soft-pedalling would bring more senseless murders, but Canadians are sick of all violence; their desires would weaken authority, but Canadians want a restoration of authority; their bleeding hearts would bring anarchy and the termination of our freedoms, but Canadians want their liberty, with law and order.

For my part, I pledge myself to be ever vigilant and watchful for any unnecessary encroachment on the rights of Canadian citizens which could result from the application of the War Measures Act, but I have no hesitation in supporting what is necessary in order to stamp out these murders and terrorists with their violence and hideous crimes. Thank heaven we had a government with the courage and wisdom to act.

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): May I say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, how pleased I am to have this opportunity to take part in the debate in this House. I should like to extend my congratulations to the hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel) and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) upon the honour bestowed upon them in being chosen as mover and seconder of the Address. I had the opportunity to serve with both these hon. members on parliamentary committees, and I must say I found them very good members to work with, men who were certainly acting in the interests of all Canadians.

The Speech from the Throne which traditionally marks a new session of Parliament was again filled with the usual flowery phrases, catchy cliches and challenging invitations reminiscent of words we heard so often during the election campagin of 1968. What is disappointing is that after two years of this regime we are hearing basically the same old rhetoric—somewhat more dramatic and more passionate on this occasion, with a little more ambivalence and ambiguity.

To use an expression we use out west, if we separate the wheat from the chaff, the tangible and concrete contents of the speech can be summed up adequately in a dozen sentences. We are told the just society is now but a distant ideal. We are told we stand on the threshold of greatness. We are told not to be cold and impersonal for the sake of efficiency but rather to be warm from the

heart, as between friends. I cannot help but recall the tone of the task force report on agriculture which consistently referred to the need for agriculture to become more efficient at any price; there is somewhat of a contradiction between the policy spelled out by the Liberals for agriculture in the seventies and the sentiment contained in the Speech from the Throne.

We are told, again, that there is to be more planning; that there are to be more studies undertaken in many new and diverse fields. This has been going on, now, for 24 months. We are told we can expect new forces, some of which we do not yet understand; some of these forces will originate internally, and others will originate externally. We are warned of the consequences of rapid change brought about by advances in technology, and the growing difficulty we are likely to encounter in controlling our destiny. Despite all this advice, we do not see much in the Speech from the Throne which prescribes a remedy for many of the conditions we are likely to face in the forthcoming year, or for that matter, in the forthcoming ten years.

• (12:50 p.m.)

We are told that 80 per cent of our population will reside in a few large metropolitan areas. As one looks at these areas, one can reaffirm one's opinion that this government totally lacks any feeling for our rural areas, the people of which are feeling a growing sense of alienation. We are adding to our problems by making large cities larger, at the expense of our rural areas, the populations of which are declining. We are aware of the quality of life in the cities. Their problems result from pollution, crime and the crowding of many people into a very small area.

We are told that there will be problems relating to housing, pollution and drugs in our cities. In Toronto alone, there is a backlog of something like 2,000 drug cases waiting to be dealt with by the courts. One wonders whether new measures will be introduced to improve the method by which we deal with the matter of drugs. I wonder also whether the minister will soon be able to table information relating to the records of cases involving drugs so that we may ascertain whether there is any disparity between sentences.

I do not believe there is a Canadian in this country today who is unaware of the problems outlined in the Speech from the Throne and who is not willing to sacrifice something in order that we may overcome the problems which face us in the 1970's. What I say we need is a co-ordinated attack on our problems, under proper leadership. Certainly, the setting up of a ministry of urban affairs and a ministry pertaining to environmental control is a start and is, I think, commendable. At the same time it is clear that appropriate policies and programs are essential if those ministries are to be effective. What we must ask ourselves is, why has all this taken so long? Perhaps the government will again use the constitution as a scapegoat. After hearing this government constantly weaseling out of its responsibilities by using the constitution as an excuse, one wonders how this country managed to survive for 103 years.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: The point is that the constitution is as good as the participants within it, and if co-operation and co-ordination to achieve a goal or overcome a problem cannot take place within the present framework, we are hardly likely ever to arrive at a way of achieving a satisfactory amending process.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: I am referring to a process under which the constitution will be all things to all participants.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mazankowski: The previous Throne Speech referred to the fact that something like one million new housing starts would take place in the next five years. There was particular emphasis on low cost housing, social progress and urban employment opportunities. The present Speech from the Throne makes no mention of this goal. One can only assume that the ministry of housing and urban affairs will accomplish these goals as the result of co-operation with the provinces and municipalities. I say that this is the logical and sensible approach. This was the main theme and essence of the Task Force Report on Housing. Why have we had to wait for two years for its implementation?

The matter of pollution and the preservation of our environment quite rightly is an issue which must be attacked by all levels of government and by all sectors of society, by the young and the old, the rich and the poor. I believe that all Canadians will be prepared to work together in a planned and effective approach in overcoming this most threatening problem if they are given adequate leadership. As I said before, I certainly welcome the intention of the government to establish a department concerned with our environment. I hope that the many young people who have corresponded with their elected representatives throughout the past year, and expressed their deep concern over matters relating to pollution and the disturbance of our ecology, will have their fears allayed somewhat by proposals such as those contained in the speech. We have received literally hundreds of letters from young people drawing to our attention their concern over the destruction of our environment and the disturbance of our ecology. I believe that all Canadians will be compelled to share in this exercise if we are to preserve this great land for future generations.

Specifically, I hope that young people will engage in more positive methods of assistance instead of merely criticizing. I hope that the minister will display the initiative and ingenuity to develop programs that will harness the energies of these young people, which can be used in

fighting pollution and preserving our environment. To date, Mr. Speaker, I believe that in some areas the young people have not been as co-operative and enterprising as they might have been. Some have displayed a contempt for authority and engaged in litterbug tactics which, to me, destroy the credibility of some young people when they cry for business, government and industry to clear up the mess. I suggest that they, too, may be caught in the web of disorder and find it expedient merely to criticize instead of engaging at working co-operatively in the finding of positive and meaningful solutions to some of these very pressing problems.

As I said before, the Speech from the Throne suggests that there will be more white papers and studies during the present session. I ask, Mr. Speaker, what has become of the white paper on Indian affairs and the subsequent response made by the Indian Affairs Association of Alberta? Since the commencement of the twenty-eighth parliament, a vigorous debate has taken place with respect to the policy to be followed in dealing with our Indian peoples, yet very little has been achieved in a concrete way to improve the welfare of our native peoples and to put right some of the social injustices with which our native peoples have been confronted. Perhaps they are more frustrated today than they have been at any time previously as a result of the expectations aroused by the government.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please.

Mr. Mazankowski: May I call it one o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): It being one o'clock, and pursuant to the special order made earlier this day, the sitting stands suspended until eight o'clock, p.m., later this day.

SITTING SUSPENDED

At one o'clock the sitting was suspended.

SITTING RESUMED

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

* * *

PRIVILEGE

MRS. MacINNIS—STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF MEMBER FOR GREENWOOD CONCERNING ARTICLE IN GLOBE AND MAIL

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. This morning a complaint was made against my colleague the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), arising from a news item in the Toronto press. My colleague was not here at the time and the matter was drawn to his attention later. He is not able to be here this evening and has asked me to read the following statement on his behalf.

I understand that the attention of the house was called to a statement in the *Globe and Mail*—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I have very serious doubts as to whether the question of privilege is in order. Mr. Speaker heard the question of privilege raised by the hon. member and made a ruling thereon. It is my impression, unless I am mistaken on the procedural aspect, that the subject was closed with Mr. Speaker's ruling.

Mrs. MacInnis: With deference, Mr. Speaker, my colleague was not here this morning. As soon as he heard about it, he decided he would like to deal with the matter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I wonder whether the House would give unanimous consent so there would be no question about impropriety in allowing the hon. member to read the short statement?

Mr. Otto: Mr. Speaker—

An hon. Member: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: There is no consent.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On the question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I happen to know that the statement which the hon. member for Greenwood would like read on his behalf is, in fact, an apology which he felt should be made to the House at the earliest opportunity. I believe under those conditions the House will want to grant that privilege.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: With the explanation of the hon. member, does the House give unanimous consent?

Mr. Otto: I am surprised that the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) would try to promote such a thing. Surely, it cannot be the rule that a member can have another member make a speech for him when he is absent. I ask the member for Winnipeg North Centre, a man learned in the rules, whether he really thinks this is the type of—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It is obvious there is not unanimous consent, and I think the House might proceed. The hon. member for Vegreville.

* * *

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel, for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session.

Mr. Mazankowski: Prior to the adjournment of the debate this afternoon, I was dealing with the white papers referred to in the Speech from the Throne and the various studies to be continued this session. I am somewhat concerned about the fact that the white paper in respect of Indian affairs was not mentioned

in the Speech from the Throne. I am concerned about the fact that today the native people find themselves more frustrated than at any other point in time because of the expectations brought about by this government, prompted largely by the fact that they were asked to participate in the discussion with regard to policy. They were given reasonable assurance that the government would listen to their representations. Are we to assume that matters affecting the native population will not be dealt with this session? I believe this urgent matter must be considered. I want to go on record as stating that this is a glaring omission. The government should seriously consider introducing acceptable policies for our native people, taking into consideration their submissions.

There has been a detailed investigation into the prices of farm machinery. The Barber Commission investigated the prices of farm machinery. I believe the cost of that Commission was in the neighbourhood of $1½ million This Commission, which was launched in 1966, issued a very strong indictment against the major multi-national corporations which engaged in the practice of price fixing at the expense of the farmers. The Commission stated this has resulted in discriminately high prices. If this is true, some action should have been taken by this time. It is imperative that this charge be disposed of immediately. This matter should be brought before the Standing Committee on Agriculture. I believe that the machinery companies should be asked to appear before the committee to answer the charges made by the report.

• (8:10 p.m.)

Furthermore, in light of the task force report on agriculture which asks farmers to become more efficient and competitive, I suggest that the time to act is now. The whole tone of the task force report is efficiency. I do not believe there is a producer in the country who would argue that he must be an efficient producer, that he must be competitive, in order to capitalize on the potential of our export markets. This is a time when he sees his input costs increasing yearly without any measureable control. I submit that every possible step must be taken to effect some control. Certainly, this is an area, in light of the Barber report, in which some improvements can be made.

The spread between farm production income and input has been further widened this past year by the unpegging of the dollar, bringing about further reductions in the price of farm products destined for export. As a matter of fact, immediately after the unpegging of the dollar we saw a decline in the price of wheat of something of the order of 6 per cent. The price of livestock earmarked for export decreased proportionately. This reduction was necessary in order to maintain our competitive position within those markets. Consequently, one can only assume that the input costs—and I refer specifically to those inputs that are a major factor in the cost of production, namely farm machinery and farm machinery parts—would have been reduced accordingly had there been a premium on the Canadian dollar. However, to this date no such decrease has been apparent.

As matter of fact, we are told now that farm machinery prices are going up. The prices of farm machinery parts have increased throughout the year, and many of the farm machinery companies are asking for orders in various parts of the country because there is a price increase in store within the next year. This is all very strange to me because I can recall quite clearly in 1962, when the dollar was devalued, that almost immediately a surcharge was imposed of some 7 or 7½ per cent on all items imported into this country—by items, I mean machinery, and machinery parts in particular—to offset the discrepancy created by the pegging of the dollar. Now that the situation has been reversed, no countervailing action has resulted, and probably never will unless some pressure is brought to bear.

When I questioned the minister in this House this afternoon, he suggested that this matter is under review by the Barber Commission. We can all see for ourselves just what effect the Barber Commission has had to date. It has been conducting a study since 1966 and many recommendations have been made, yet none of these recommendations has been translated into legislative action.

I submit that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) or the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford), should look into this matter and look into it immediately. If to compete in international markets we must lower our export prices as a result of the increased value of the dollar, then I think a corresponding premium should be added to the value of our dollar when we import items which are necessary to produce farm commodities.

The Throne Speech also makes reference to the improved export position of grains, and I am certainly glad it specifies grains rather than wheat. I say this because in many press circles this question of increased grain exports has been interpreted as an increase in our exports of wheat. But this is not the case.

The speech also praises the government for the success of the Lift program. Let me make it very clear that I think the success of the Lift program has been due largely to the weatherman more than anything else. We are all awaiting the program that is going to be instituted next year, especially since, as the House knows, there is plenty of summerfallow in western Canada this year. Under the Lift program and the wheat reduction acreage program, this year the farmers were asked to restrain from increasing their acreage of feed grain, particularly barley and oil seeds. However, we are now told that demand for barley is excellent. As a matter of fact, our sales figures indicate that exports of barley have been very good.

There has been some suggestion that we may not be able to fill all available orders for barley, and there was evidence of this as early as last spring when prospects for barley looked promising. However, this information was not transmitted to the producers; as a result many were not able to capitalize on the buoyant demand for barley.

We all welcome the aggressive sales approach that has been taken in the last ten months. This only proves to me that markets have been available, and they will be available providing someone is prepared to go out and merchandise particularly our feed grains. We in this party have continually pressed the government for a more progressive merchandising policy, above all headed by someone who understands the business.

I cannot help but once more refer to the task force report on agriculture which draws attention to our blatant disregard for market research. Of the total amount of research devoted to agriculture, only 1.2 per cent has been set aside for marketing research. Another glaring weakness in our policy is that research data is not readily available in Canada. As a matter of fact, the data that was tabulated in the task force report was obtained largely from foreign sources, mostly from the United States.

I am sure there is no member of the House who does not welcome any measure that would improve the market potential of our agricultural products. However, the Speech from the Throne only touches on this subject very vaguely, merely suggesting that the government will continue to introduce programs designed to improve market potential for agricultural produce and to assist in the adjustment to changes in this vital sector of our economy.

The task force report clearly suggests that the need for more than that is obvious. If anyone is to place any credence in the report, it is abundantly clear that we will have to do much more than just continue along the lines we have adopted in the past. We must aggressively engage in market research programs that will provide the ways and means to anticipate, to plan, to implement, and of course to assess, the appropriate measures to capture the full market potential of our products.

Above all, in discharging this duty I believe it is of paramount importance that we engage qualified and knowledgeable people. I hope that hon. members will not be misled into the belief that the problems of agriculture in western Canada have been overcome by this vast array of publicity brought about in respect of improved grain sales. The lack of grain sales has been a chronic problem experienced by the Liberal government, and our sales performance has been nothing short of dismal in the last few years. There is a lot of catching up to do.

• (8:20 p.m.)

May I remind you as well that the grain which is being sold is largely barley at an elevator price of 60 cents a bushel. The elevator price for wheat is $1 per bushel. When you subtract the advances of previous years, I suspect that the effective cash influx will be much less than the anticipated $500 million figure which has been quoted.

Referring again to the task force report on agriculture, we see in it a broad approach to agriculture in the 1970's. Certainly, one could find ample opportunity to debate many of the recommendations contained therein. There is one area in which I feel the government will soon have to make its plans known, and that is the future position of the small family farm.

It is clearly evident that the policies we have been dealing with in the past two years are directed toward larger, so-called viable enterprises, with little emphasis or consideration being directed toward the small enterprise. I believe this is a most pressing and urgent situation and the government owes a statement of intent in this regard because the small operators can no longer adjust to the arbitrary quotas on grain and on cream which are being discriminately placed upon them. The abolition of the 400 bushel unit quota has placed a severe hardship on small family operations. They, too, are being dealt a blow by the discriminatory practices of the Farm Credit Corporation in that they are not able to obtain any capital to expand.

These small family farm operators are concerned about the reference to the sorting-out process in the report on agriculture. This sorting out process suggests that only those farmers who operate aggressive and viable enterprises will survive. This matter creates a certain amount of apprehension and fear, particularly when we consider the high level of unemployment. Many of these people will be faced with little or no option other than to go on public welfare.

The mention of quotas leads me to the subject of the farm products marketing bill which has been referred to as a contentious measure. We in the Conservative party were accused of filibustering and killing the bill during the last session, even though many of our members cut our summer recess short to attend committee meetings studying this bill. Let me say here and now that this is a sweeping measure which demands comprehensive study. I make no apologies for being associated with a party dedicated to a thorough study of such a measure. The simple fact is that many people throughout the country have had some very serious second thoughts respecting this legislation, having had an opportunity to study it and realize its far-reaching implications. I remind you that the majority of those presenting briefs to the committee found many inadequacies in this bill. In practically all instances, the matter of producers' rights was clearly overlooked. This is particularly so in view of the fact that the intent of the bill was supposed to be directed toward the interests of producers.

I see you are sitting on the edge of your chair, Mr. Speaker. May I conclude by saying simply that a grain act, designed along similar lines was introduced. Again, in this regard, we have been accused of killing this bill. I want to remind hon. members that we are concerned about the direction in which the government is moving in respect of agriculture. I think it is very appropriately summed up in an address by Mr. D. R. Marshall, the president—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order please. I regret that it is my duty to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to permit the hon. member to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Mazankowski: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members for your indulgence. I merely want to conclude by quoting a concern which was expressed by Mr. D. R. Marshall, president of the National Dairy Council of Canada in an address he made to the 53rd annual convention in Toronto. In part he said:

> The march toward "concealed" socialism in agriculture in this country is now well advanced and I am sure that is not the wish of the vast majority of Canadians that it should be continued, no matter under what camouflage.

If this is an accurate assessment of that trend in agriculture—I see the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) indicating that it is not and I wish I could agree with him. If this is an accurate assessment, I am proud to be one of those who is fighting this measure. I will continue to do so in order that those freedoms of choice which remain to the producer may be preserved and not destroyed by multi-corporations or integrated companies or the bureaucracy. I am convinced that these two measures seek to destroy these privileges.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to take part in the debate on the Address in reply to the Throne speech.

Mr. Speaker, how could anyone speak today without referring to the death of a minister of the Quebec government?

Without going through the complete details of this event which saddens the whole population of Canada, I think I must draw the attention of hon. members to its distant cause. Someone once said that the violence of the weak is a reaction against the inertia of the strong. Because Louis XVI and Louis XV had remained indifferent to people's demands, Louis XVI was eventually executed.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Violence is only the normal escalation of democratic procedures followed to stir the dormant conscience of competent authorities. The intuitive judgments of the people are sounder than the deductive judgments of misled intellectuals.

Justice and harmony are so deeply rooted in the heart of the man in the street that they are at the origin of the most efficient revolutionary movements.

While congratulating the government for having taken emergency measures to control aggravating and dangerous conditions, I would like to point out that those are only superficial steps which will never put right the causes of the deep dissatisfaction of the people before the procrastination of competent authorities who for too long have remained conservative while calling themselves Liberals or advocates of political economic liberalism.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking the following question: do people revolt against honest, fair and humanitarian governments?

Current events oblige us to much soul-searching and self-accusation as to the way we in Parliament have conducted the personal, family and social affairs of all Canadians.

One aspect we must not forget: the Canada we represent is in 1970 a country with a population of nearly 22 million people who all have the right to a living standard in keeping with our gross national product.

Mr. Speaker, that is the essence of the problem. Have we settled it? Does the last Speech from the Throne propose appropriate solutions? Can our people wait any longer for an honest distribution of the production from a prosperous economy? I do not think so.

The people are not asking for promises, resolutions, wishes, words, laws, white papers, slogans and investigations. The people want a fair and honest distribution of Canada's magnificent annual production, according to the needs of all citizens who live in Canada and according to the merits of the Canadians who work and who provide capital.

Mr. Speaker, the first right of the 22 million Canadian citizens is the right to life. That should not be forgotten, even faced with the death of a noble citizen who has paid with his life for the inertia shown by governments in recognizing the right to life of all citizens. Mr. Speaker, thousands of children may die every year through lack of proper food and care, heads of families may get so discouraged that they want to kill their wives and children because they feel unable to feed them and give them a decent living, on account of the inaction of governments which are too slow in bringing the necessary reforms, but we do not seem to care. We find all kinds of excuses.

But if a selective assassination is committed, we are touched. Well, if we do not want any more selective assassinations, we will have to consider most seriously our grave responsibilities. Let us prevent collective assassinations, an obvious result of our inertia, ensure a guaranteed personal income, an adequate and proper purchasing power consistent with our national production.

There is of no need, here, to give a university lecture in economics. Production must first be used for consumption and then, for capitalization. Nothing is more simple. Even citizen in this country can understand that.

Our production amounts to $84 billion, which represents $3,900 per person, or $19,500 for a family of five as an average. We should demand a personal minimum allowance for every child in Canada and every young people. We should establish it at least at $90 a month for adults between 18 and 59 and at least at $120 for old people and pensioners of 60 and over.

As for family allowances, established in 1945, they have been increased only by $1. Their rate ranges only from $6 to $8 while the cost of living has considerably increased.

The right to live is a normal and proper one, in fact the first right of each citizen within a civilized society. It is therefore the first to be protected by legislation.

As can be seen, no political partisanship is involved, any more than nationality, religion, language, race, colour, different provinces or even the Constitution. It is just a matter of elementary justice for all citizens of the land.

Nor are capitalism, socialism or communism involved. In all countries, whether capitalist, socialist or communist, goods and services are produced by the nation's adult population and apportioned between consumption and capitalization. That is the purpose of an economy, to be kept well balanced by simple means consistent with facts and economic realities of our country.

Nor is it entirely a matter involving a monetary system. The situation does not depend on that only.

• (8:40 p.m.)

In any economic and political system, the production of any year should be used by the living citizens before being made available to citizens who will be living during the following years. We should consume enough before capitalizing too much.

There are great academic people, famous men who believe they are the centre of the world, who maintain they are increasing production and who increase capitalization without worrying about consumption.

Such is, Mr. Speaker, the crucial problem that must be solved. If we can produce, then to be logical, we should be able to consume our products. That production should meet all needs, at least the essential needs of everyone, otherwise, our economy will be unbalanced, even unjustified.

That is important and simple. One does not need a university degree to understand that. It is simple common sense. Even a very young child will think of eating today before thinking of saving for tomorrow. The little squirrel eats the peanuts people give it and hides the rest for winter when it is not hungry any more.

Therefore, in order to act according to the laws of nature in Canada, if our production is worth $84 billion in 1970, every Canadian should consume enough before we capitalize $34 billion.

That is the rub. That is the core of the problem. There is too much capitalization and not enough consumption and frustrated people are dissatisfied, and rightly so. It is up to the government to correct the situation. But who is the government? At least 264 members and ministers, elected by the Canadian people to look after the management of the Canadian economy for the 22 million people of Canada.

I believe that at present, we consider the Canadian economy in the abstract. Living from hand to mouth, most people laugh on Friday and cry the next Monday. The future of a community must not be built on present sorrows, but on economic facts and realities. From now on, Canadian prosperity will keep publishing analyses on the economic life of Canadians.

States are duty bound to become aware of national problems and of conditions required for their solution. Can we define and detect the problems? Several organizations have been making inquiries and reports of all kinds in order to detect poverty and unemployment for many years. But the number of unemployed is still on the increase. Those inquiries and plans of all kinds, and so on, have cost millions to the government, but they failed to solve the unemployment problem.

Unemployed are found in all municipalities. The idleness and helplessness of so many men being such a serious problem, members of the House and economists as well are seeking effective solutions.

Technocrats set up great programs, economists consider, analyze and seek solutions. Intermediate bodies demand, call for and condemn; realistic publications voice opinions and think.

But few people reflect on the true composition of the puzzle we have to solve. Unrest and dissatisfaction are now widespread.

The solution seems immediate and concrete. Everyone could bring an element of solution to the anguishing problem of unemployment. But that evil is not the responsibility of anyone in particular, and no one works positively towards its solution. A solution is not a plan, an idea, a program, or an invention, but the answer to a problem! It is not a conclusion, but action!

I defy anyone to tell me that in this Parliament, in the last ten years, steps were taken to solve the serious problem of unemployment.

Are the Canadian people really incapable of innovating, of creating, of foreseeing the needs in order to enlarge or develop the required markets? Are we short of imagination, initiative or competence? Needless to say, initiative would upset many comfortable habits but if the elite does not move within the next months to relieve human hardship, considerable upheaval and disastrous consequences can be expected.

If credit unions do not make money more accessible nor use it to raise the living standard of their most disadvantaged members, it is all the more unlikely that capitalist philanthropists should put an end to the ills of Quebecers and other Canadians.

Those in charge of government who appreciate what the economic development of a state or a country means should feel extremely concerned. Mr. Speaker, it is quite customary to find in any Quebec village a $600,000 school, a senior citizens' home valued at $800,000 or $1 million and a quite comfortable church, whereas, in hundreds of municipalities, not a single industry exists.

The young people may attend school, the older people stay in a home for the aged, the whole population goes to church yet, the young people have to rely on welfare or unemployment insurance payments. For their part, the workers must leave for the large cities. In many rural or semi-urban centres, the population happens to be much lower in 1970 than it was in 1950.

Soon we shall have a great metropolis inside a desert, inside a territory almost uninhabited. Meanwhile experts

continue to study, analyse and forecast fully expecting that the economy will pick up with time.

Mr. Speaker, for an analysis of our public financial position, one has only to refer to statistics and check expenditures by the central government and the province of Quebec, where my constituency is located. In 1970-71, the federal government spent $12.9 billion, the Quebec government, $3.982 billion, the Quebec municipalities, $810 million and the school boards, close to $1 billion. Nobody has the exact figures since it is impossible to obtain accurate statistics for the Quebec school boards. But this year, for every citizen, young or old, male or female, Ottawa is spending $845, Quebec, $665, the municipalities, $135 and the school boards, $135 or more. The annual expenditures of the Ottawa and Quebec governments, of the municipalities and school boards, total $18.492 billion, i.e. $1,579 per capita. It is the highest per capita average in Canada and it applies only to the province of Quebec and to Ottawa; I am not talking about the other provinces.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, can we afford to finance this display of grandeur with part of the money borrowed? This is a sure way to compromise our future.

On March 31, 1968, the direct federal government debt was $32.575 billion and the indirect debt $8.335 billion. On March 31, 1968, the consolidated debt of the Quebec government stood at $1.678 billion and the indirect debt at $2.799 billion. The 1,652 Quebec municipalities owed $283 billion on December 31, 1967. The bond debt of the school boards amounted to $485 billion and even more in 1963 and it has increased at a fantastic rate since.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, each Canadian is in debt to the tune of $1,971 at the federal level, $755 at the provincial level, $355 at the municipal level and possibly more at the school board level. So, each Quebecer sees his future income mortgaged for about $83,436. The government debt exceeds $50 billion in 1970 and to this must be added close to $10 billion in personal debts. The total Canadian debt exceeds $60 billion. Considering the rate of interest to be paid and the amounts needed for bond renewal, no country, much less a province, can survive. I challenge anyone to find somebody smart enough to finance that.

Debentures are renewed at new interest rates, the rich are getting richer, but there is an increasing number of poor people and welfare recipients. The frightful rate of public debts does not frighten anybody, neither the governments nor the governed; the former bring in more social measures and increase expenditures, the latter call for more without thinking that eventually they will have to foot the bill.

Is it possible, Mr. Speaker, to find an adequate financial system that will put some order in all this and enable the citizens and the government to pay their debts? But, in order to pay their debts, interests rates have to be reasonable, debentures have to be renewed under reasonable terms and not under the exorbitant conditions existing today.

Such conditions are senseless. We make the rich richer and the poor poorer. This causes general discontent and brings about developments such as we have never seen before in this country. We will see more of them if we do not control the situation, if we do not put our economy in order, if we do not allow each citizen to live decently in a rich and prosperous country. We will pay for our mistakes. We have paid part of our dues, but there is more to come. This is only a beginning.

To administer billions of dollars, the people elect representatives most of whom are unable to administer a single million and are even less able to understand the nature and operation of orthodox financial mechanisms. These only pile up public debts that will never be paid even if all our real wealth is used for that purpose. It is therefore normal to find that the application of fiscal policy, the dispersion of loans, the scarcity of investments and the inconsistency of administrative measures greatly increase the costs of public services.

Those facts are sufficient to show that an economic problem does exist, that it is becoming more and more serious from year to year in our country, and especially in Quebec. Prosperity cannot grow by itself, and the people must truly want it. Can we imagine what tomorrow's society will be like, to guess what the future will bring and to plan accordingly? Can outside influences, which we are unable to control, prevent us from becoming what we want to be?

We are assured of being able to realize this on the one condition that we once again become masters of our money and our credit and make use of them for the realization, in answer to real needs, of attainable objectives.

A balanced system must make financially possible what is physically workable, whereas the present system makes impossible financially what is physically workable. This is nonsense but such is the way things have been for decades.

As for the Speech from the Throne, it proclaims the definition of a just society in reasserting the slogan which brought the present government to power. We can say that the definition is a good one, and we accept it:

> —a society in which individual freedom and equality of opportunity remain as our most cherished possessions;

We are convinced that by its housing policy the government did not achieve that high ideal. A decent home—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but the time allotted to him has expired.

Mr. Latulippe: Mr. Speaker, I have still a few remarks to make. May I be allowed to go on?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Does the House agree to let the hon. member for Compton conclude?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Mr. Latulippe: Mr. Speaker, I was saying that we are convinced that the government did not attain its lafty ideal through its housing policy.

The policy of individual freedom and of equal opportunity is still very far from the social justice advocated in the "just society" slogan, considering the number of slums where too many Canadians live.

The 12 per cent tax on building materials, the 8 per cent interest rate on capital loans, the 8 per cent tax on material purchases in the province of Quebec, the 10 or 12 per cent interest on bank loans for the construction of houses, all those things further contribute to raise the cost of materials and services that the people and the municipalities must pay.

By increasing taxes and interest rates, the government contributes to raise the price of real estate and construction, so that an individual can no longer afford to own his home.

Under our present economic system, the individual is made to bow to the whims and demands of money-lenders, instead of the economy adjusting to his needs and those of his family. If money-lenders decide to build sky-scrapers so that their investment will yield a higher interest, families are packed together in superimposed bird-cages and charged prohibitive rents, considering the low income of the citizens.

Our just society, by its taxes and its housing policy, deprives the individual of his right to ownership. Can it be repeated too often? Only those with a high income can become home owners. Low wage-earners will always be tenants from generation to generation.

But interest on large investments keeps increasing, both in private and public enterprise. The value of a bond bearing a 10 per cent interest doubles in seven years, quadruples in 14 years, multiplies itself eight times in 21 years. And this is how capital controls the whole economic life of the nation, while wage-earners live from hand to mouth, without being able to make both ends meet.

In order to realize the present state of our economy let us consider this aspect of private ownership of individual and family housing, and we will find that the situation is impossible, unfair, unacceptable, for the present as well as for the future.

What is the use of having a Minister of Urban Affairs and Housing, as mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, if we make ownership more and more difficult, if we prevent individuals from becoming property owners?

How is it, Mr. Speaker, that so many people could find more suitable and cheaper houses in all our towns and villages hardly fifty years ago? Is this situation merely due to chance? Is there no one responsible? And if someone is responsible, are we to blame? Is it the passenger or the driver who is responsible for an accident?

Mr. Gaétan-J. Serré (Nickel Belt): Mr. Speaker, following the unfortunate events taking place in our country these days, it is with deep emotion and great anxiety as to what the future holds for us that I take the floor in the House, the seat of democracy cherished by all worthy Canadians.

In my own name and on behalf of all my fellow citizens of Nickel Belt, I hasten to express my most sincere sympathy to Pierre Laporte's family, to all his colleagues in the National Assembly, to the Prime Minister and all government officials. I wish them the courage required to meet the challenge now facing us.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we shall soon hear that Mr. Cross has been safely released.

The events of the last few days have consequences that go far beyond the captivity of Mr. Cross and the assassination of Mr. Laporte. I hope that thanks to the indomitable courage shown by our Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and to the co-operation of governments at all levels as well as of every Canadian citizen, it will be possible to restore order and to ensure the security of all Canadians.

[*English*]

I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, we are presently faced with the worst crisis in Canadian history. Anyone who believes the present situation can be solved by arguments about a possible threat to our civil liberties is fooling himself. There is no room at this time for opportunism and party politics such as the leader of the New Democratic Party and some of his hon. friends in that party have shown in the last few days. The political opportunism and lack of sincerity displayed by th NDP will never be forgotten by the Canadian people.

Some hon. Members: Order.

Mr. Nystrom: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I think the hon. member is imputing motives, and that is contrary to our rules. I, for one, can say I was not insincere in my stand. I was very sincere as, I am sure, were other members of my party. I would ask the hon. member to withdraw his last remark.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): I must tell the House that I was busy talking to somebody here so I did not follow the last part of the hon. member's remarks. It is difficult, therefore, for me at this time to judge the remarks about which the hon. member is complaining. But if that part of the hon. member's observations were comments about a vote in the House of Commons, I might take the opportunity to read again the last sentence of Standing Order 35, which states as follows:

> No member may reflect upon any vote of the House except for the purpose of moving that such vote be rescinded.

This is the second time today I have had to read the Standing Order and I hope hon. members will keep it in mind in order that the Chair may not be confronted with points of order similar to those which have been raised earlier.

Mr. Serré: I should like to tell the House, Mr. Speaker, that I was not referring to the vote which was taken here yesterday.

This is a time for statesmanship, for leadership such as our Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has been giving us all along during these difficult moments in our history. Even though these sad events are most deplorable, it is my firm belief that they will have served to unite us all more strongly than ever.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in congratulating the two members who distinguished themselves so much by moving and seconding the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, namely the member for Bourassa and the member for Assiniboia (Messrs Trudel and Douglas), the former, an accomplished businessman and the latter the farmers' untiring spokesman. Both performed their task in a masterly manner, and have shown once again the great worth of the men recruited by the Liberal party at the last election.

Mr. Speaker, on reading carefully the Speech from the Throne, one can find a keener desire on the part of the government to take concrete steps aimed at establishing the just society, which is the ideal of any true democracy and of most Canadians.

With a view to enabling the Canadian people to participate in the establishment of a sound policy, the government intends to pursue its policy of issuing white papers, while implementing bills carefully prepared in the past two years with the help of the whole population.

I am delighted to find that the government will keep on intensifying its fight against air and water pollution by setting up a department responsible for the environment and by introducing a piece of legislation on air pollution.

• (9:10 p.m.)

God knows that the pollution problem worries us in the Nickel Belt. Needless to say, the situation has become alarming. The main industry, INCO, has been allowed far too long to deteriorate the ecology of the area. To be sure, great efforts have been made recently and the company spends fantastic sums of money to remedy the situation, but it is rather late in the day.

The provincial government, which has jurisdiction in that field, has certainly been remiss in its duty. It should have forced the company to take the necessary preventive measures. It even should, in the present context, punish the polluters severely, be they giants like INCO, a small industry or even an individual.

Since the provincial government has been unable to control pollution in our part of northern Ontario, the federal government should take the initiative and set up a pollution research and control center at Sudbury's Laurentian University, right in the center of northern Ontario. Such a center could co-ordinate the initiatives at every government level. People are becoming extremely impatient and I am sure they are favourably impressed by what our government is doing in this regard.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel).]

Mr. Speaker, our life in the Sudbury area has far too long been conditioned by the mining industry, the only major industry controlled by foreign capital. INCO has always exploited our abundant natural resources, making enormous profits every year, without concerning itself enough with the living conditions its operations create for the people in the area.

I feel that it should contribute more to the various community services such as housing, transportation, education, recreation and so on that are required by its employees and all citizens in the area.

Such an operation being controlled by foreign interests, of course, it cannot be totally sensitive to local problems. Therefore, my constituents and myself shall certainly follow with interest the developments resulting from the white paper on the control of our economy shortly to be tabled by the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Gray).

I recognize that foreign investments have been and remain necessary to the development of some of our resources. However, I consider that the government should take the necessary means, as soon as possible, to make sure that we have better control over our economy.

The recent proposal of the Ontario Liberal party to the effect that 50 per cent of our national interests should be controlled by Canadians seems to be quite reasonable in the present circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, our area is greatly in need of both secondary industries and investments. But prospective investors are often afraid of moving into our area because we lack adequate means of transportation.

The cost of living is higher than elsewhere, especially owing to lack of competition and to exorbitant freight rates. For instance, I believe that the railway companies exercise discrimination against northern Ontario, where they have set the rates higher than in other parts of the country.

I have asked and I am still asking that the Department of Transport undertake a full study on this problem and insist that this abnormal situation be rectified as soon as possible.

When I talk of inadequate transport facilities I refer specifically to air transport, the worst in my opinion. For example, our only airport, operated by the city of Sudbury, is too small to give good service to the 200,000 odd citizens of the area. An expansion program is imperative. The increase in air traffic makes it long overdue. Aware that the city of Sudbury is not in a position to undertake such an expansion program entailing expenditures of a few million dollars, I suggest that the Department of Transport take immediately the necessary steps in order to take over its operations.

After all, Mr. Speaker, that airport has to become regional because it has to service not only the city of Sudbury, but dozens of surrounding municipalities. I therefore hope that the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) will take notice of my suggestions and that he

will deem it advisable to transfer the jurisdiction from the city of Sudbury to the Department of Transport in order that the population be offered an adequate service.

For example, it is high time that our area be serviced by jets as is the case in centres much smaller than ours at the present time.

In perusing the program proposed by the government for this third session, I am pleased, like all my constituents, I am sure, by the fact that the government will give special consideration to all citizens without exception, at all levels of society, and mainly to the disabled, both young and old.

I do not have time to comment on the numerous measures which will be introduced these next few months. I will mention only a few like, for instance, the establishment of two new departments: Urban Affairs and Housing, to remedy the problems created by the influx of people into our great cities and to give particular attention to the housing crisis and to the pollution of our environment. A number of measures will be introduced especially on air pollution and tax reform, designed to divide more equitably the economic burden and improve the small wage-earner's lot.

There will be amendments to existing legislation on labour-management relations so as to improve the collective bargaining process and establish a more modern legal framework to that end.

Mr. Speaker, as I have the honour to represent people who are for the most part wage earners belonging to a powerful labour union, I am sure they will watch closely the new amendments to the Labour Code.

New measures will also be introduced to give consumers better protection so that they know better what they buy and so as to protect them against unfair practices.

The existing unemployment insurance system will be amended so as to increase the number of eligible people. Special consideration will be given to the possibility of providing assistance to the unemployed so as to enable them to secure decent employment.

As I said earlier, and again in order to enable people to take part in the preparation of measures concerning them directly, a number of white papers will soon be issued on foreign ownership in the Canadian economy, national defence, citizenship, immigration, the status of women and social security.

In the white paper on social security, special attention will be given to the old age security pension plan and family allowances.

It is high time that we show greater concern for our old people. Many of them may well be the poorest citizens in Canada, while they actually were the ones who built up this prosperous country in which we live today. For several of them, the pension cheque is hardly large enough to pay the rent. I hope this government will increase by a substantial amount the pension payments which are the only income these old men and women ever get.

As regards the old age security pension, as in the case of family allowances, may I be allowed to suggest that the benefit rates be increased considerably but that eligibility be limited. In other words, it could be withdrawn from those whose income is large enough to provide for their own needs, and it could accordingly be increased in the case of lower income citizens.

There is a group of pensioned citizens who are not treated fairly and I refer here to retired railwaymen. I do hope that the CNR management will find their way to accept the last recommendations of the Committee on Transport and Communications that the already pensioned employees and those who will retire in the future may enjoy the same advantages as the employees of other sectors. As of now I urge the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) and the Minister of Transport to put the necessary pressure on.

• (9:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

I certainly hope that during this third session of our 28th Parliament, our colleagues in the opposition will choose to be less negative and more positive, less irresponsible and more constructive, so that we may stand firm and united during these difficult days that lie ahead, and so that we may each contribute more fully according to our talents and experience toward the fulfilment of our common ideal; a just society in a united Canada.

Mr. W. M. Howe (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): As has been customary over the years, Mr. Speaker, I offer my congratulations to the mover (Mr. Trudel) and seconder (Mr. Douglas) of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. However, I say to them that they should not be carried away by all the congratulatory remarks that have been made, irrespective of the fact that their contributions were good and their efforts in this House have been commendable. There have been a great many members chosen to move and second previous Speeches from the Throne who are not here today. Other criteria are necessary to win the confidence of the people who are in this great House of Commons.

My wife and I would like to join with the thousands who have tendered their sympathy to Madame Laporte and her children, and well as the colleagues of Mr. Laporte. I sincerely hope that the memory of the happy associations and the pride in the outstanding achievements of a husband and father will be a great consolation in the days of trial ahead.

My constituency is mainly rural. I was rather surprised that there was not more said about agriculture in the Speech from the Throne. Just one small paragraph referred to export sales, the Lift program, marketing and a few things in that connection. I wish to quote from an article which appeared in the September 14 issue of the *Globe and Mail*. The article is headed "Applied research felt need for agriculture", and reads:

> A special study for the Science Council of Canada recommends creation of two federal boards and five specialized research centres to co-ordinate agricultural research and shift the emphasis to applied research.

The next paragraph is very profound:

> The three-year study by an eight-scientist commission under Dr. B. N. Smallman of Queen's University, Kingston, says agriculture is still "the most important primary industry in Canada" and research is largely responsible for its success.

I see the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) applauding because the leader of this commission is from Kingston. Those of us from agricultural areas have always felt that the prospering of most nations depended on the top six inches of the soil. We feel it should not have taken an eight-scientist commission three years to determine that agriculture is still the most important primary industry in Canada. For that reason, I am critical of the government because there was not more said in the Speech from the Throne on ways and means to improve agricultural processes and procedures in this nation. The article continues:

> However, an increasing degree of specialization has resulted in an inadequate communications system among researchers and with farmers.
>
> Dr. P. D. McTaggart-Cowan of Ottawa, executive director of the science council, says the Smallman report's conclusion may seem controversial to some but should serve as "a useful starting point for informed public debate" on agricultural research.

Was anything mentioned about agricultural research in the Speech from the Throne? After sitting for three years, an eight scientist commission presented a report, but this matter is not referred to in the Speech from the Throne. If agriculture is going to maintain a position of importance in the years to come to assist in feeding the many millions of people who need to be fed, improved agricultural research programs must be given more consideration. In the field of marketing, crop specialization, animal husbandry and practically all other fields of agriculture there is room for a great deal more research in order that agriculture will continue to be the most important primary industry in our nation.

I sincerely hope that as this session proceeds legislation will be introduced regarding marketing programs that are necessary. We hope this legislation will be better drafted than previously so that it will not be so difficult to bring it to completion in this House and in committee.

I hope the Minister of Finance will give consideration to ensuring that farmers can get the farm improvement loans they require. There has been some reticence on the part of the banks to providing the farm improvement loans that many farmers require. They would rather lend the money on their own terms. I ask the minister to do his utmost to see that this money is readily available for those who need it.

There are many other fields to which continued thought should be given. This government has received adequate assistance. There have been commissions, the task force on agriculture and the Barber Commission on farm machinery, as well as the commission on research to which I have made reference. Many people are working to find ways and means to assist the government. I hope the government applies some of the programs and suggestions of the commission.

The hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) intimated that little had been done as a result of the Barber Commission report which indicated that Canadian farmers should be able to get their farm machinery and replacement parts at lower prices than are presently being charged.

I intend to use the rest of the time available to me to mention two or three matters applicable to my own constituency to which I have referred on many occasions. The first matter is the building of post offices. I am happy the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Laing) is in the chamber tonight. He has given very kind consideration to the post office in the village of Elora. About two years ago, the post office authorities in Elora decided that they wanted more space, more modern facilities, and decided to tear down the old post office building, find a new site and build a new post office. We must remember that there are communities in this nation that are not so ready to brush off the old and take on the new, but Elora is one of them.

• (9:30 p.m.)

The reason for this is that Elora is a beautiful community. The Elora rocks have always been an outstanding tourist attraction for people passing through or staying in the vicinity. Many of the homes in Elora were built of limestone, and they are beautiful structures. This is the case with the existing post office. The building is an asset to Main Street. It is a landmark and is as strong and sturdy as the day it was built. With some renovation, changes and additions, I feel, along with an outstanding architect who has looked into the subject, that it is not necessary to destroy this beautiful old post office in order to erect one of these new match box buildings the Post Office Department favours today, which are rarely things of beauty no matter where they are sited.

The people of Elora rose up in arms and presented petitions to me, to the Postmaster General (Mr. Côté), and Minister of Public Works, (Mr. Laing). I have been very happy that the Minister of Public Works has been able to hold back his people, so nothing has yet been done. I sincerely hope that the plan the people of Elora would like to see implemented, which is the retention of the old post office building after renovating it and improving its facilities, is the plan adopted. I hope also that the Minister of Public Works, as he promised me, will some day go to Elora to see the post office building.

The second matter I want to bring to the attention of the House is one I referred to last April and have spoken about innumerable times in this House. I refer to the attitude of the Canadian National Railways to the passenger service which it provides in a great many areas in Canada. When I spoke about the matter in this House last April, I said that except for Newfoundland we in this part of western Ontario felt that we were being used as guinea pigs, since the second application that had been made to the Canadian Transport Commission to reduce passenger service related to this area.

I attended the hearings of the commission at Owen Sound during the Easter recess. I was rather encouraged because I could not help but feel that, in view of the tremendous pressure brought to bear by the representations made to the Canadian Transport Commission at the hearings, the commission could do nothing else but maintain passenger rail service in this area. However, along with a lot of other people in the area I was shocked when I saw the decision handed down on September 30 by the Canadian Transport Commission. The commission decided to cut off all passenger services north and west of Guelph, including those serving my part of western Ontario, the city of Owen Sound, the town of Southampton, the town of Kincardine, Stratford and Goderich.

I do not think that this is a good decision or a fair one, because I do not think that attention was paid to all the representations made at the hearing. In fact, when I see commissions like this in operation, I sometimes wonder whether we are living in a democracy or in a country where commissions and bodies of this type make the final rulings that destroy the right of the individual not only to be heard but to have his representations considered. Believe you me, Mr. Speaker, I do not think the commission listened carefully to the words of the people who made representations at Owen Sound.

I should like to refer to that part of the decision which relates to the cutting off of the railway services which I have mentioned. Paragraph (a) of the decision reads:

> The Committee finds that the actual losses incurred do not justify the continuance of these passenger train services for the convenience of the number of passengers that have used them and that, in the opinion of the Committee, would be likely to use them if the services were not discontinued.

It was elicited at the hearing that the commission did not even consult with the mid-western organization that was making surveys of the requirements of this particular area. Neither did it listen to the representative of the province of Ontario, which is making a study of the transportation needs of the region. The Commission went ahead without waiting for the completion of these surveys and studies, and as a result did not get the true picture.

The next paragraph of the decision reads as follows:

> The Committee finds that the highway system serving the points in this region of Ontario served by the passenger train services is excellent and is probably as extensive as could be found in any comparable area of Canada. The Committee further finds that the existing bus services in the area constitute a satisfactory alternative public transportation service and the Committee accepts the evidence adduced at the hearings that these bus services will be adequate in capacity and will be increased in frequency as required by traffic demands resulting from discontinuance of passenger train services.

On talking to the mayor of Southampton, one of the towns affected, I learned that if you go to Toronto from Southampton, a distance of 120 miles, by bus, you travel via London, which adds another 80-odd miles to the journey. So, the suggestion that the bus service is a satisfactory alternative is not correct. The decision continues:

> The Committee agrees with the submissions of both railways that discontinuance would have a minimal effect on other passenger train services.

One thing that I found most difficult to understand was that one of the railroads said that if the other's services were discontinued, it would take up the slack. But what has happened? Both services have been cut off. The CPR service from Toronto to Owen Sound has been discontinued, and if this decision is upheld there will be no passenger service by rail from Toronto.

Then, the committee report has this paragraph:

> Finally, the Committee further finds that discontinuance of these services would not, in its opinion, conflict with future plans for the area to be further studied by the government of Ontario in accordance with the guidelines of the report, Design for Development: The Toronto-Centred Region, which was adduced in evidence by the government of Ontario.

I do not think there is any justification for this particular decision. In fact, I feel that the whole thing was already cut and dried between the railways and the transport commission before these hearings at Owen Sound, commenced. The hearings were a sop to the people of the area, an attempt to convince them the commission was doing the job it was supposed to do. This is just not good enough.

I also find it hard to understand why the things we asked for, such as improved service, a survey of the requirements of the area and a possible alternative service, were not taken into consideration. However, in denying the railroad company's application to cut off train service from Guelph to Toronto, the commission used the very reasoning we had asked them to use in our case. I should like to put on the record what the commission said about maintaining the service from Guelph to Toronto. Incidentally, there are a lot of passenger trains passing through Guelph en route to Toronto, irrespective of this particular service, so it would not have meant too much to the area had this service been discontinued. However, it meant a lot to the area I represent. The commission says:

> None of the evidence convinces us that the actual losses incurred could not be substantially reduced by changes in equipment assignment, and by providing more convenient and more suitable service based on surveys using modern methods, of the requirements of passengers, both actual and potential.

We have been asking the railroads for years to upgrade their equipment and to make more modern rolling stock available. If they were to do this, they would attract more passengers and make the service more sound economically.

• (9:40 p.m.)

I was interested in a little booklet that came to my desk the other day entitled "News briefs from France". There is an article in it about transportation in France

where they have been carrying on a transportation system a lot longer than we have in Canada. This article appears under the heading: "More comfortable and faster trains for the French railways" and there is a picture of a turbo train. It is one of the latest and is a very attractive, modern, efficient looking train which I imagine has one or two coaches similar to our railiners. It is certainly a lot more attractive and much more comfortable than the 25 year old trains our transportation system requires us to use. These trains are not comfortable; they are often dirty and certainly do not provide the best type of transportation or even an adequate transportation system in my area.

I appeal to the minister in this particular case because I feel that, irrespective of commissions, rules and laws, as in many other departments of government, the minister has the right to make whatever ruling he wishes. I say this because of a statement the minister made regarding changes in the role and structure of the federal transport portfolio. This appears at the bottom of page 4 and reads:

> The Canadian Transport Commission will continue to perform its economic regulatory role independently, subject to Ministerial and governmental review as established in the National Transportation Act.

On the following page there is a paragraph which reads:

> Canadian National Railways, Air Canada and Northern Transportation Company Limited, being outside the Public Service, will continue to exercise freedom in their personnel policies, but policy issues or public interest matters will require continuing close consultation with the Minister in the light of the Government's general policies.

I sincerely hope that the minister will give his earnest attention to this particular matter. The paragraph then continues:

> Administrations and authorities, although largely made up of public servants, will be exposed to the normal forces of the commercial environment and will need a capability to be responsive and adaptive to changing conditions. A high degree of authority will therefore be delegated to the heads of Administrations and Authorities allowing them to make managerial decisions on many day to day matters but subject to Ministerial decision on all policy issues.

I do not see the minister in the House tonight, but I hope to see him one of these days to put this matter to him personally. I hope he will insist that a clearer picture is provided and that another look will be taken at the importance of maintaining this particular service in that part of the province of Ontario. This service is required for the future development and organization of that part of the province. If this service is taken away it will be a tremendous blow. I sincerely hope the minister will give this his earnest consideration before the thirtieth of this month, at which time this service is to be cancelled.

One other thing that worries me is that when actions of this kind are taken they are not taken for today or for tomorrow but forever. For this reason, I think the government should have another look at this decision by the Canadian Transport Commission. On other occasions when the commission has made decisions, the government has reversed those decisions after further consideration.

An hon. Member: They didn't in Newfoundland.

Mr. Howe: No, they did not do that in Newfoundland but we hope that is not the pattern to be followed. We hope the minister will look into this question seriously and insist that the railways continue to give the passenger service so badly needed in that area.

Another thing of particular importance to my riding is the discussions taking place and the studies being made regarding the development and construction of a new airport in the area of Dufferin County, particularly in that part encompassed by Amaranth township. I feel this is a good site. I feel that a decision should be taken in this regard very shortly. The hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Ryan), in his speech the other day, mentioned the fact that the present airport facilities at Toronto are inadequate. The traffic is very heavy and the highway facilities in and out are inadequate. A decision should be made in this regard very soon and I sincerely hope that attention will be paid to this particular area because it would be a good site for an airport of this magnitude.

An airport of the type anticipated will cost a great deal of money and should be designed to be useful for many years to come. In the area to which I have referred there is sufficient land at reasonable cost. The area is not that far away from the large centres in southern Ontario. It can be conveniently reached, perhaps by some of these turbo trains, monorails or special highways. The area is not highly developed and the noise or pollution resulting from the operations of an airport there would not create a great deal of trouble. I hope the Minister of Transport will give serious consideration to the suggestions I have made tonight.

It is my hope that the Minister of Public Works will have another look at the Elora post office before making a final decision to tear it down.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Robert P. Kaplan (Don Valley): Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in the speeches made by my colleagues the hon. members for Bourassa and Assiniboia (Mr. Trudel and Mr. Douglas). I must say that I felt proud listening to them. I am sure their constituents are proud of them too. I congratulate them.

[*English*]

I want to focus my remarks tonight, Mr. Speaker, on the references contained in the Speech from the Throne to the recognition of a federal responsibility in the area of urban life in Canada. It is proposed that there be established a Minister for Urban Affairs and Housing. The same proposal has been expressed before and has generated a lot of excitement in this House and across the country.

A number of factors have been dealt with by hon. members who have spoken on this subject in the House.

Some people are asking that there be a greater investment by the federal government in our cities and that the federal public sector be enlarged. Other people have recognized that there are already a large number of programs of the federal government which are carried out in the cities. They are asking that, in respect of this new ministry, these programs be co-ordinated and that policies be established which would comprehend all of the programs of the federal government within the cities. It is also suggested that there be new programs.

The third approach being taken by members and other people commenting on the Speech from the Throne has been based on constitutional considerations. It has been observed that the federal government is not the only government with urban responsibilities. The constitutional questions have been considered. The participation of other levels of government is being considered. A wise government policy, as the minister himself observed, would be a national policy, not just a federal policy, planned, agreed upon, and implemented at all levels of government. A number of members have made suggestions concerning tri-level political instruments focusing on housing, airports, harbours, or urban ground transportation.

• (9:50 p.m.)

Hopefully all these ideas I have itemized can now be considered in a broader context than before, when the minister was nominally only responsible for housing. The reference to urban affairs in the new title of the minister is in itself encouraging. To me it suggests what I hope will be a new focus, broader than housing and broader even than the term "urban development" which was the expression used in the past. These limited terms of reference, that is housing and urban development, seem to be oriented to the idea of growth and a concept of futurism rather than to intensification of the use of existing facilities and an interest in the present condition of urban life. This is the subject I should like to discuss in the short time available to me. The reference to urban affairs reflects recognition of the potential that urban life presents for Canadians.

I should like to suggest that Canada become an urban nation and that we should commit ourselves to giving all Canadians the opportunity to be urban people, whether or not they live in cities. I refer to urban in the sense of being plugged in and aware of the opportunities there are for experiences of the type which always draw men to live together in cities and which have characterized the great cities, that is opportunities to communicate, to learn, to grow as people; opportunities to make choices of life styles and choices of association; the opportunity to have access to the greatest variety of experiences, of goods and services, leisure activities and entertainment.

In a recent speech the minister responsible for housing, the hon. member for Port Arthur (Mr. Andras), who will become the Minister of State for Urban Affairs, proposed new terms of reference as his criteria for future urban programs. He asked this question: Does the program pay in terms of social comfort and stimulation of people? Does it quicken the pulses of the large cities that are becoming the homes of most Canadians? This is an intriguing question and may imply, as I hope it does, that there will be new standards for government action along the lines I have outlined.

Ottawa in the past has searched for a handle on the urban environment. It has been natural to look to the BNA Act for something that would give Ottawa the right to play a role in shaping the cities. Transportation, housing, and sewers are the subjects Ottawa has chosen to use in the past. I should like to suggest that our past approach has been too much obsessed by the hardware of city life and not enough by the software. We have thought the answers to urban problems lay in physical solutions, such as a better stock of housing, more rapid and efficient transportation systems and better sewage treatment.

These programs are important and there should be no reduction of our commitment to them, but I believe we are putting too much faith in hardware. In addition, hardware solutions imply the destruction and replacement of what we are already living with and these "scorched earth" approaches are beginning to revolt even those people in the cities whose physical surroundings are the worst.

Lately there has been a trend to downgrade physical growth as a valid standard of urban progress in favour of a new standard which has been given the name "Quality of Life". But even this expression has come to mean something physical and a new kind of hardware. It is used to refer to the level of pollution, the conservation of wild life and again, it is a growth standard, but in this connection growth of public capital investment. These so-called quality of life priorities are also important, particularly the attack on pollution. We must fight pollution and fight it with hardware until we reach what the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) has called the plateau at which further deterioration of our environment is arrested. We must assure the preservation of a liveable environment for ourselves and for the plants and animals on which we depend. But, Mr. Speaker, concentration on these physical priorities has dominated government thinking about cities and urbanism itself has been forgotten.

All the programs I have described are designed to produce physical comfort and, as important as that is, it is different from the minister's phrase "social comfort and stimulation". I suggest that if physical improvement alone were the answer we would already have a great urban life in Canada because it is a fact that we are the world's best housed nation. I do not say this in a sense of complacency. On the contrary, there are big urban problems in Canada, but there are worse problems in our large cities than physical comfort and standards. There are problems manifested even in those areas of large cities where physical standards are adequate and more than adequate. There is a growing feeling that there is a lack of contact with the environment, not just the natural environment but the urban human political environment.

It is a sense of lack of access to social institutions, private and public. It is a sense of alienation from established political functions. It is a lack of awareness of the rich potential of urban life. It is a lack of influence over one's surroundings.

In the approaches we have taken in the past we have virtually ignored all the opportunities which exist within the housing stock we have, within the given hardware, to enrich urban life by policies which encourage Canadians to define their interests and to relate more to each other.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it ten o'clock at this point?

Mr. Speaker: It being ten o'clock, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at two o'clock.

At ten o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, October 21, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OPPORTUNITY FOR CHIEF OF COMMITTEES AND PRIVATE LEGISLATION BRANCH TO SERVE AS THIRD CLERK ASSISTANT

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I take a moment of the time of the House to inform hon. members of an important change in the duties assigned to a senior officer of the House of Commons, Mr. Antonio Plouffe, Chief of the Committees Branch. To recognize the services of this loyal, competent and much respected officer of the House of Commons it has been decided to give him an opportunity to serve from time to time at the Table as Third Clerk Assistant. Mr. Plouffe will continue his duties in the Committees Branch, while the benefit of his experience and wise counsel will be available to the Table until the time of his retirement at the end of the year. I am sure all hon. members would want me to extend congratulations to Mr. Plouffe and express their appreciation for his continuing contribution to the work of the House of Commons.

* * *

• (2:10 p.m.)

PRIVILEGE

MRS. MacINNIS—STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF MEMBER FOR GREENWOOD CONCERNING ARTICLE IN GLOBE AND MAIL

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. It concerns a complaint that was made yesterday against one of my colleagues, the hon. member for Greenwood, arising from an account in a Toronto newspaper. My colleague was not here at the time. When the matter was drawn to his attention he asked, in view of the fact he could not be here today, because of official duties, that the following statement be read on his behalf:

I understand that the attention of the House was called to a statement in the *Globe and Mail* of Tuesday attributed to myself criticizing those who had apparently changed their minds about the vote on Monday in relation to the approval of the government's invocation of the War Measures Act and the regulations passed thereunder.

The statement made by me was not intended for publication. It was made immediately after the vote at a time when my feelings as well as those of other members were understandably strong.

I regret any imputation in my remarks and am glad to withdraw them and to apologize.

I know this statement should be made at the earliest opportunity but as I will be out of Ottawa for some days on the Constitution Committee which is travelling to the Maritimes, I have asked one of my colleagues to present this statement on my behalf.

Andrew Brewin,
Member for Greenwood.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

FISHERIES

AGREEMENT WITH SOVIET UNION RESPECTING FISHING OFF PACIFIC COAST

On the order: Motions.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, may I rise on a point of order before you proceed past "Motions". I notice that the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry is not only scheduled to be here today but is here, and I wonder whether he would not take advantage of the opportunity under motions to make a statement to the House about the draft agreement with the Soviet Union regarding fishing privileges off the west coast of British Columbia, which on the surface looks like a sell-out of the Soviet Union?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I had the impression the hon. member himself was anxious to make a statement on motions. He realizes and knows as well as other hon. members that if he wants a statement to be made this has to be done by way of a request during the question period and, if the minister so wishes, he can ask for leave of the House to return to motions. Certainly this is not the time in our proceedings to make such an inquiry.

* * *

CRIMINAL CODE

PROVISION OF DEATH PENALTY FOR KIDNAPPING FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-171, to amend the Criminal Code (Kidnapping).

He said: Mr. Speaker, this bill would amend section 233 of the Criminal Code which deals with kidnapping. There are now three subsections and it would add a new subsection 1 to the Act and renumber the present subsections as 2, 3 and 4.

The purpose of the new subsection is to make kidnapping for political purposes a capital offence subject to the death penalty. Because of the relevance of the subject matter of this bill at this particular time and because of widespread public opinion which I believe, favours such action, I ask that the House give unanimous consent to move this private bill from the last place it will hold to the top of the list so that the House can deal with it immediately.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

Mr. Speaker: When shall the said bill be read the second time? At the next sitting of the House?

Some hon. Members: Now.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Thompson: Who said "no"?

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the suggestion made by the hon. member for Red Deer that this bill be moved to the top of the order paper. This would require the unanimous consent of the House.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is no such consent. Therefore this bill will be read the second time in due course at the next sitting of the House.

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

AGRICULTURE

INTERPROVINCIAL MARKETING OF POULTRY PRODUCTS—ACTION OF PROVINCIAL BOARDS

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters), to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the action of provincial marketing boards in closing their traditional markets to poultry products from other provinces which has resulted in serious dislocation in the movement and the prices of such products and calls for immediate attention by this Parliament.

Mr. Speaker: As the hon. member and all hon. members know, one of the factors which has to be taken into account by the Chair in determining whether a motion can be put to the House under the terms of Standing Order 26 is the possibility or probability that the matter may be debated by the House within a reasonable time. We are now on the Throne Speech debate. There was an opportunity yesterday, there is an opportunity today, and there will be an occasion tomorrow for hon. members to debate and consider the subject matter raised by the hon. member for Battleford-Kindersley. In the circumstances I am sure the hon. member will understand and agree that the motion cannot be put at this time.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PROPOSED PROTOCOL ON PSYCHOTROPIC DRUGS—CANADIAN REPRESENTATIONS—DISCUSSION OF TERMS PRIOR TO SIGNING

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the participation by Canadian officials in the preparation of a protocol on psychotropic drugs, would the minister undertake to make a statement at a very early date outlining the representations being made by Canadian officials in connection with this protocol? I think this is especially important because it has been our understanding that the Canadian government was reserving its views on this question until after the Le Dain Commission had reported.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have been discussing this matter with my colleague, the Minister of National Health and Welfare, and either he or I will make a statement.

Mr. Stanfield: Will the minister also indicate whether the government of Canada is making any requests that the final draft of this protocol be postponed until after the government has received the Le Dain Commission report and has had an opportunity to consider it?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, this point of view obviously is one that is very important and I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his suggestion.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister to assure the House that before the government will consider signing the protocol, if and when it is passed, the House will receive a report on what is included in the protocol and have an opportunity to discuss its terms?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, depending upon the nature of these international agreements, sometimes the House is invited to express its views and at other times it is not considered worthy of being placed on the agenda because of other more pressing matters, but I will certainly take this suggestion into account when we are reaching a decision on whether to bring this matter before the House. Of course, as the hon. member knows, the government can sign the protocol or ratify the agreement without the concurrence of the House.

Mr. Orlikow: In view of the fact that the government has already appointed a commission to study the whole question of the use of drugs in Canada and their effects, would the minister not agree, even though the government has the right, that before it signs such an agreement or protocol the House should have an opportunity to discuss the implications?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's supplementary question is an argument and not really a question.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, would the Secretary of State for External Affairs give an assurance that the government of Canada would not sign any protocol before it announces its own policy in Canada with respect to drugs?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I am examining with my colleague the inter-relationship between this international agreement and the studies that are under way in Canada as to the form of our legislation. I am sure the

hon. gentleman would agree, however, that international co-operation in this field is essential, and that he would not want to interfere with an agreement that would help to control the drug traffic.

Mr. Stanfield: I am simply assisting the government to play their role in the participatory democracy which it talks about so much.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

WAR MEASURES ACT DETENTIONS, CHARGES AND RELEASES—NAMES OF THOSE DETAINED, RIGHT TO COUNSEL, COMMUNICATION WITH FAMILIES

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question either to the Prime Minister or to the Minister of Justice. Can the government tell the House how many persons have been taken into custody under the Public Order Regulations passed under the War Measures Act, whether or not these persons are being held incommunicado, what number have been released and what number detained, and how many have already been charged?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, my information is that to date in all areas the total number taken into custody is 379. The hon. member will appreciate there might be variations as a result of some being picked up since I got the figures at noon. As to those released, the figure I had as of last night was 21, but a large number are being released today. I cannot give that figure because I do not have it. The authorities are in the process of releasing quite a substantial number today, but as I say I do not have the exact figure.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I ask the Solicitor General whether the names of the persons being held will be released and whether those who are being detained are being given the right to secure counsel and are being allowed to communicate with their families?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, perhaps you would allow me some latitude in replying to this question because I think I may be able to anticipate some others as well in my answer.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, we understood from the Prime Minister's statement yesterday that the Minister of Justice or some responsible minister was going to make a statement on motions. If the minister wishes I am sure the House would readily agree to revert to motions in order to allow the minister to make a full statement.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The minister has the choice either to make a statement or to reply to the question.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I will just reply to the question and then rely on your ruling. The hon. member is aware, of course, that the regulations under the War Measures Act, as in the case of offences under the Criminal Code, lie within the responsibility of the Attorneys General, in this case the Attorney General of Quebec. As early as last Saturday I was in communication with Mr. Choquette and we agreed on the desirability that there be some effective control and supervision by the provincial legal officers on the application of the regulations, and that there be a review as soon as possible of the evidence against any persons arrested by a team of Crown prosecutors and lawyers who could assess the material from the legal standpoint. It was understood that any person so arrested against whom the evidence clearly proved to be insufficient should be released as soon as possible. We understood as well that the accused should be given access to counsel at the earliest opportunity. It is my understanding that the Attorney General of Quebec has made a statement or issued a release dealing with these matters.

I might say that this morning I transmitted to Mr. Choquette the suggestion made by the Leader of the Opposition in regard to what procedure should be followed, and whether the names of persons arrested, the numbers and the charges laid against them should be made public. I might say that in my view—and this is in answer to the question of the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands—I am not convinced that it is necessarily in the interest of all those who have been arrested—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister has indicated that he would rely on the judgment of the Chair to determine whether he was answering the question or making a statement. He should decide whether he simply wants to reply to the question put to him by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands. I realize how important this matter is and I do not want to apply the rules too strictly, but if the minister thinks the information he has to give cannot be given within the limitations of an answer to a question, he should be prepared to revert to motions to make a statement.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I am replying to the specific question of the hon. member. It may not necessarily be in the interest of all those who have been arrested to have their names published in these particular circumstances. I am sure the House has assessed the significance of what I am saying. However, I have transmitted to the Attorney General of Quebec the concern of some hon. members of this House that that should be done.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I say that I hope the minister will still reconsider and ask the House to revert to motions, because I think we should be given a much fuller statement. From what the minister said it is apparent that he is prepared to give more information, but that decision must lie with the minister. In view of his statement and his constant reference to the fact that the administration of the Public Order Regulations, 1970, is in the hands of the Attorneys General of the provinces, may I ask if the government is prepared to amend those regulations, which it can do by Order in Council, so as to guarantee that every person who is held in custody will be assured of the right to communicate

with his family as well as the right to secure legal counsel?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I do not want to accept any implication in the hon. member's question that, because the primary responsibility for the administration of these regulations lies with the Attorney General of Quebec, we have not expressed to him and to the government of Quebec our concern that the ordinary rights of people be interfered with as little as possible and for as short a time as possible—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): —consistent with his responsibility and our responsibility in attempting to immobilize and break this criminal conspiracy of violent men. It is my understanding that those detained have been given the right to contact parents and friends so that their whereabouts may be known. The Attorney General of Quebec made a statement this morning dealing with the right to counsel.

WAR MEASURES ACT—SUGGESTED INDEPENDENT COMMISSION TO SUPERVISE APPLICATION OF REGULATIONS

Mr. David Lewis (York South): May I ask the Minister of Justice whether the minister or the Attorney General of Quebec, or both, or the two governments have given consideration to a suggestion which I read in one of the Montreal newspapers that, as it were, an independent commission of two or three people be appointed to do what he says is now being done by officers of the Department of the Attorney General?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General of Quebec is aware of that suggestion.

WAR MEASURES ACT—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON APPLICATION OF REGULATIONS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, am I to understand from the exchange that has taken place today that the full statement I requested yesterday is not to be given?

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Forrestall: The minister is not even answering. What does the government think this is?

[*Later:*]

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the Prime Minister heard my question. I asked whether, in view of the exchanges that have taken place, it is correct to assume that the full statement I requested yesterday will not in fact be made?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, that is not a correct assumption.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Stanfield: When may we expect such a statement, then?

[Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

Mr. Trudeau: If the hon. member reads *Hansard* for yesterday he will see that I did not undertake to have that statement made today.

WAR MEASURES ACT—LOCATIONS OF ARRESTS

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the Solicitor General. Can the Solicitor General tell us what areas he meant when he said that there have been a number of arrests in different areas? Could he indicate what those areas are?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Yes, Mr. Speaker: Montreal, Rimouski, Hull, Sherbrooke and Quebec City.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, may I address a further question to the Solicitor General. Has any arrest been made outside the province of Quebec in this regard?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, there was one temporary detention over Saturday night in Toronto while the authorities were investigating the story the person picked up had told them. That is the only one I know of.

WAR MEASURES ACT—ARREST OF HULL, QUEBEC, SOCIAL WORKER

Mr. David Lewis (York South): I have a further supplementary question for either the Minister of Justice or the Solicitor General. Would the responsible minister undertake to investigate the report of the arrest of Mr. Cournvoyer of Hull, Quebec, a social worker, and report back to the House? It is reported he was arrested because he was organizing assistance for some of those arrested under the War Measures Act regulations. Is either minister aware of that arrest? If not, would the responsible minister undertake to investigate and report on it?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): I am not familiar with the case to which the hon. member is referring, Mr. Speaker. I will investigate the matter to see if I can properly bring forward an official answer.

SUGGESTED REWARD FOR APPREHENSION OF FLQ KIDNAPPERS

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Justice. Has the minister or the government taken any initiative to provide a substantial reward, with executive clemency for the informant, for information that will lead to certain individuals who are known to be directly involved in the kidnapping, a most serious offence?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Not at the moment, Mr. Speaker.

WAR MEASURES ACT—NUMBER OF RAIDS, ARRESTS AND RELEASES

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Can the Solicitor General advise the House in connection with some of the statistical information he obviously has in front of him? How many raids have taken place, how many actual arrests have been made and how many

releases have there been? I ask these questions so that we may have the full picture.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): I cannot give the House any more than I have already given. I accompanied it by the warning that although the figures were approximate they were as accurate as I could get them at noon today.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Forrestall: A further supplementary. I will restrict my question to the Solicitor General and ask him to give the House an indication of the total number of raids carried out by the various authorities in connection with the recent events?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what a "raid" is in this context. If the hon. member is referring to searches, I do not have that information available.

WAR MEASURES ACT—INITIATION OF DEPORTATION PROCEDURES AGAINST SOME OF THOSE ARRESTED

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): I have a supplementary question for the Solicitor General. Can the minister inform the House whether deportation procedures have been initiated against any of those who have been arrested in the last few days?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): I have no knowledge of any deportation being ordered or anticipated in any of the cases.

WAR MEASURES ACT—SUGGESTED COMMITTEE OF MINISTERS AND PARTY LEADERS TO SUPERVISE APPLICATION OF REGULATIONS

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. Is consideration being given to establishing a committee such as the Defence of Canada Regulations Committee which was set up in 1940 and met in secret so that the name of each and every person picked up with the evidence against them could be made available to the committee which would be sworn to secrecy? If such a committee were established composed of members of the Privy Council, other government members and party leaders, there would be no question whether justice was being done. In particular, those who are picked up and found to be innocent would not have their names bruited throughout the country.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): There is something to be said for that suggestion, Mr. Speaker. I prefer to answer it by saying I will refer it to the Attorney General of Quebec.

[*Translation*]

WAR MEASURES ACT—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT BY PRIME MINISTER ON NECESSITY OF REGULATIONS

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

Considering that confusion prevails, that the leaders of some groups are banding together to protest against the application of the War Measures Act by the Canadian Parliament and that very misleading explanations are volunteered by every half-witted person in the province of Quebec, would the Prime Minister be willing to give some information and some re-assurance to the people with regard to the validity of such measures, by making use of television, radio, and newspapers, in short all the mass media at his disposal? This way he could correctly inform the public who, at the present time, is confused because of the statements made by some Quebecers and some political leaders in this chamber.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I feel that the hon. member has made good suggestions. I hope they will be heeded by the owners of information media.

[*English*]

KILLING OF QUEBEC LABOUR MINISTER—DELAY BY RADIO STATION IN GIVING INFORMATION TO POLICE

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): I wish to address my question to the Minister of Justice. Has the government investigated the conduct of the manager of the radio station in Montreal which on Saturday night received three or four calls reporting that Mr. Laporte had been killed and giving the location of the car in which the body could be found, who did not notify the police of any of these calls and finally sent his own employee to investigate the situation, thereby delaying police action for several hours and reducing the chances of apprehending the murderers very considerably?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): That situation was drawn to the attention of the Attorney General of Quebec, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Hees: Would the government bring to the attention of all police forces that it would be wise to give the public knowledge of licence numbers and descriptions of any cars in which crimes are committed to prevent cars such as the one in which the body of Mr. Laporte was transported being driven undetected in daylight through heavily populated areas?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Obviously the hon. member is making a suggestion to the minister. He has to assume it has been noted.

ASSOCATION OF FOREIGN EMBASSIES WITH FLQ ACTIVITIES

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Will the minister inform the House whether any foreign governments are directly or indirectly implicated in the activities of the FLQ? I ask the question in view of remarks reportedly made by the minister in Toronto last Saturday night.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker. As I think I informed the House, or perhaps it was on radio or television, we did inform the governments of Cuba and Algeria about the contents of the manifesto issued by the FLQ. As far as I know these governments, and they are the only two which have been mentioned, are not implicated.

Inquiries of the Ministry

FISHERIES

AGREEMENT WITH SOVIET UNION RESPECTING FISHING OFF PACIFIC COAST—CONSERVATION OF ATLANTIC CONTINENTAL SHELF RESOURCES

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. It concerns the announcement made earlier today that Canada and the U.S.S.R. have reached a tentative or draft agreement with regard to permitting the Soviet Union fishing fleet to fish inside our territorial waters on the west coast. Will the minister move forthwith to have this draft agreement referred to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry so that it may be examined by members of this House?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): I will be glad to do that, Mr. Speaker. I point out to the hon. member, if he is not aware of it, that representatives of all segments of the west coast fishing industry agreed unanimously that this is a good deal for our fishermen.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Howard (Skeena): The minister should be aware that I have many good friends among those who were delegates and therefore I knew what was happening. I am glad that the minister has agreed to refer the agreement to the standing committee.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I have a supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member was given the floor for that purpose.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Inasmuch as a map was attached to the press release which appears to have on it fisheries closing lines, can the minister indicate whether they have in fact been promulgated?

Mr. Davis: The map was for illustrative purposes to indicate the areas in which the Russians are permitted to fish and the areas in which they are not permitted to fish. As the hon. member knows, the closing lines have not been proclaimed.

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): I wish to direct a related question to the Minister of Fisheries. In view of the disastrous effect of foreign fishing fleets on our declining fisheries resources on the east coast, has any progress been made in discussions with ICNAF countries concerning international rules governing safe navigation, the reporting of catches, the species of fish which may be taken and in what quantities, on our continental shelf?

Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, progress has been made. For example, two days ago we made an announcement with regard to haddock stocks off the coast—

An hon. Member: There are no haddock there, anyway.

Mr. Davis: —and the suspension of fishing by all countries.

[Mr. Sharp.]

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (Southwestern Nova): In light of the agreement reached between Canada and the Soviet Union, the effect of which is that Russian fleets will now have access to our ports, will the minister be introducing legislation to rescind Bill C-134 passed last March?

Mr. Davis: Well, the effect of that particular bill was to bring the Russians to this country to try to get back into the port of Vancouver, and the price they had to pay was to stay off our continental shelf.

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Will the minister now honour the undertaking he made on Thursday last to make a full statement to the House on motions perhaps today or tomorrow, outlining the reasons behind the agreement which has now been drawn up and explaining the government's future plans on the east coast in order to accommodate east coast fishermen with respect to international fleet fishing?

Mr. Davis: There are two matters to be considered here. The bilateral negotiations with the Russians related to the west coast are somewhat involved and I would prefer this to be dealt with by the Committee on Fisheries and Forestry. As to the other matter affecting the Atlantic coast, I think we should await further progress.

CLOSURE OF CERTAIN WATERS TO FOREIGN FISHERMEN—DISCUSSIONS WITH FRANCE AND UNITED STATES

Mr. T. S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): I believe it would be appropriate to direct my supplementary question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Is he now in a position to reply to the question I asked on October 15 concerning whether negotiations are being pressed with France and the United States which would lead to an early proclamation of our fisheries closing lines?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I do not believe it will be necessary to secure any international agreement of the kind suggested before proceeding to establish fisheries closing lines. This is a matter which lies within the jurisdiction of Parliament; indeed, parliament has now granted the government the right to make a proclamation. There are, of course, other considerations of a more general nature and these are under study.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Comox-Alberni and other hon. members appear to be anxious to ask supplementary questions. We shall soon be running out of time and I think we should move on to another subject. Nevertheless I shall allow two or three more supplementaries, but they should be brief.

Mr. Barnett: My further supplementary arises from the statement the minister has just made to the effect that this is a matter entirely within our own jurisdiction. I therefore ask him to tell us when he intends that the government shall take such action to honour the commitment given by the Minister of Fisheries last spring that these lines would be proclaimed almost immediately.

Mr. Sharp: The Minister of Fisheries has brought this matter before cabinet, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): In view of the fact that redfish and flounder are becoming extinct, while stocks of cod are seriously declining, has the Minister of Fisheries asked the ICNAF countries to close certain areas along the lines of the action taken to preserve haddock stocks?

Mr. Davis: The brief answer, Mr. Speaker, is yes. We are very concerned about fish stocks off our east coast.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Would the minister give consideration to extending the headlands on the east coast all the way out to Sable Island, bearing in mind his action on the west coast?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I suggested there might be two or three supplementaries. We shall extend that number to four and recognize the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate.

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister of Fisheries holding any discussions with the Secretary of State for External Affairs with respect to the possibility of convening a fisheries conference led and headed by Canada and attended by representatives of the great fishing nations of the world? If so, does he have the backing of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, a person who, I understand, has been dead against any move in this direction?

* * *

NATIONAL PARKS

SUPREME COURT RULING ON PERPETUAL LEASES—POSITION OF GOVERNMENT

Mr. Allen B. Sulatycky (Rocky Mountain): Can the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development advise us whether he has now reached a decision to abide by the ruling of the Supreme Court of Canada with regard to perpetual leasing in national parks?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, this matter is now under consideration by the cabinet and I hope to be able to report to the House in the very near future.

* * *

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

BANKS ISLAND—TABLING OF OIL EXPLORATION AGREEMENTS

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table, in both official languages, copies of the agreement between the government and companies engaged in oil exploration on Banks Island in the Northwest Territories, as requested on October 13 last by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett).

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Has the hon. minister leave to table the documents to which he has referred?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HEALTH AND WELFARE

ACTION TO REDUCE HOSPITAL, MEDICAL AND DENTAL COSTS

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

Yesterday the Department of National Health and Welfare published a report which says that the cost of hospital, medical and dental care has almost quadrupled in Canada between 1957 and 1969. Here is my question: Is the department now considering measures for the 1970-1980 decade in order to determine whether the costs will quadruple again? What does the government intend to do in that regard?

Mr. Speaker: I would suggest to the hon. member that his question is much too wide in scope. He will undoubtedly agree that normally the minister should answer his question by making a statement on motions.

* * *

[*English*]

CONSUMER AND CORPORATE AFFAIRS

PROVISION OF WORKING RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN BUSINESS BUREAUX, CONSUMER AGENCIES AND DEPARTMENT

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. What mechanism does the hon. gentleman propose to establish to provide a working relationship between the Association of Canadian Better Business Bureaux, provincial consumer agencies and his department? Will he undertake to make a statement in the House on this subject?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): That is a very broad question, Mr. Speaker. With regard to provincial agencies and departments, my officials, particularly regional officers, are instructed to meet with them from time to time for the purpose of liaison. This liaison is very close—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am sorry to have to interrupt the minister but it is my understanding or interpretation that the hon. member asked whether a statement would be made. I do not think such a statement should be made now.

Mr. McGrath: Perhaps I might ask a supplementary in a related field. Has the misleading advertising branch of the minister's department established guidelines—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member will appreciate that the question as asked is in terms which cannot be accepted by the Chair from a procedural standpoint.

Inquiries of the Ministry

DRUGS

EXPRESSION OF OPINIONS BY MEMBERS PRIOR TO INTERNATIONAL MEETING IN VIENNA—LE DAIN COMMISSION FINAL REPORT

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare, and it will be brief. I want to know whether Members of Parliament will be given an opportunity to express their opinions on the drug question before the subject is discussed in Vienna in January?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I think there will be considerable opportunity for hon. members to express their views on this question before the appropriate committee. In addition, I believe there will be opportunities for them to express their views to me in the House at various times during the next two months. I want to say that the government's attitude still allows for much flexibility prior to the meeting in January as far as the whole drug question is concerned internationally.

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the minister can advise the House, because of the peculiar position the government finds itself in now in respect of the final report of the Le Dain Commission, if he or the government is considering asking for a postponement of the meetings in Vienna?

Mr. Munro: Mr. Speaker, last January when this matter first came up we indicated that in view of the fact there was an inquiry we did not want to be too definite at this particular time. When this comes up again in January there will be several options open to the government which can be decided upon within the next couple of months. One, of course, is that of making reservations in respect of any particular program.

* * *

TRANSPORT

CARIBOU, N.S.—IMPROVEMENTS TO FERRY TERMINAL—ADDITIONAL SHIP

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport which I posed earlier and now wish to bring it up to date. When will tenders be called for improvements to the ferry wharf at Caribou, the Nova Scotia terminal of the Wood Islands Service?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, we have run into some difficulty because of a piece of land which has to be purchased and which is owned apparently by a very great number of people. We have had to track down the various members of the family. This has been part of the problem. As soon as this has been completed tenders will be called.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. MacEwan: Has the minister or the government decided whether or not another ferry will be added to the service?

Mr. Jamieson: This is under consideration and I think I can say that the considerations are affirmative. I prefer not to go beyond that because I do not know what our relationship is with the two provincial governments concerned at the moment.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SUGGESTED POSTPONEMENT OF FRONTENAC AND LABELLE BY-ELECTIONS

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Prime Minister.

Considering the unquestionable anxiousness of the people and the social unrest in several areas of Quebec, would he consider postponing the by-elections which are to be held in the Frontenac and Labelle constituencies on November 16 next?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I must admit that I have not considered the matter, Mr. Speaker. I do not think that I have the legal power to do so, but I will examine the question put by the hon. member.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL SECURITY

TERRORIST OPERATIONS—ALLEGED TRAINING OF CANADIANS IN CERTAIN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a further question to the one I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs earlier. In view of the nature of the minister's reply, has the Canadian government made representations to the governments of Algeria and Cuba, and I would take it Jordan as well in view of the reports, objecting to the training of Canadians for FLQ activities in these countries?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker, we have made no such objections, nor have we any reason to do so as far as I know.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Speaker, the minister has indicated, and there have been other indications in the press and elsewhere, that these men have been trained in these countries. Would the minister not make representations?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PARIS—OCCUPATION OF CANADA HOUSE BY CERTAIN QUEBEC STUDENTS

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Whereas a Montreal newspaper has reported in its yesterday's edition that Canada House in Paris has been occupied since last Sunday by something like a hundred students from Quebec, and whereas some of them have indicated that they were in agreement with the contents of the FLQ manifesto and that they intend to launch in the low-class districts a subscription campaign in favour of the FLQ prisoners, would the minister be in a position to state whether this report is true and whether the government has taken action with respect to this occupation?

[*English*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think it is significant that the students have already ended their occupancy of Maison Canadienne.

* * *

HEALTH AND WELFARE

NEW BRUNSWICK—PAYMENT OF COST OF MEDICARE PUBLICITY

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare in connection with the very massive expenditure of what appears to be thousands of dollars for newspaper advertisements, television, radio and other publicity regarding medicare in New Brunswick? Is the federal government involved directly in this cost? In other words, is the government paying the cost or is the province of New Brunswick picking up the tab?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, this would depend on the nature of the advertising. As the hon. member knows, this is a cost-shared program and I would have to look at it in more detail to determine whether this is really part of the administration of medicare.

Mr. Forrestall: I have a very brief supplementary question which I think is justification for the original question. I would ask the minister whether or not the federal government approved the very direct identification of the Liberal party in such publication of the present medicare program proposals?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would not think that the question can be asked in those terms. If there is urgency in respect of the search for this kind of information, which is not apparent to the Chair, the hon. member might give notice of his desire to have the matter considered at the time of adjournment.

Mr. Forrestall: Perhaps the Minister of National Health and Welfare and I might discuss this at ten o'clock.

Inquiries of the Ministry

NATIONAL SECURITY

QUANTITY OF WEAPONS SEIZED IN RAIDS—AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION LEADING TO INVOKING OF WAR MEASURES ACT

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Solicitor General. In view of the statement made last Friday in the House by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion to the effect that the FLQ has thousands of guns, rifles, machine guns, bombs and about 2,000 pounds of dynamite, and in view of the concern that this has very naturally caused in many quarters, I should like to ask the Solicitor General whether since that time any quantity of these offensive weapons has been seized as a result of the raids which have been going on since the War Measures Act was proclaimed.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): As far as I am aware, Mr. Speaker, the answer is no. I presume the hon. member means substantial quantities.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I ask a supplementary of the Prime Minister. In view of the statements that have been made not only by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion but by the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Labour regarding intelligence information which the government had and on which it based its contention that there was a state of apprehended insurrection, may I ask him whether it is the intention of the government, or if the government would be willing, to make the contents of that report available to hon. members or, if there is some reason for keeping it confidential for the time being, would he be prepared to make that information available to the various political parties in the House on a confidential basis?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I will consider that suggestion, Mr. Speaker. I might remind the hon. member, however, that insurrection can be a technique which is used without all that quantity of dynamite. Perhaps I could refer the hon. member to some reading material on the theory of insurrection which might be of assistance to him.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

ASSISTANCE IN LOCATING MISSING ATHABASCA AIRWAYS PILOT

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transport. I ask him whether the Athabasca Airways pilot, Mr. Hamilton, who has been missing since September 30—

An hon. Member: We can't hear you.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I beg your pardon?

An hon. Member: Speak into your microphone.

Mr. Diefenbaker: My microphone has not been working for the last half hour. I will speak up. The RCAF has

conducted a search unsuccessfully. The helicopter has not been found despite search in the Northwest Territories within an area which is generally known and designated. In view of the imminence of the approach of winter at any time, which would make any further search impossible, will the minister give consideration to providing a couple of aircraft from his department to assist and co-operate with the RCAF in making an immediate search? The helicopter having not been found is an indication of the probability that this man is still alive.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I will certainly look into this immediately for the right hon. member. If there is anything more that we can do I can assure him that we will certainly do it.

• (3:00 p.m.)

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The House resumed, from Tuesday, October 20, consideration of the motion of Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel, for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session.

Mr. Robert P. Kaplan (Don Valley): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was dealing with the proposal contained in the Speech from the Throne to create a minister of state for urban affairs and housing. I had suggested there was a great challenge to him to go beyond the hardware programs which have characterized the past activities of the federal government. As important as hardware is, and without a reduction in our commitment to housing, transportation and the quality of life, I think this government should commit itself to making Canada an urban nation and to giving all Canadians the opportunity to be urban people whether or not they live in the cities.

I speak of urban in the sense of being plugged into and aware of the broad range of opportunities which are available in the cities: opportunities to communicate, to learn and to grow up as people; opportunities to make choices of life styles and of association; the opportunity to have access to the greatest variety of experiences, goods and services, leisure activities and entertainment activities.

In our past concentration on putting new hardware in and around our cities we have ignored, or virtually ignored, the opportunities that have existed within the housing stock we have, within the given hardware, to enrich urban life by policies which encourage Canadians to define their interests, to recognize their power over events and to reach out more to each other. We would greatly benefit from such a focus. We have done our cities a disservice in ignoring the opportunities which have been there all along to make life richer. We have looked only at the problems rather than at the opportunities. For past governments, which have been oriented to move without policies from crisis to crisis, this attention only to problems is understandable. For a government which proposes to plan for the future and to enrich Canadian urban life, concentration on opportunities is vital.

Without meaning to be cynical, I would observe that there always have been and always will be problems in human society. But if a government never looks above them to the opportunities, these opportunities will disappear—because opportunities depend upon the good will of people, and human morale is a precious commodity which will weaken and disappear if it is frustrated for too long. We are in great danger today of having our morale as city dwellers disappear. If it does disappear, urban life will degenerate in Canada—as it has in some American cities—into a cluster of walled enclaves, each looking inward, sharing space but not communicating, interdependent but related symbiotically rather than through shared values and human contact.

There should be a software side to urban affairs in the new ministry. It should involve programs which bring people into contact with each other, which give meaningful access to the institutions which exist in society to serve them, to help them understand their environment and assert control over it. To live as an urban man should be to have basic information about the environment and the society, to be able to communicate and be involved, to be able to choose from a wide variety of life styles, of neighbourhoods, of human associations.

What I hope the government will do, through its assumption of responsibility for urban affairs, is seek methods of developing this kind of social integration. Let the federal role in our cities be information, research, provision of media for communication, the stimulation of volunteer associations with advice, expert services, the lending of facilities and even seed money, whether the association's goal is to bring a neighbourhood to life by providing information referral or whether the goal is cultural, social or even political. The great task of the government in establishing a ministry of state for urban affairs and housing is nothing less than than taking the opportunity to bring Canadians together by social comforts and stimulation.

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I should like to begin, as is traditional and proper, by extending my congratulations to the mover and to the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I listened to their remarks with interest and appreciation. I noticed that before he was too far along in his address, the seconder referred to the establishment of a distillery at Weyburn, Saskatchewan. I am tempted to say, after reading the hollow homilies of the Speech from the Throne, that if it would not lead people to drink it would lead them to think of drink. I shall resist that temptation and say I enjoyed his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, since I last participated in this exercise, which I think is a very important one in a representative Parliament—namely, a general debate—we have suffered a loss, which is particularly significant to me, in the death of my seatmate George Muir, a long-time friend

whom I knew long before either of us came to this House, a man of whom I could say simply that he was a gentleman and a gentle man. I miss him dearly. I am happy that in his place we have a new member of our party, the distinguished hon. member for Spadina (Mr. Ryan).

There are so many things about which one could speak—matters concerning one's home province, one's country or the world itself. It is difficult even in this Throne Speech debate, when our minds should be on the generality of the questions and issues which we face to pre-empt from our thoughts the great crisis which faces our country today. Certainly we are passing through difficult times. I believe it is clear to all of us that we Canadians will never be quite the same again. Out of the great travail, sorrow and anxiety through which Canadians are passing we will, I hope, discard some of the smugness and security which perhaps for too long we have glibly assumed and sometimes even, I fear, eloquently proclaimed.

Too often as we looked about the world and saw people facing immense and trying difficulties we, I think, allowed ourselves to believe that in this very blessed land such things did not happen and that in some fortunate way we were not as other men are. I note the following in the Throne Speech which was delivered just a short time before the tragic events in Montreal:

> Notwithstanding its difficulties, Canada continues to enjoy social stability to an exceptional degree.
>
> This stability is not simply a matter of luck. Good fortune is a factor, but we should accept gracefully the fact that we are also more amenable to reason and, perhaps, more capable of wise decision than we are normally willing to admit. The burden of our European inheritance and our fascination with our American neighbour tend often to distract us and cause us to be unaware of that reasonableness and that wisdom. We forget to our own disadvantage, for these are traits that have made Canada a land of freedom. Canadians should pause on occasions such as this to reflect that their country is regarded by others with envy.

• (3:10 p.m.)

That self-satisfaction in the Speech from the Throne was not merely a reflection of the authors. I think we Canadians too often felt just that way. I hope that one thing this crisis will teach us, if I may use that old-fashioned and didactic expression, is to foresake the attitude which we have too often displayed when we look at the people to our south in the United States and too often reveal for them a lack of compassion and a superabundance of condescension.

We have been going through a recent, fevered upsurge in anti-Americanism and have been too little aware that the great problems which face the people of that country—social, political and economic—are in many cases, and indeed most cases, the very same types of problems which face us and most decent, free people in these tense and trying times. Perhaps we might henceforth, at least for a while, look southward with a little less condescension and less assumption that somehow we have a superior mystique and that the ills of their society are something which out of their peculiar character they have brought upon themselves and from which we are somehow happily immune. I have often found that what is supposed to pass for exceptional, super-Canadianism is sometimes anti-Americanism of the smallest and meanest kind. I think there is no place for that attitude in a mature country which Canada should be.

There are many developments in the world on which one might like to speak. After many months of waiting we have come to a new stage in our relationship with the People's Republic of China. I noticed at the United Nations the other day that the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) dilated upon the importance of this new relationship. The following is a quotation from his statement at a news conference:

> I do not think there has been any other action taken this year as important as Canada's agreement to establish good relations with Peking. I can think of no initiative that is more likely to advance this matter in the United Nations than what we did yesterday.

This is a question that causes me to wonder.

Mr. Ryan: It causes everyone to wonder.

Mr. Macquarrie: I do not take a hard line. I think we have to recognize a *de facto* situation and we have to avoid the point of view which often prevailed in U.S. diplomacy, that the juridical and diplomatic act of recognition is also an indication of moral approval. If we adopted that attitude, the row of our embassies would be somewhat narrower, in the view of many Canadians. But two questions about this development concern me. I think the Canadian people should not expect too much to flow from this. We should not believe that all the tensions, the great power struggle and all the anxieties will somehow be vitiated and disappear because Canada and Peking have a new relationship. I recall watching what happened when Westminster and Peking established contact, and what happened when Paris and Peking established diplomatic contact. I am not saying I think this recent move was wrong, but I think it is a mistake to inflate the expectations of the Canadian people as to what will happen as a result of this action.

The other aspect which troubles me is that I do not think it is a humane diplomacy, if I may use that expression, to cast Taiwan into utter darkness diplomatically. I wonder if we could not have been as logical in the one case where you say that Mao of course is the *de facto* sovereign of the People's Republic of China—to use the old political science terminology—and at the same time and with equal logic to recognize the *de facto* sovereignty of the Nationalist Chinese in Taiwan.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Macquarrie: Why could not some effort have been made—perhaps it was made, but we have never heard of it—to try to find some way whereby the Taiwan administration is not totally cast off into limbo with no diplomatic association with friendly states? Surely there is nothing to be gained by taking those actions which isolate that country, and I think that it would behoove the Canadian government to give consideration, despite the

credo of Mao and of Chiang Kai-shek about one China, to finding some way whereby Taiwan could retain some association with countries of the world.

That is my comment on the situation. If I am wrong, then I shall be glad, but I do not expect those tremendous changes in the diplomatic patterns of world politics which are sometimes postulated and prophesied by those who after many years have brought forward this act of recognition. I repeat that if I am wrong on this, I shall be delighted, because if it makes for an improvement of the world situation I will not mind at all that Macquarrie was wrong and that things in fact are better. Time alone will tell.

I am very much troubled, and I do not see how anyone in Canada could be otherwise than troubled, about the escalation of troubles, anxiety and bloodshed in the Middle East. I was appalled when I looked at the multi-coloured white paper, if I may call it that, on foreign policy which came out in the last session and found how little emphasis, how little attention, and indeed how little script was given to our relations with the Middle East and to our concern for what is taking place there.

Today we are agonizing over acts of terrorism in our country—and, God knows, we should and must. But it is only a short time ago that the world was focusing its attention upon terrorist activity in the Middle East. However, it should not require some spectacular form of terrorism, hijacking or civil war to cause us to turn our attention in that direction. The Middle East is, and seemingly has been down through the long reaches of history, one of the most intense crisis-ridden areas of the world.

These tensions which come from history, from geography, from religion, from strategy and from much else, have made it a danger spot of explosive potential and the possibilities of a major conflagration are there every day. I agree with President Nixon who said some weeks ago that the dangers in the Middle East, in so far as the great powers are concerned, are much more acute and more portentious than in reference to Viet Nam or, I should say more properly now, Indochina.

In these days of instant communication and modern warfare we cannot assume that this is some remote area where Canada does not have direct and close contacts and precise and important responsibilities. Whoever wrote the white paper might have thought that, but he should not have thought that and Canadians should not think that. Canadians dare not think that, because what happens in the Middle East is going to be of major importance to us, whether or not we in our diplomatic structure regard it as an area of priority. There will be no escape for us if trouble comes in that area; and if we have given it a low priority, we had better think again.

The other day I asked the Secretary of State for External Affairs whether the government was considering further aid to Jordan, where there has been terrible destruction and loss of life. The minister's reply was, if I may say so, a magnificent example of pharasaic self-satisfaction. He said:

I believe it is considered that Canada has made a very generous contribution.

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

What was the contribution? It was $25,000 to the Red Cross and an additional $150,000 to the UNWRA program, in the aftermath of a war which was terrible in its intensity and awful in the suffering which it inflicted upon so many people. Of course, I commend the government for doing that much—naturally I would—but in the immensity of the suffering, surely such self-satisfaction was a little out of place. I humbly commend a little modesty to the minister and to the government as to their contribution in this matter.

• (3:20 p.m.)

We must do a lot more. Even in times of our own domestic travail, sir, we must do more. We must assist with a greater measure than we have so far. Canadians have been involved with truce operations and in peacekeeping forces. Our men have done a splendid job. The name of General Burns is highly regarded in that area. But it strikes me that since the end of the six-day war, the Canadian role in the Middle East has been diminishing. In fact, one of the things that trouble me is that there are so many areas in the world where Canada's role has been diminishing.

For years we have paid our portion to the United Nations Works and Rehabilitation Agency, UNWRA. We have done more than many other countries. This is true, we can say with candour. But I feel that for too long we have made our annual contribution by way of taking part in the debates and listening to the Commissioner General's report. I have sat in the United Nations General Assembly and heard these debates. We have then seemed to let the matter rest. But the population in the refugee camps has mounted over the years. There are now 1⅓ million people living in tents, hovels and shacks throughout the Middle East. Some of them were born there and have known nothing but the squalor of that situation. After 20 years there is an increase in the population of displaced persons, and an annual contribution just to keep them existing is surely not enough. How could we expect that people uprooted from their homes and shut up in camps under these privations would not erupt into something a little more disturbing than satisfaction and complacency? What kind of human beings would they be if they did not manifest a different reaction from that?

A few months ago I was in the Middle East to attend a meeting of parliamentarians to discuss the Middle East situation. I remember very vividly the spokesman for the Palestinians, a most eloquent man. The fact that he is the son of a Presbyterian minister did him no harm in my judgment. Dr. Yehid Hammoudd began his remarks by saying, "There is no Middle East problem; there is only a Palestine problem." That was months ago. This is one of the things we are realizing slowly, and in some cases painfully—that at centre stage must be the Palestinian people.

For far too long we have talked about governments as a group of strategically located political entities and we have forgotten that wars are not about, and this problem is not about, a collection of governments. This problem is

not merely about some spots on a map, but about people with a deep sense of grievance, people with intense longings, people with aspirations and people who have reason to believe that the world community has not regarded them very highly or with much compassion and concern. With that whole complex of human suffering, it is not surprising that some of the reaction is of a violent kind; and, of course, as always with violence and terrorism, it is counterproductive.

In the world outside the middle East there is some forward movement in popular opinion toward the belief that a free Palestine must be set up. But as these moves and gains in public opinion are registered, then comes an outrage, a hijacking, and it often hurts their case far more than the progress of moderation gains for it. This, of course, is what extremists never learn whether they are in the Middle East, the Far East or anywhere else. But I hope it is not too late for us to look with a little more knowledge and a little more compassion at the Palestinian problem. We must not think that all Palestinian leaders are violent men.

I would think that Canada, as a country which has always been involved in UNWRA, which voted for the establishment of the state of Israel—and I believe the right of Israel to exist stands today as it did when we voted that way—must not satisfy itself with the old methods. As Canadians we cannot allow this dangerous situation to remain in the Middle East, lest it bring forth the conflagration that would overwhelm us all. We have there the dabbling of great powers. We have there animosities, ages old. We have there the potential for a terrible explosion. It is not for us to draw about us the skirts of legality and say that it is someone else's problem. It is not someone else's problem. It is our problem and I would like to see Canada assume leadership. Let us move in on the refugee problem and say this cannot go on year after year, that we must take dramatic, perhaps difficult steps to try and liquidate at least some of the awful human suffering which pervades so much of that group of people who once were residents of Palestine. The way out will not be easy, but the way out surely must be found.

We in this chamber, Mr. Speaker, as representatives of our provinces and constituencies try to find opportunities to bring to the attention of the House some of the important problems facing our people and bring forward suggestions to better the areas which we have the honour to represent. Indeed, we try to do this throughout the whole session. I expect to be pressing the government on a number of matters because I submit, sir, that it has not yet completed all those things in Prince Edward Island which I think should be done. And if it ever reaches that stage, I will devote my energies to thinking up some more things to be done!

We are always talking about transportation. The first Prince Edward Islanders who came up here talked about transportation. We do it yet. It is almost a conditioned reflex. I do not say that the most important problem in P.E.I. is the condition of the Charlottetown airport, but I say it is at the very top so far as urgency is concerned. We have one of the finest commercial air services in any part of this country. One can in comfort fly from Montreal to Charlottetown in about an hour and a quarter on a splendid service provided by Eastern Provincial Airways. On the way back it takes about the same amount of time and we are served with a delicious P.E.I. lunch, P.E.I. potatoes and all the rest of it, which makes it even better. After all our pleading, Mr. Speaker, the minister did have his department arrange for an extended terminal. It is a splendid one so far as it goes, but in terms of seating capacity it only goes about half way down the cabin of the aircraft, and that has nothing to do with seating space for the good people in the waiting-room greeting their loved ones on arrival or saying goodbye to them. In other words, putting it very simply it is significantly too small.

Prince Edward Island depends very much upon tourism for the growth of its economy. Agriculture we can improve; fisheries we can improve—but the one which I think is most capable of expansion is tourism. More and more people are coming to P.E.I. I can never completely despair of Canadians and Americans when so many of them choose to come to P.E.I. We love to have them, but we want them to come in comfort. I think it is the responsibility of the government, having failed to give us the causeway, at least to give us a good airport terminal. I have great regard for the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) and I will send him a copy of my speech tomorrow, with a covering letter telling him once again that I am appealing to him, honourable and learned doctor of laws and of much else, to look upon our needs in Charlottetown with immediate favourable reaction.

I have something to say to another minister. This is to the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier). He was largely responsible for the establishment in Charlottetown last year of what was called a youth hostel for young people. I tried to assist during the summer by wiring him when I saw him getting into trouble, but I was not able to forestall some of his difficulties. I presume that the tradition across the country, when establishing a youth hostel, is to take semi-abandoned military barracks and turn them over to transient youth. This is quite all right in view of the fact that so many of our young people are unemployed, which I think is a crime. There is nothing wrong with their moving across the country. I know a great many of them. I live in Prince Edward Island between Borden and Charlottetown and have picked up all sorts of young people moving in and out of the city, and the great majority of them are fine young Canadians.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Nevertheless the Secretary of State made a complete botch of establishing a hostel without consulting the authorities in the city of Charlottetown or the province of Prince Edward Island. When it came to choosing those who were going to run the hostel, instead of going to any of the many fine youth leaders in the city of Charlottetown he imported some whose attainments in leadership left a good deal to be desired.

It is tremendously important in this day of the generation gap, when some people think that a man with long hair is suspect, that when the government establishes a

venture of this kind it ensures that it does not contribute to any further misunderstanding between the young and the old; that it does not contribute to the building-up of a bad reputation for what is essentially a very fine group of young people. I do not care how a man wears his hair, whether as long as Einstein, as short as Jack Benny, or as in my own case where 75 per cent of the question is academic. But when a youth hostel is established it should be well run. It should be run by people whose reputation is reasonably impeccable.

This reminds me of the old Scottish Presbyterian who told his preacher that humanly speaking, he was perfect. None of us is that. However, it would be wise to avoid those who have had recurrent problems with the taking and trafficking of drugs, and so on. Indeed, I think we should err on the side of caution. It would not hurt occasionally to appoint an out-and-out "square". I think these youth programs could do some good. It is a terrible thing in any community to create the kind of situation where it is easier for people who are hostile to youth to continue to express themselves in such a way as to say "I told you so". The Company of Young Canadians let down a great many of us who believed it was worthy of support. I do not want the same thing to happen with the youth hostel program.

I hope that next year, if the program is implemented, we will not have a recurrence of what took place last year. I hope the Secretary of State will pay heed to some of us who are very concerned about these matters and are very anxious to see that all young people in Canada are given opportunities. I have been in youth work for many years. I hope the minister will avoid some of the pitfalls into which he fell with great rapidity last year.

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to take part in this debate on the Speech from the Throne. First of all, I should like to make a comment on the speech yesterday of the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees) in respect of the question of pollution. In his speech he alluded to the fact that in his opinion long-term, low-interest loans would be the way to most effective abatement of water pollution.

I would point out that this idea is completely contrary to the tenor of the Canada Water Act which the government has indicated is one of its major weapons in the fight against water pollution. The philosophy behind that act is one of "the polluter must pay"; that the cost of cleaning up water must be an integral part of the cost of production. Just as with municipal taxes or labour costs, so must the cost of cleaning up water to be used in production be a cost of that production. Only thus will we have the economic motivation whereby in each area of our manufacturing industry we will achieve the optimum results with respect to water usage.

If, on the other hand, we say that we will have the government look after polluters by extending to them long-term loans or otherwise, this of course is a disincentive to a polluter to clean up his own house. The polluter who knew that somewhere downstream the non-polluters, the taxpayers of Canada, would in some wise have to pay for the cleaning up of his pollution would be very foolish indeed to build in anti-pollution measures as a cost of his production and so pay for them himself.

Therefore, may I point out that the two philosophies are opposite and opposing and in our view the principle of the Canada Water Act is superior. I would refer my hon. friend to the evidence given by Professor Juby to the House of Commons committee on this score. I think he put the case for "the polluter must pay" proposition, that the cost of cleaning up pollution should be an integral part of the cost of production, far better than I could hope to put it today in the short time at my disposal.

I want this afternoon chiefly to speak to the dual questions of nationalism and natural gas which in speeches from the opposite side of the House were referred to by more than one member including, I believe, the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield). The two do, in fact, in some way go hand in glove and I think can be effectively dealt with together. First of all, on the question of nationalism itself, if I may be permitted to mix a metaphor I would say that nationalism is, in any age and in any country, at once a tender flower and an unruly horse which must on the one hand be carefully nurtured and on the other hand be ridden with care; because if it runs away, then indeed the problems of a surfeit nationalism can be greater than those of not having a strong nationalism in a country.

• (3:40 p.m.)

I think we have seen of recent days actions by the FLQ, in the name of nationalism, to which none of us would subscribe. I think over the years probably more harm has been done and more wars have been waged in the name of nationalism than any other cause. I believe a great deal of harm can be done by irresponsible nationalism, by nationalism which seeks to incite popular acclaim in the short term, which seeks to gain short-term political advantage, over the long-term best interests of positive nationalism. Nationalism in a positive sense is indeed one of the most wholesome attributes of any country. It enables the people of any land to work together toward common objectives, to enhance the lot and the opportunity of the entire people of a country. It points out the road and the direction in which a nation must move and can ennoble the very purposes of nationhood.

I have said, and I say again this afternoon, that I think there is in Canada today a very real influence toward a positive Canadian nationalism, a very real nationalism, a nationalism which is not against anyone, but which is determined to build in Canada a unique Canadian society; not a pale imitation of any other society, not merely a second-hand view of some other land or of society in some other land but something that is peculiarly and essentially Canadian. This philosophy is particularly evident among our young people. All of us should indeed welcome it because in this direction of thinking there is the source of the very unity which Canada has sought so long.

The question before all of us in deciding the major issues that come before this House, which are particularly the responsibility from time to time of the government, is whether in any specific decision that is taken we are steering a course toward that kind of positive Canadian nationalism wherein will lie the best interests of the country, or whether we are acting in a negative nationalistic sense, for the purpose of short-term gain political or otherwise rather than in the interest of that positive Canadian nationalism.

Mr. Speaker, we should view the decision of the National Energy Board to export 6.3 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, that decision having been approved by the cabinet, in light of the basic question of whether this was a positive decision which would be conducive to Canadian nationalism in its best sense, or whether it was a negative decision in favour of the country of import and against the Canadian national interest.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, if we as a nation want to reach the objectives we have set ourselves, we must build on a sound economy. It would be a gross error to yield to emotions and to take unjustified decisions, from the economic point of view.

It would badly serve the cause of Canadian nationalism and engage it more surely on the way to frustration and failure.

[*English*]

In other words, Mr. Speaker, essential to that positive Canadian nationalism and to our ability to build a strong and unique Canadian house is that we have the strength, the will and the ability to tend well our own garden and to build a strong economy by adopting such sensible policies as will serve the Canadian interest, present and future, so that our young people may have continually widening economic opportunity, as well as opportunities in other areas of human endeavour. I do not think that Canadians have made a national decision to return to Walden with Thoreau. I think they want here growing and expanding economic opportunity. No single factor would contribute more to the dissolution of the Canadian state and enable others to take over our economy, if they so desired, than not running our own ship well and not managing our own economy well. I should like to approach the decision in respect of natural gas on that basis.

I should like for a moment to turn my attention to the remarks of the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas). He has made a valiant attempt to satisfy the two irreconcilable appetites which exist within his party. On the one hand he tells us that we ought not to use our energy resources to "feed the voracious appetite of American industry," further, that our move has placed Canada completely at the mercy of giant oil corporations of the United States and that we have moved one more step in making Canada an economic dependency and military satellite and a cultural colony of the United States. Those are fighting words indeed. But I wonder if they are words spoken in that positive, Canadian national sense, or are they of that very negative kind of nationalism which is meant to arouse hatred or animosity toward some other people or nation, instead of enhancing our own positive, real and unique Canadian nationalism?

Whatever else those words did or did not contribute, we know one thing that they did—they satisfied, possibly, the Waffle group. But the hon. member's task is not that simple, Mr. Speaker. On the other hand there is an older and wiser element within his party whose appetite is for power and for office. They realize that this Waffle nonsense will keep them sitting where they are today, in even smaller numbers than at present.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Greene: To placate the office-hungry people of his party he said later in his speech, "We do not object to selling to the United States any of our surplus energy resources provided Canadian long-term needs are taken into account"—which the Energy Board has done—"and provided we gain access to the United States for Canadian semi-processed and finished products" which, as I mentioned, is happening to an increasing extent almost every year of our history. Both quotations, Mr. Speaker, were taken from the speech made by the hon. member in the debate. I trust that the contradiction has satisfied both halves of the two-headed party which he now leads.

Mr. Skoberg: The minister belongs to a no-headed party.

Mr. Greene: It must be said, Mr. Speaker, that the duality of the Leader of the New Democratic Party makes him a formidable opponent and a formidable adversary. One never knows whether the swing will come from the left or the right, whether the hon. member is talking at any given moment from the Waffle side of his mouth or the office-seeking side of his mouth.

The decision of the Energy Board, as approved by the government, to permit the export of surplus Canadian natural gas was made in the Canadian interest. That is the one aspect of the decision to which we must address ourselves. I feel sure that our customers for this product in the United States of America are well able to take care of themselves. They will determine whether the sale is in their interest. We for our part should determine only one question: Was it in Canada's interest? I intend to devote my efforts to answering that question in the affirmative. Mr. Speaker, I contend that the decision of the board, confirmed by the government, is the only decision that could be made consistent with good, economic sense.

The total value of the new pipeline facilities to be constructed in Canada under these and associated authorizations issued with respect to the applications is approximately $200 million. The Canadian content of the facilities will be approximately 80 per cent and some 13,000 man-years of work will result in Canada. Of this total, about 30 per cent of the employment effect will occur in

the Prairie provinces, about 45 per cent in British Columbia and the balance of 25 per cent east of Manitoba. The amount of gas authorized to be exported over the 15 to 20-year period of the licences is 6.3 trillion cubic feet, compared with 8.9 trillion cubic feet sought by the applicants. The export revenue to Canada from the gas to be exported over the period of the licences is approximately $2 billion.

I point out that the term of the sales was shortened by the board in its decision—some to 15 years and some to 20 years from the 25 years which was the general period of the applications. It is interesting to note that throughout the course of our history in exporting surplus energy resources we have greatly diminished the term of the export, to the greater protection of the downstream Canadian consumer. We originally exported in 1910 or 1911 hydroelectric energy for periods of up to 85 years. We now find that a shorter period will give greater protection to future Canadians. The period in question is the shortest to be found in the history of such decisions.

Canada, Mr. Speaker, has energy resources in very great abundance. It is estimated, on the basis of geological factors, that Canada's reserves of natural gas could amount to 725 trillion cubic feet. We should judge this decision for the export of 6.3 trillion cubic feet within those parameters. Our proved oil reserves exceed 10 billion barrels, and potential conventional reserves have been estimated at 120 billion barrels, of which 25 billion barrels may be on our eastern continental shelf. In addition, the oil sands of Alberta have reserves estimated at 300 billion barrels. We have 28 per cent of the world's proved reserves of uranium, which a rapidly advanced technology will one day make a principal source of energy in Canada. Furthermore, we have very large reserves of good grade coal in western Canada.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, a resource policy and more particularly an energy policy is a question of priorities. These priorities may change in time, but our statutes and our present policy clearly reflect certain basic national objectives.

First, we promote the development of our abundant natural wealth. Second, we try to make available to consumers a variety of cheap energy sources. Third, we advocate the marketing of our surplus of energy to foreign countries, thus improving our balance of trade and our opportunities to carry on and even to accelerate our exploration programs. Fourth, we are anxious also to protect our national security both as regards both the availability of resources and the capacity to develop and use them.

• (3:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

It has long been the policy of Canada that all resources clearly established to be surplus to Canadian needs are to be developed and sold with broadening economic benefit to Canada. Almost a decade ago the decision was made by Parliament, not the government, that the decision as to what was surplus to Canadian needs ought to be made on the basis of scientific determination and not left to the whimsy of the political marketplace, as the leader of the New Democratic Party apparently would have it.

[Mr. Greene.]

In pursuit of this policy the National Energy Board was established and charged with the responsibility of determining what of our resources were to be considered disposable surplus. The board has developed an establishment of some 170 people, including scientists, engineers, accountants and economists. It has access to all the government's geological and other scientific determinations and is privy to confidential records of the industry not generally available to the public.

The board was aware in 1969 that new circumstances were developing in the natural gas industry and felt that the forthcoming major public hearing on gas exports would provide an excellent opportunity for the board to reconsider the criteria and practices by which it had in the past dealt with applications for gas export licences. It therefore asked applicants and interested parties to advise the board of their views as to whether the board should alter its criteria and, if so, what new criteria should be used.

The parties interested in these matters responded generously with thoughtful, constructive and cogent advice to the board on the criteria which the board used to determine Canadian requirements for natural gas, the measurement of supplies against which surplus is determined and pricing arrangements in the export markets. Thus, the board had the benefit of knowledgeable advice from all provinces from Quebec west to British Columbia and from all sectors of the natural gas industry, the producers, the transmission companies, the distributors and the consumers.

The board deliberated over a considerable period. Applications were first received in May of 1969 and the board considered until August, 1970, when its decision was rendered. The public hearing on these applications was held in Ottawa, commencing November 25, 1969, and ending March 20, 1970, occupying 54 days and resulting in over 6,000 pages of transcript. Some 150 exhibits were filed and representations were heard from more than 40 parties. The results of the Energy Board's deliberations on these matters are contained in the board's report to the Governor in Council dated August, 1970, which many hon. members no doubt have seen. I commend it as excellent reading to anyone who genuinely wishes to obtain an understanding of the economics of our natural gas resources and wishes to contribute in a positive sense, rather than in the realm of political profit, to Canada's natural gas policy. On the basis of this expertise and information, the National Energy Board determined that the 6.3 trillion cubic feet was surplus to Canadian needs and was available for export.

Mr. Speaker, it may be that there exists somewhere an equally competent group of scientists who are prepared to challenge the findings of the National Energy Board in this regard. If so, the government would welcome their advice. What we are interested in is facts and figures, not ill-informed conclusions based upon inadequate investigation and incomplete facts and manipulated so as to fan the passions of narrow or demagogic chauvinism. The temerity of the leader of the NDP is somewhat striking when he says the National Energy Board is wrong. He

states this quite categorically. He cites no scientific authority. Only the wisdom in his all-knowing head, for that conclusion!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Greene: The National Energy Board has a proud and proven record of ten years' service in the national interest, which convinces the government that it is entitled to continue placing the utmost confidence in its decisions and advice. The board has consistently maintained that increased sales would result in increased proven reserves because of increased exploration and development. The facts have proven the board to be right. At the beginning of 1960 our proven reserves were 30.3 trillion cubic feet. At the end of 1969, after exporting in the previous decade approximately 4 trillion cubic feet with a value to Canada of over $1 billion, our proven reserves amounted to 57.4 trillion feet.

I repeat, after selling gas which produced $1 billion in foreign exchange and creating the basis of exploration leading to new jobs not only in western Canada but eastern Canada as well, our proven resources have almost doubled. In light of these statistics it is difficult to put any credence in the alarm expressed by those who would play politics with our precious energy resources, rather than leaving the decision regarding surplus, in the hands of those scientifically trained, and proven able to make these judgments on behalf of the people of Canada.

It has been suggested that the National Energy Board has failed to take into account the increased demands upon natural gas because of anti-pollution measures, which will make it a more desirable fuel than oil and coal. He who so alleges obviously has not even taken the trouble to read the reasons for judgment of the board. A reading of the National Energy Board report will indicate that this increased demand has been taken into account. In the reckoning of required supplies, allowance has been made for the conversion by Ontario Hydro of the Hearn plant and two other plants to natural gas use. Allowance has also been made for the use of gas in British Columbia power plants. The board is also accurate in pointing out that natural gas is not the pollutant-free fuel, as some have suggested, and that the heightened demand for this purpose has to be limited by that consideration. It does not contain sulphur but it does contain nitrogen, and the polluting factors of nitrogen have not yet been fully researched or reported upon.

[*Translation*]

It was said, Mr. Speaker, that authorized explorations are exhausting too many of our known reserves. It indicates that one of the basic principles on the economy of resources is misunderstood. It is only by expanding our markets and boosting our sales that we can hope for an increase in our known resources, since it is also the only way to stimulate research and development of existing power sources.

[*English*]

It was alleged that this export will result in higher prices to Canadian consumers. Energy prices both in the United States and Canada may well be increased in future years. I would not pretend to mislead or disillusion the House or the Canadian consumer in any way on this question. One cannot expect increasing costs in other areas of our economy, increasing wages in the industries which serve the energy industry, and static prices for energy. Again, the best protection for Canadian consumers, in the view of the National Energy Board and concurred in by the government, is to increase the supply. This can only be achieved by increasing markets. Surely that is a fundamental rule of economics. It is a restricted supply which puts unwarranted pressure on prices.

• (4:00 p.m.)

If we fail to build up our reserves by stimulating exploration through sales, I can guarantee that there will be a very sizeable increase in consumer prices. This is what the United States is experiencing today. Might I point out with respect to prices that the sale of surplus natural gas will enhance the competitive position of Canadian consumers of natural gas whose requirements are fully protected through lower prices attributable to economies of scale, and through benefits flowing from the export revenues of natural gas transmission companies in Canada.

In the case of the licences issued to two of the applicants, the board has added the stipulation that the export price must at no time be less than 105 per cent of the comparable price to Canadian distributors. The National Energy Board controls the rates of the transmission companies under its jurisdiction and the provincial public utilities boards control earnings of the distributing companies within their jurisdiction. The more revenue derived from exports, the lower the consumer price allowable in the Canadian market.

It has been further said that the government did not take advantage of the American need for our natural gas to extract concessions from the Americans for the export of our oil. To those who feel that such a tactic is a sound manner of increasing our trade and improving our trade relations, let me point out that the amount of new gas now to be exported to the United States will amount to approximately 1 per cent of their national demands. Surely it would be naïve to believe that this is a sufficient club with which to coerce the government of the United States into altering its strategic oil policy, a policy which in the view of many has been a fundamental factor in its foreign policy as well as of its domestic oil policy for a period of half a century or more.

The reluctance of the United States to grant us open access to their oil market is motivated to a considerable degree by the concern of that country for security of supply. The security of the supply of Canadian oil is one of the factors which concerns them in considering their decision as to whether or not to rely in greater degree on Canadian oil. We are hopeful that such apprehensions can be allayed. What is known and appreciated by United States officials, and this was clearly indicated in the government's announcement as reported in the *New York Times* of Wednesday, September 20—

An hon. Member: Lights out!

Mr. Greene: I had not realized that my speech was having such an effect on the house and its lighting. That report stated:

> The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, J. J. Greene, has made it plain that if the United States expects much more natural gas from Canada it must let much more Canadian crude oil into the United States.

I can assure hon. members that this simple economic fact is clearly understood by United States officials and by the United States negotiators in respect of oil.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I might say to the minister that perhaps the flickering of the lights indicated that his time has expired. His time has expired and he may continue only with unanimous consent. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Greene: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I shall try to be easier on the lights and easier on hon. members.

The simple economic fact is that unless greater access to American oil markets is granted, future exports of natural gas are unlikely to be allowed, not because of any desire on the part of the Canadian government to intimidate but simply because the proven Canadian reserves which determine our exportable surplus will only be increased if there is further exploration and development of oil resources to which natural gas is complementary, and this in turn can only follow from increased markets for Canadian oil.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with the critical observation that Canada is both an exporter and an importer of oil. My department, the National Energy Board, and certainly the oil and gas industry, have had under consideration for some time the economic feasibility of the construction of a pipeline to bring western oil into eastern Canada. Until the exploration programs currently under way offshore in eastern Canada and in the far north are completed and the results determined, it would in our view be foolhardy to undertake the construction of an oil pipeline which could only be undertaken with some form of government support and which might prove to be totally unnecessary. If these exploration programs should prove to be unsuccessful, then Canada, in the interest of her own security of supply, may have to give serious reconsideration to the proposal of a pipeline.

There is an urgent need at all times to be responsible and reliable in our dealings with our trading partners in matters of energy trade, as well as in other aspects of our trade. Canada is one of the world's great trading nations. Our future depends on expanding trade and enlarging our marketplaces. There are only two great marketplaces available to us in the free world—the United States and the European Economic Community. Each of these must be developed by us. At the moment the United States is suffering from an energy shortage. Everyone is aware of this. However, I and anyone else who is close to the situation will tell you that this shortage is likely to be only of a short-term nature. I quote from an editorial which appeared in the *New York Times* of October 2 this year:

> There is no shortage of coal, oil and gas as such. The nation's reserves of all three are still enormous. Foreign sources are also available. But several special circumstances have developed at the same time to cause disruptions in the normal marketing of these fossil fuels.

By conducting our trade relations as responsible and reliable merchants, we will in the future, as in the past, achieve further development of our trading relationship with the United States as Canadian interests dictate. Would it, then, be prudent, even if such a ploy could be successful, to take advantage of the current fuel shortage in the United States to gain an immediate benefit? Would this help our trading position in energy and otherwise with our largest trading partner in energy and other commodities? Would this be a proud act of Canadian nationalism? Or would it be in our interest to act as does an honest merchant in dealing with a proved and reliable customer?

Canada has not been irresponsible in its natural gas dealings with the United States in the last ten years. We have delivered according to contract and these contracts have not been interfered with for political gain or as a squeeze in other trading areas. We have scientifically determined, by the best methods available, whether there was a surplus to Canadian need, contracted for sale of that surplus and delivered according to contract.

Indeed the United States is anxious to obtain additional supplies of natural gas from Canada. The National Energy Board's position, endorsed by the government, is that additional supplies of natural gas, by the natural economic link of oil and gas in the business of exploring for hydrocarbons, will only be found if there is a market available for oil. In the exploration for oil engendered by such a market, more gas will be found and we may then have more surplus for export. Conversely, the absence or limitation of a growing market for Canadian oil will discourage investment in the exploration for hydrocarbons generally.

The decision of the United States to exempt natural gas liquids from the crude oil import quota is welcomed by the Canadian government. This decision allows those materials which are produced from raw natural gas in the course of processing to enter the United States without the quota of crude oil exports to the United States being affected. Estimates are that this will make available markets for approximately 40,000 to 50,000 barrels per day of additional sales.

Sulphur is also a by-product in the manufacturing process of a large proportion of Canadian gas. The government has pointed out that in a situation of global surplus of sulphur it would not expect the United States to adopt any measures to restrict access quantitatively for Canadian sulphur to the United States market. Such restriction would discourage exploration for gas in Canada by increasing its costs and would diminish the amount of gas which might be available for future export to the United States.

The export of surpluses, be it minerals, fuels, wheat or other trade commodities, brings back benefits to Canada which would have otherwise to be foregone. I have already mentioned some of the benefits which will directly flow from the recently approved export of natural gas. While there are trade commodities which respond more readily to demand and bring forth more production, fuels and minerals have to be explored for before becoming available. Exploration, then, is the key to increased supply, assuming of course that it is worth while to look for these resources in the first place. It appears to all of us that Canada is just such a place where it is worth while to look.

• (4:10 p.m.)

We have seen something of the problems of unsold surpluses in the mineral field, such as potash and uranium. Our producers, our miners, and all those dependent on them cannot live off these surpluses, however important and desirable the commodity itself is. I ask you to point to any example in the world where a surplus in any commodity has benefited the country unless it was sold. It is this fact of basic economics that must be kept in mind. It is the demand in the marketplace that makes for an economic value, results in a return, encourages more production and, in the case of the fuel and mineral industries, results in further exploration and, if the tempo of sale is right, results in even increased exploration and, in completing the economic cycle, in even greater surpluses.

Our present surpluses are mostly in Alberta and British Columbia. Increased exploration undoubtedly will reach more and more into our northland and encourage the development of the north. The Canadian vision has been increasingly to this frontier and successive governments have made it their policy to reach north. It is not so different to suggest "roads to resources" or a pipeline corridor which is a very real economic road to resources. In its totality, increased exploration will convert possibilities or hopes into a real inventory of resources. Without exploration we will never know, never have, never sell and hence never receive a benefit.

Some people have asked if we should not retain the surplus of natural gas in Canada and use it to attract industry. The answer to this is that such a tactic simply does not work. In industry other economic factors, such as proximity to markets, are more important than availability of low-cost energy. Examples of this are seen in decisions of industry to locate in Ontario rather than in Alberta where energy costs are much lower. I believe in Texas, Mr. Speaker, they offered free gas to potential industries but had no takers because this is a very minor factor in the economic location of industry.

Here again we see another of those double-barrelled conundrums which was put forth by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands. He tells us on the one hand that we should withhold our energy resources and make the United States industries locate in Canada. Yet as leader of the NDP he deprecates the fact that there are too many United States industries located in Canada at the present time. I wonder which goal he really wishes us to pursue. On the other hand, a gas production and transmission industry expanded to increasing needs of Canadians and export markets attracts supply and service industries, such as pipe mills, of considerable importance to the producing provinces and the provinces through which the transmission line passes.

I should like to answer one final criticism to the effect that Canada should use the leverage of its energy resources to gain access for our manufactured goods into the United States. I have already indicated how much leverage 1 per cent of its gas demands would have on United States policy. I would like to point out to the NDP leader that natural gas is not a raw product; it is a manufactured product. He did not appear to appreciate that fact. It is exported in useful form, having been manufactured to that form. I would also point out that Canada has been able to gain increasing access for Canadian manufactured goods into the United States market and I have every reason to believe that our position will continue to improve. I might point out our success at the Kennedy Round which opened up and considerably enhanced our opportunity in the United States market.

I would point to the automotive pact, which is certainly in the interest of Canada. Might I say, with the greatest respect to the leader of the NDP, that he would provide a great service to Canada and Canadian workers generally if he could persuade the bosses of those large American unions upon whose support his party so much depends to reduce their pressure on the United States government to resist the lowering of import barriers to Canadian manufactured goods in the interest, of course, of employment in the United States rather than employment in Canada. It is this tariff resistance which is the real barrier to opening the United States market to finished Canadian products. This is a barrier that is not likely to be repaired by any narrow use of our present export policies.

The concern has been expressed in some circles in western Canada that the criterion used by the board when rejecting the one application could result in a preferential position for those transmission companies already established to the point where there was concern lest a monopolistic situation develop which would be a detriment to Canadian producers. I do not believe that a careful reading of the board's judgment leads to this conclusion. With respect, I think the judgment should stand on the particular facts of the case and the particular applications involved. I do not for a moment believe that the judgment lends itself to the conclusion that those already in the field will have a continuing monopoly.

In concluding my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would reiterate our contention that the sale of energy resources clearly proven by scientific methods to be surplus to Canadian needs makes good economic sense. It is a positive decision in Canada's national interest both present and future. It is a decision founded on economic realities and not on emotions or imagined fears. It is a decision geared, not to

short-term political gain but to long-term economic interests; to Canada's present and future. I believe history will confirm that this was prudent husbandry of our resources that will help generate the wealth with which we can attain the goals of our uniquely Canadian society. I believe it is a sound decision in the interests of that positive Canadian nationalism to which I believe this House and the people of Canada would universally subscribe.

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I want to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, those men who set this debate in motion. I listened with considerable interest to the minister who has just resumed his seat, in respect of the problems of energy and its uses in Canada. It is not my intention to reply to him or to say anything about the subject of the minister's speech. I do not intend to speak on economic matters, which is the customary thing in this debate. I realize that economic matters are vitally important as a prerequisite to the realization of what we might call the good life.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say as emphatically as I can that I do not believe affluence can in itself produce a satisfactory kind of life to which all Canadians would aspire. I therefore propose to direct my remarks for the most part to matters, other than economic ones, which I believe to be vitally important. If my few remarks were such that they would merit a descriptive title, I would probably call them "not by bread alone". I think this is an age in which we tend to judge everything too much in economic terms and evaluate everything by the yardstick of the dollar. I belong to that generation which grew up in the great depression and on maturity found itself confronted with the almost insurmountable task of overcoming the dual force of nazism and fascism.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Having accomplished that objective, our generation moved forward with enthusiasm toward a better life not only for themselves but for mankind generally. I think it was that feeling at the end of World War II that produced such efforts on the part of mankind as a determination to achieve world peace through the setting up of the United Nations organization. Then a secondary, or perhaps equally important goal of 20 or 25 years ago was the provision of equality of opportunity. By holding these views we were probably not sufficiently aware that we were ripe for exploitation.

In our effort to provide equality of opportunity we forgot that this could be debased by growing numbers of people who would interpret it as meaning that the world owed them a living. In an attempt to provide for the physical prerequisites of a good life we measured everything in materialistic terms and made economic matters almost a religion. In biblical terms, we became worshippers of the golden calf forgetting some of the other, most important aspects of life not only for the individual but for nations.

In that framework of thinking chiefly of material gain we were ripe for exploitation by the vendors of political

snake-oil guaranteed to cure all political ills. Many Canadians—especially those in the cities—are, politically speaking, primitive and ripe to have their most valued possessions bartered away for slogans, ideals, states of society, new orders, just societies and in short all the tinsel and finery with which modern political charlatans charm their jewels from the modern political savage. As a result, often as Canadians we have exchanged things which were priceless for things which were merely expensive.

I believe we have forgotten there are things, including our very way of life, which are fragile and which must be carefully preserved. As Canadians we go along blindly on the assumption that we have some magical constitution that will protect us from bad government. Nothing could be further from the fact. Canadians, like any other people, will get governments only as good as the people who make up those governments and only as good as the ability of the people who elect them to determine good from bad.

Mr. Speaker, I am a Conservative. For this I make no apology. I believe the aim of politics, as of all else, is the good life. But the good life is something which cannot be comprehended in some phrase or formula about political or social order. Even if it could be so comprehended, it could not be brought about in the main by political means. I believe and contend that the most a politician can do is ensure that some, by no means all, of the most important conditions in which the good life can exist are present and, more important still, prevent fools or knaves setting up conditions which make an approach to the good life impossible. Many of the great evils of our time have come from men who mocked and exploited human misery by contending that government, according to their way of thinking, could offer Utopia. I find the motive force of human progress not in the compulsory authority of the state but in the individual's conscience and his sense of duty.

As a Conservative, strangely perhaps, I do not believe that the political struggle is the most important thing in life. In this I probably differ from Communists, Socialists, Nazis, and even Social Crediters or perhaps many Liberals. But to the great majority of Conservatives, religion, art, study, family, country, friends, music, fun, duty and all the joys and riches, of existence of which the poor know less than the rich are the indefeasible freeholders, are higher on the scale than their handmaiden, the political struggle—because the most the political struggle can achieve is an improved standard of living, and in trying to achieve it frequently we have traded for it other valuable things that are not measured in dollars.

As a result of this I believe we have taken for granted some of our most priceless values in life. We have failed, for example, to recognize that man has existed on the globe for millions of years and that only in a small fraction, the last 1 per cent, of his experience has there developed anything we might in the loosest terms call civilization. Yet we take for granted that our civilization is a permanent thing that will go on no matter how we mistreat it or with what carelessness we fail to inculcate it in the next generation.

We have failed to realize that our civilization is carried on from one generation to the next only by learning it and having a proper respect for a civilization that civilized men have achieved by struggle over the centuries. Civilization, therefore, is a very weak and fragile thing. In the course of the centuries, even in our own memory, this tiny light in an ocean of darkness has flickered and almost gone out. Instead of realizing that our way of life and civilization is a thin veneer which can be quickly lost, we tend to assume that it is our automatic heritage or that it is proportional to technological advance.

• (4:30 p.m.)

I think there is very little relationship between true cultural civilization on the one hand and technological advance on the other. We make the great error of assuming that this is automatically our heritage, but we should realize that it should be carefully nurtured and passed on from generation to generation. I believe that one of the greatest weaknesses of our present way of life and of our present civilization is that our economic situation is such that one pay cheque will not support the average household. Therefore, too many mothers have to provide a second pay cheque to allow the family to meet its economic needs, thereby depriving the children of a close-knit family relationship which I believe is essential to the passing on from one generation to the next of the values that we hold so dear.

In rural Canada and in the small communities it has been traditional for families to be closely knit. They have been the bulwark, in rural and small town areas, of traditional virtues to which a country must resort in times of stress. Yet in the last 25 years especially, the economic policies of one government after another have devastated the rural life of Canada so that much of rural Canada today consists of dead or dying communities, vacant houses, abandoned land and empty churches and schools.

This series of policies has been as effective in decimating the rural population as was the bubonic plague in the Dark Ages or the Communist programs in the Ukraine between the wars. One of the causes of this—I do not know why it arises, and I am sure it is not from malice on anyone's part—is that the bureaucratic planners in all governments seem to look upon rural people as, not people in the ordinary sense but merely automatons to produce cheap food. Their right to exist and to continue must be measured in cold, economic terms only. If they cannot produce wheat at so many cents a bushel, they have no right to exist, and so on.

I believe this is a very unfortunate state of affairs. I do not know for whom this cheap food should be produced, whether it is to satisfy the teeming millions in our metropolitan areas or whether it is an unconscious way of assuming that good life is not achievable in a rural setting. I think maybe that is it, and this is a great fallacy. With modern facilities I believe that any family can achieve a much higher standard of living, in the true sense of the word, on a given income in a rural setting or in a small town than it can in a large metropolitan area.

At the same time we are letting our large cities grow, without plan or purpose, like a cancer until they strangle themselves in their own transportation systems, in pollution, crime and bad housing. They are staggering under a burden of taxation that they cannot support and which cannot even provide the essentials with which to carry on. Also, the uncontrolled and unplanned growth of our cities forces an ever-increasing percentage of their inhabitants to do without even the essentials of a reasonable life, such as a decent diet and a roof over their heads. These things they can afford.

Much of this growth is unplanned and it is probably stimulated, in most cases, by the activities of corporations. I do not want to be misunderstood. I believe that the most feasible way of carrying out the large-scale operations that are required in a modern society is through the corporations. However, having said that I must add that I do not believe that just because a corporation has no body to be whipped or no soul to be saved, it should not be required to be a good corporate citizen in the society in which it intends to live and should not take on the responsibility of paying the cost of the social disturbance that it creates by operating in one environment or another.

I think our large corporations should be required, under a rational taxation system, to assume at least some of the extra cost that society must bear because of pollution, because of congestion, because of the need for new schools and the infrastructure of roads that goes with the placing of an industrial operation in a given position. If even a token portion of these costs was imposed on corporations, they would make more sensible choices of the places in which they chose to operate. I think you would find that corporations would not locate additional enterprises in the large, overcrowded cities but, rather, would do so in the smaller towns from one end of this great nation to the other.

Only by dispersing the primary type of employment throughout the country together with the secondary service industries which create more and more jobs, only by creating this compounding effect, can regional economic disparity be eliminated. I believe this is where the central government could give leadership to the provinces in the planning of new cities, new towns and the rationalization of our industrial capacity as a nation.

I want to turn for a minute or two to another subject, that is, the type of leadership we have been receiving from this government for the last six or seven years. Perhaps this applies in some measure to all governments which I consider have shown hypocrisy and an erroneous judgment of values in dealing with the rest of the world and with ourselves. We are everlastingly rushing around to the far corners of the world with a "holier than thou" attitude, trying to make underdeveloped countries into our own image or telling other people what they should be doing. We subscribe to the principle of self-determination for peoples in Africa, countries like Rhodesia. But I have never heard the government say in a crystal-clear fashion that the right of self-determination by democratic means is a right which also pertains to all Canadians.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLean: I would like to hear the federal government say that if the people in the Maritime provinces, in British Columbia or in Quebec decide by democratic means that the vast majority want to secede from Confederation, they have every right to do so.

• (4:40 p.m.)

I am not a separatist of any kind. I think such a course would be unwise. But I would be the first to defend the right of any area of Canada to secede from Confederation if it believed it was in its own interest. By the ambiguous actions of central government we have led people to believe—unjustly, I think—that they are compelled to remain in Confederation. That is not the case. We have been ambiguous in many other realms and fields, and it is no wonder we find ourselves in a crisis.

We have, as reflected by the government in any case, equated freedom of speech with the right of anarchists to appear on our nationally-owned radio and television network and, at the public's expense, pour their venom into the minds of people—this venom ticketed with the respectability of our national network. We have subsidized anarchists through organizations such as the CYC and the Canada Council. We have taxed our people to a shocking degree. This year every Canadian, every man woman and child, will on the average have to fork out $656. A family of six gives over $3,600 just to pay for the federal government, not to mention provincial and municipal governments. In this set of circumstances we almost become employees of the state because we have to devote so much of our time to trying to pay our taxes.

In this environment, usually both parents have to work to get their children through school and to pay for their higher education. With great sacrifice and great endeavour, these young people who have been deprived of a proper home environment are sent off to university to sit at the feet of revolutionaries, dedicated in some cases to the destruction of our civilization. We have allowed these people to infiltrate our universities in the name of academic freedom.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. MacLean: This, in my humble opinion, is lunacy. This government has downgraded our national symbols. It has done away with many of the traditions of our armed services, those services that we now have to call upon. It has struck from the masthead of our national flag the symbol of Christianity, I suppose because that is old-fashioned. We have scorned law and order in the name of free speech. The freedom to do our own thing has been talked about a great deal. Mr. Speaker, what is the freedom to do our own thing? The freedom to do our own thing, to do as we damn well please, is the freedom of the jungle—nothing more and nothing less.

I believe that the government over the last few years has shown a kind of schizophrenic attitude toward the responsibilities of leadership. I believe this is because it has two factions within it, one gaining ascendency at one time and the other at another time. But I hope the faction within the government that will gain ascendency in the future is the faction which believes in some of the principles that we hold dearest, that most Canadians hold dear, and I hope that in the future we will be more careful of our heritage. Some may say, "Oh, heritage; that is old-fashioned. What we need is a brave new world." To me, Mr. Speaker, a country that scorns and forgets its heritage is like a man who has lost his memory.

There is no magic that will preserve our way of life. We have to do it ourselves. We must recognize that the very ethic we live by is in the final analysis determined, preserved and protected only by the sense of decency of the people who happen to be its temporary custodians. For example, there is no point administering an oath of loyalty or oath of office to someone to whom it means nothing. There is no means by which extraordinarily destructive power could be withheld from a government that desired more power than it needed. I do not mean this as criticism of the government in the present situation, but we should recognize that when a government becomes a government, it is all-powerful. Nothing assures the future of what we consider to be our way of life except the willingness of members of the government to carry on that way of life.

Mr. Ross Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to speak at length today. Before dealing with the one subject on which I intend to speak, I want to compliment the member who moved the motion for the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. We must not forget, Mr. Speaker, that he is a member of the government rump in this House. While there are not too many of us here this afternoon, we feel that periodically we hold the balance of power in this House and therefore we are very proud that a backbencher should have been chosen to move the Address in Reply.

I would tell some of my hon. friends to my left, who may not know him as well as the rest of us, that he is one of the most completely bilingual men in the House of Commons. His French and his English are perfect. He also speaks another language. I think a man like the hon. member should be congratulated for the fine job he did in moving the Address in Reply, and also for the fine job he does as a member of this House in representing the great constituency of Bourassa.

I would also like to compliment the member who seconded the Address in Reply, the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas). From all sides of the House we hear a lot about the poor western farmers. It would surprise some hon. members to my left to hear some of the things told to us by that hon. member in caucus, when he talks about the wheat farmers and the dire straits in which they find themselves. As a result of this, the Canadian Wheat Board and the minister responsible for selling wheat have pulled up their socks and wheat is now being sold in great quantities. To the hon. member for Assiniboia, my congratulations.

This afternoon I wish to speak about a subject that is somewhat local to my riding. However, I feel that many

hon. members present will be interested in it because it concerns a problem that is prevalent across Canada. Some time ago the Canadian Transport Commission held hearings dealing with Canadian National Railways and Canadian Pacific Railway, in the cities of Owen Sound and Guelph. They brought down a verdict that from November 1, 1970, there would be no more passenger trains, either Canadian Pacific or Canadian National, running north of the city of Guelph in the province of Ontario, that is, in southern Ontario. I have not the slightest idea whether the government reads these speeches. I have not the slightest idea whether the speech I have made this afternoon is an exercise in frustration. But I do hope that some member of the government will look into the situation that I am about to recite, because it is most important that he does.

• (4:50 p.m.)

We have to go back many years, Mr. Speaker. Many speeches concerning this subject have been delivered in the House of Commons and undoubtedly some of what I say will be repetition. Canadian National Railways is owned by the people of Canada. The Canadian Pacific Railway, free enterprise corporation that it be, has been subsidized, not only since it commenced to run train services across Canada but indeed before it started to do so. For example, the Canadian Pacific Railway was given $25 million by the taxpayers of Canada. What is more, it received a grant of 25 million acres of land in Canada, absolutely free. This land was a present to the company. In return, the company had an obligation to perform. The obligation was to provide services, both freight and passenger, wherever rail lines had been built in Canada.

I do not think there are many of us in the House who would want either Canadian National or Canadian Pacific to run a train service to a part of Canada where nobody lives. It is true that there are in Canada lines where economy demands passenger service be either stopped completely or curtailed. In my opinion, the railways of Canada have not been forced out of the passenger business. What happened was that the board of directors sat down at the table one day and came to the division that ten years from now the company would be out of the passenger business in Canada completely. They decided they did not want to bother with it because there was too much other business to be had—carrying freight and other ventures of the company such as oil wells, gas wells, copper mines, hotels, airlines, shipping lines and so on.

At the hearings held in Owen Sound the railway representatives said the reason for wanting to get out of the passenger business was that it was not paying. Most of us are not willing to accept the figures put forward by the railways in support of this claim. At least, I am not willing to accept them because they do not prove this contention at all. Somehow or other there is a kind of closed corporation between the Canadian Transport Commission and the railways. The railways claim that it costs $15.87, or whatever it is, to carry a passenger from Owen Sound or from Southampton to Toronto. How do we know that these figures are correct? I am highly suspicious that they are exaggerating them in an effort to get out of the passenger business completely. I think they should be told to put all their figures on the table so that I and other interested citizens of Canada have the opportunity to examine them. Be that as it may, their contention is that they must get out of the passenger business because it does not pay.

On the day I attended these hearings I asked the representatives of Canadian Pacific Railway whether they wanted to get out of all business activities that did not pay, and they said yes. I clipped an article out of the financial section of the *Globe and Mail* about a month ago, which announced that CP Air had lost $600,000 or $700,000 during the last two or three months and that as a result of this loss an extensive advertising campaign was being taken up immediately. There was published that day a half page ad in the *Globe and Mail*—hon. members may well remember it because it appeared in all the larger newspapers in Canada—advertising a flight known as "The Executive".

I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether you have ever flown on this Executive flight, but let me tell you it is some plane. In the advertisement it was stated that you can have any kind of magazine on the plane. If you are travelling from Toronto or Montreal to Vancouver and you want to occupy yourself with business matters, they can even supply you with dictating machines. You can have any kind of beer you want. They serve the best meals. There are toys for the children. They even boast about the pretty stewardesses, and this may be one of their true claims. It is very hard for a country fellow like me to appreciate all this boasting about the great service given by CP Air, which is owned completely by CPR, when you cannot even buy a cold hamburger on their train from Toronto to Owen Sound, a city of 19,000 people. As I say, as of November 1 Owen Sound will not have one train leaving the station.

Years ago when I was a member of the legislature in Toronto I used to travel by train from Owen Sound to Toronto quite often, and when I did it was absolutely full. The train went down in the morning and came back at night. The CPR decided some years later to get out of the passenger business. They did so because they were making so much money in other endeavours that they could not bother to count the money collected from their passengers.

In spite of the fact that 15 years ago this train was full, the CPR then decided to run the train every second day only. Since the train was still full, this made it difficult for them to get out of the passenger business as fast as they could so the company decided to double the fare. While the CNR would charge you "X" dollars to take you to Toronto from Owen Sound, the CPR charged "XX" dollars. That is one way to get out of business, and it is an indication that the CPR certainly wanted to lose its passenger business in Canada. I defy any of their senior officials to tell me otherwise.

Once again let me impress upon you, Mr. Speaker, that as of November 1 the people in the city of Owen Sound, some 19,000 of them, and many thousands more living in

the surrounding area will not have one passenger train leaving the station. The verdict of the commission handed down the other day was that it would not only allow the CPR to discontinue its service but also Canadian National Railways.

I close by saying something about the Canadian Pacific Railway. There is no member in this House who believes more in free enterprise than I. On the other hand, I believe that a corporation such as the CPR should have an obligation to the people of Canada. This corporation owns hotels all over Canada worth hundreds of millions of dollars. One thing that surely we can boast of is that this is the largest transportation company, not only in Canada but in the whole world, with shipping, railways and airline operations. That is something of which Canadians should be proud.

• (5:00 p.m.)

How did they make these hundreds of millions of dollars with which they built up their airline, shipping and hotel interest? I will tell you how they made it. They made it out of the railways. And how did they get the railways? They obtained them from the people of Canada. They were given 25 million acres, according to the original contract between the Canadian Pacific and the goverment of Canada, and $25 million, which was a great deal of money in those days. They kept the money, they kept the millions of acres, and now they do not wish to supply us with passenger service. What is more, in my opinion they are trying to get out of providing that service even though in many instances it has been, and still is, a paying proposition.

The Canadian Pacific Railway, Mr. Speaker, has two or three aspirations. One of those is to make money. Another is to get out of the passenger business not just from Owen Sound to Toronto but all over Canada. The railways are attempting to stick us, the people, with this lack of service. They are doing this after having taken all the goodies given to them in years gone by. And what goodies they are! Think of the gas rights and the oil wells that they obtained from the 25 million acres that were spread right across Canada. Think of the prime locations they have in the various cities of Canada. Think of the location of the Royal York Hotel in Toronto, and of the locations of the CPR hotels in the cities hon. members come from, or in the cities close by.

It is high time we found out who is running these services, whether it is Parliament or the railways. So far as I am concerned, a deal was made. The deal was completed before the hearings took place. Not a single witness who appeared at the hearings wanted the railways to discontinue passenger service. Only the railways wanted to do that. I am sure the Canadian Transport Commission has heard all the arguments many times before. This situation is simply not right, when two parties have signed an agreement they both are under the obligation to carry it through. The government of Canada, on behalf of all Canadians, has kept its side of the bargain. The Canadian Pacific Railway, in my opinion, has not. The same could be said about Canadian National Railways. From that city which is north of Guelph there will not be a single passenger train running on or after November 1—not one.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, many residents of that area have no alternative means of transportation. When the hearings were held, the railways said that there are bus services if one goes to London. If you want to go to Toronto you must go to London and then to Toronto. It is a most unsatisfactory arrangement. The people living in places like Southampton, Kincardine, Walkerton, Port Elgin, Owen Sound, Mildmay and Hanover are all placed in this position.

If I may, I should like to refer to one paragraph of a letter written by the mayor of Southampton. He said that when the report was issued that this vital service was going to be discontinued on November 1, the citizens of Southampton could not believe that the report was correct. He said, "It was the most shocking and distressing news we have had in many years". He also said that evidently the voice of the people is completely ignored by our government, because they spoke strongly against this both in Owen Sound and in Guelph at the supposedly public hearings. In both these localities the only people who supported the discontinuance of the service were the railways. If this is our democracy, he wrote, these so-called public hearings are a farce and a complete waste of the taxpayers' money. To this, Mr. Speaker, I say amen. He continues with a most logical argument, pointing out that as far as Southampton is concerned there is no alternative service to the metropolitan area. I point out that within my riding is the huge development at Douglas Point, at which over $1 billion will have been spent in the next three or four years. All the same, the Canadian Transport Commission had the nerve to allow the railways to discontinue passenger service.

I said at the beginning of my remarks that I sometimes wonder whether those in the government service read speeches made in this House. I sometimes think that what we say here is said in vain and that our remarks have no effect. I hope that someone in the government will look into the situation in the next week or so. I am referring particularly to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson), to whom I have spoken about this matter. This whole question is most difficult. We realize, of course, that passenger services have not always paid in the past. There are many other factors that must be corrected: the service is lousy and the trains are lousy. I do not mean that they are infested with lice; I mean that often they are dirty. There are no meals, and the only way you can obtain a drink of cold water is by stopping at a pump. Also, the hours of service are disgraceful.

It seems to me that if the citizens of Canada are to continue paying subsidies to the railways for passenger service, wherever it still exists, the citizens should have the right to say where and at what time a train will start. For example, trains from Owen Sound to Toronto leave at seven o'clock in the morning. That simply is not good enough. There are many ways in which passenger service should be improved. I appeal to the government and particularly to the Minister of Transport to look into

this situation involving thousands of people who live in the area north of Guelph and who, after October 31, will be entirely without passenger service as a result of the decision of the body that dictates to the railways. That decision was made notwithstanding the testimony given by every citizen who appeared at the hearings and who gave substantial reasons as to why the trains should continue in operation.

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) saw fit to ask one of my friends, the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) to second the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. The hon. member's constituency adjoins mine in Saskatchewan. We both represent people who are great Canadians. I am sure, although our political philosophies may differ, that we agree on this point. I am also pleased that the Prime Minister saw fit to ask the hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel) to move the motion for the Address in Reply. He and I went on a "voyage of discovery" this past summer to the nations of central and eastern Africa on behalf of the Canadian Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. I heartily concur in the remarks of an hon. member who said a short while ago that the hon. member for Bourassa is a great credit to this House.

Many of us attended the memorial services held yesterday in connection with the funeral of the late Pierre Laporte. Many went to Montreal to attend the service. I admire Mrs. Laporte's decision to have a quiet, simple funeral in an attempt to avoid making national figures out of murderers. Our heartfelt feelings go out to Mrs. Laporte and her family, and to the late Mr. Laporte's immediate family and relatives. All of Canada will have watched on television the coverage of the services, and all areas of Canada will react in different ways to what they saw. I only hope that overreaction will not be the situation.

• (5:10 p.m.)

I can only say to those unfortunate, opportunist souls, the hon. member for Timmins (Mr. Roy) and the member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Serré), who criticized our stand on the War Measures Act, that they would be well advised to spend as much time recognizing the rights of innocent people who have, no doubt, or will be questioned and detained under the regulations of the War Measures Act. I stand in my place in this House of Commons proud of the fact that I voted as I did.

I condemn the terrorists and murderers who have inflicted death and horror on one province of Canada. However, the imposition of the War Measures Act will do more harm to Canadian unity than anything that possibly could have been done by those people deliberately dedicated to the destruction of Canadian unity. The people of Quebec, and indeed of all Canada, are divided by the implementation of this act. People across this nation are supporting the Prime Minister for reasons other than those he wishes to believe.

This past summer we visited some nations in Africa. At that time we met some of the liberation movements and freedom fighters of those nations. In particular situations, revolution by force is the only way. That statement applies particularly to those nations which do not have the ballot-box at their discretion. That is the situation in South Africa. I support the position of those people using a type of force. But in Canada, where revolution by the ballot-box is possible, we do not need revolution by force. I am sure everyone agrees that changes are necessary, but these must be brought about by use of the ballot-box. We were fortunate to obtain copies of a book written by the President of Tanzania, Mr. Nuyere. The book is entitled, "Ujaama"; in other words, "familyhood". In that book he refers to the obligations of his country, one of which is to give the individual the right to job opportunity. In exchange for job opportunity the individual must be prepared to work.

We would not be faced with the problems we have today if every Canadian had the right to job opportunity. It is only through job opportunity that we can suppress what is happening today. I sincerely urge members of all parties to bring this fact to the attention of every authority, whether local government authority or otherwise. I hope no member of this House will support the law of the jungle philosophy which was also referred to a moment ago by an hon. member. In a democratic society we have recognized authorities vested with law and order. These authorities must ensure that innocent people are not subjected to terrorist acts. We know what happened in the rise and fall of the Third Reich in Germany. We do not want the same to happen in Canada. Suppression of civil liberties is taking a chance on the road to democratic society. We must ensure that the civil rights and liberties of individuals are not suppressed.

The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) addressed the House a short while ago. The lights did not flicker in this chamber because of his speech; it was not that earth-shattering. Before I came to this House I was told that the minister would provide some humorous speeches. I have not been disappointed in that regard. The minister stated that the government did not subscribe to taking short-term political advantage. Not too long ago the minister made a speech in Denver, Colorado. Since that time he has been trying to apologize for what he said to his corporate friends. A good deal of his speech today was devoted to the philosophy of our party. He must be bankrupt of ideas if he has to spend so much time defending something he was not able to put before us.

The minister suggested that a positive nationalism is being created across Canada and it is no pale image. I wish I could subscribe to his philosophy. Unfortunately, outside of the speech he made in Denver he has not said very much with regard to positive nationalism. I suggest it is short-term political advantage he is concerned with at this time.

I now wish to deal briefly with the agricultural economy of Canada. It has been said in this House, and bears

repeating, that 51 per cent of the people in Canada are directly or indirectly connected with the agricultural economy of Canada. For some reason, particularly in central Canada, this fact seems to evade some hon. members of the House. This government must recognize the fact that 51 per cent of the people are directly or indirectly connected with agriculture. Those people must be looked after. They must be listened to and their wishes made known. There must be planned economy and planned involvement.

A typical example of what was not done this year was the granting of a three-bushel quota for Durum wheat. The elevators in my district were full of Durum wheat, but the government opened the quota. The elevator agent is saying, "I have a little room, but I do not want more Durum. What can I do?" In spite of this, the government left the quota at three bushels of Durum. Is this the planning about which they talk? Planning must go further than just saying, "we are going to obtain an eight bushel quota this year come hell or high water, so we will do everything we can to get the eight bushels there as quickly as possible."

Some hon. members have already spoken about participation by those most directly involved in the production of a particular resource or material. This question could be referred to the task force on agriculture. Has this government asked the opinions of those directly involved in agriculture? I suggest it has not. The task force on agriculture will hold a meeting in Ottawa in November. At the same time, the farmers of western Canada will hold regional meetings throughout the west to get the opinions of producers in respect of the task force on agriculture. Instead of waiting for these farmers to formulate an opinion to pass on to their representatives in Ottawa, the government goes blissfully along suggesting that which has no basis. They say, to heck with the producer. It is not too late for the government to reverse the decision of the task force on agriculture. I ask all hon. members with authority, particularly the hon. member for Assiniboia, to urge the minister to delay the conference which is to be held in Ottawa.

Questions have been raised in this House with regard to the marketing bill and protein grading. It must be admitted without hesitation that these bills were delayed, but not by us. Canadians need a national marketing act and a bill to provide for protein grading. There must be equal representation in so far as the regulations are concerned and the adjustment to be taken into consideration concerning these two bills.

It has been said in this chamber that there must be active participation by people across this nation. I agree with the hon. member who stated yesterday that more Canadians must feel they are part of this institution. Every member is obligated to make his constituents sincerely believe they are part of this institution. Because of the lack of participation by the people of this nation we are confronted with such a serious situation today. I urge members of all parties to at least speak to those in the schools at their earliest convenience. It may be too late to speak to some people, but those in the schools should be told they can participate in bills before this House by making representations, they might feel they are not too far from Ottawa.

I will now turn to one of my favourite subjects, decentralization. I see no reason at all for the centralization of all government departments here in Ottawa, bearing in mind modern means of communication which are available. I believe the public would get better service if departments were decentralized. If information is needed quickly, those concerned can punch a computer in Ottawa and get the answer. I am sure every area of Canada would benefit from the decentralization of government offices, and I think this would apply not only to the federal government but to the services of provincial governments. If we really want to take government to the people, we have an obligation to do exactly this.

• (5:20 p.m.)

I was extremely pleased to hear what the hon. member for Wellington-Grey (Mr. Howe) said last night. I was also very pleased to hear the references which the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) has just finished making to transportation problems affecting various areas. Last week an attempt was made to appear before the Canadian Transport Commission in Regina and put forward views with regard to the rationalization program of the CPR. The president of the Transport Commission, Hon. J. W. Pickersgill, once again saw fit to take the chair at those hearings. Submissions, which he accepted, were made on behalf of six Members of Parliament. I had prepared a statement for submission. He reserved judgment on whether to accept it at the Ottawa hearings beginning next week. I shall read from the *Leader-Post* an item headed, "Pickersgill to Reserve Judgment on Statement".

J. W. Pickersgill, Canadian Transport Commission president, Friday reserved judgment on whether to receive a statement prepared by John Skoberg, NDP Member of Parliament for Moose Jaw, for presentation at the rail transport committee hearings in Regina.

Mr. Pickersgill did not allow Mr. Skoberg to read a statement at the close of the Regina hearings into the CPR's proposal to reduce service provided by "The Canadian," and to increase fares.

The commission president said he would reserve judgment, examine the statement prepared by Mr. Skoberg and announce his decision at the railway transport committee's hearings in Ottawa later.

Further on, the report continues:

Mr. Pickersgill said the references to the commissioners were "irrelevant and rather offensive". He said the commission was set up and the commissioners were appointed by the Canadian government. He said Parliament was "the proper forum" for this type of discussion and directed Mr. Skoberg to discontinue that line of discussion.

Later, when the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) was trying to pursue a point in the brief, Mr. Pickersgill made a further observation. The newspaper report reads:

Mr. Pickersgill, a former Liberal MP and former cabinet minister said Parliament was the forum for proposing the changes suggested by Mr. Benjamin.

"I've retired from the legislative arena and you're there and I'm not going to do your work for you," he told Mr. Benjamin.

In view of the statement by the president of the Transport Commission that it was very doubtful whether he would accept my brief, I thought it only fair to present it here in the House of Commons. Indeed, in effect Mr. Pickersgill directed me to do exactly that, I believe it is only appropriate that the people I represent should be looked after to the best of our ability. The fact is that the president of the Transport Commission has already made up his mind about transportation in Canada, but he insists on repeating judgments he has made many times before. I would point out that the Supreme Court has upheld the costing formula of the C.T.C. and that branch line abandonment proposals will now be considered on the basis of that formula. As long as the Canadian Transport Commission holds its present ideas, there is no question as to what our transportation policy will be. All of us realize that the make-up of the Transport Commission is really the "gut" issue and we must look at the situation in this light.

I tried to present my statement in Regina on October 16. The commission ran out of witnesses, so we were able to get on at about 6.30 in the evening. The submission was made in the interests of good transportation generally and deferred to the plan for the rationalization of "The Canadian." I shall read from the brief:

The remarks I shall be making today will in some cases sound like mere rhetoric. If they do, I can only suggest that thousands of Canadians like myself are concerned. It is common for politicians to take so-called cheap shots or to be accused of taking cheap shots at persons, particularly officials, who cannot defend themselves.

Let me say in this regard that Mr. Pickersgill is quite capable of defending himself. The brief continues:

This may well be the reaction to what I am now going to say. The distinction I want to underline at the outset is that the subject of my remarks, the President of the Transport Commission, is here. He will react as he sees fit.

I might note, at this point, that he did react.

The burden of my comment is that he should not be hearing this case, indeed, that he should not be the President of the CTC. Clause 6 of the National Transportation Act outlines the constitution of the commission. The commissioners know it well, especially the president, because he made the transition from being the minister who marshalled the creation of the CTC through Parliament to being the first head of the commission.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but perhaps I should take this opportunity to read to him part of section 157 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, page 132, where it is stated in paragraph 3:

It is out of order to read extracts in a debate if they ... reflect upon the conduct of persons in authority.

If the hon. member continues his remarks along those lines the Chair may have to call him to order.

Mr. Skoberg: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But really this is no reflection on the character of a member, nor will there be from here on. I am reading from my own brief; I am not referring to a debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The citation says it is out of order to read extracts in a debate if they reflect upon the conduct of persons in authority. It was my impression that the hon. member was reading extracts which might reflect upon the conduct of the president of the Canadian Transport Commission who holds a position of authority.

Mr. Skoberg: I was not quoting any outside authority in this regard, but I will take what Your Honour has said into consideration and continue to refer to my brief. It continues:

Clause 6 states that "each commissioner holds office during good behaviour ... but he may be removed for cause by the governor in council at any time."

I have asked the government directly to relieve the president of his duties.

I have a letter here which will confirm this. I am awaiting a reply. My immediate reason for making such a request centres on the statements made by the president since he became president, and some of his staff, which indicate to me and others that the opinions he holds regarding the future of passenger service on the railways are prejudicial to a fair and neutral judgment on his part in respect of arguments put forward by anyone who questions the policy and the methods adopted by the railways to get themselves out of the passenger business.

• (5:30 p.m.)

I believe it is a more complex and serious situation than that. I believe strongly that the former Minister of Transport should never have taken the job and, further, that it was a grave error in common sense for any government to have offered the post. I said in my brief:

To amplify, I came into politics as a Member of Parliament after the president had made his leap from the Commons to his present judicial function. Before coming to Ottawa I had no fixed opinion as to his competence or fairness beyond a memory that on two occasions as a minister of the Crown he failed to act in situations and seemed to reflect a pro-management bias. I refer firstly to the fact that as government House leader in 1963 he effectively blocked House consideration of recommendations of the Commons Railways, Canals and Telegraph Committee that the Railway Act should be amended to place upon the railroad the responsibility for dislocation costs of workers as a result of technological innovations. Later as Minister of Transport he brushed aside the recommendations of the committee in as specious and circuitous a speech as I have ever read.

I have that speech here, which I can refer to. Then I said:

Secondly, in 1963 discontent of the running trades on the CNR over management plans to introduce run-throughs led to a national wildcat strike. Beforehand representatives of the men could get no sympathetic response from railway management or government ministers. At the same time the president was Minister of Transport. His unwillingness to listen and to act led directly to the strike and subsequent appointment of the Freedman inquiry. Surely one fair opinion one can draw from the recommendations coming from that inquiry is that there were substantial grievances and views to which the then minister turned a deaf ear. So the memory of these two cases and the president's role in them were all that I brought to Ottawa with me in 1968 in so far as he is concerned.

I quickly found in Ottawa that the president's name among politicans of all parties was synonymous with partisan chicanery

and over clever partisan acts. That statement, put in assertion terms, is libellous or close to it. In other words, I realize the seriousness of making it. Let me tie it into the present situation where the president now sits in judgment on issues that affect the well-being and future of my constituents. I do not in fact trust his fairness and I am shocked at his reputation as a devious partisan.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. Again I must remind the hon. member that he is treading on very slippery ground. I must refer him to May's Parliamentary Practice, the Seventeenth Edition. Let me read him one of the rules governing the contents of speeches, which appears at page 448. It states:

A member, while speaking to a question, may not... reflect upon the conduct of the sovereign or of certain other persons in authority—

In the last sentence of the last part of the hon. member's remarks he has been passing judgment on a person who occupies a position of authority in the public administration, and he also has been reflecting on the character or the integrity of that person. The Chair cannot allow the hon. member to carry on in this manner.

Mr. Peters: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, during the debate on the Address in Reply to the Throne Speech hon. members are allowed a great deal of latitude. The Throne Speech really is of no relevance. It simply provides hon. members with an opportunity to state their positions in terms of their constituencies. I think the hon. member is doing just that, although I would agree with Your Honour if you were to say that he is sticking too closely to his text.

As to whether or not the hon. member is allowed to comment in this manner, it has been the general policy during these debates that if a person refers to the conduct of a department or an agency of government, and that person's background is part of the policy being developed by that agency, considerable latitude has been given. I have in mind the discussions that recently took place in this House, within Your Honour's memory, about the circumstances surrounding the Atomic Energy Commission and its relationship with the deuterium plant in Nova Scotia. This debate took place during the latter part of last session. I would suggest that we have considerable latitude during the debate on the Address in Reply to the Throne Speech and in that respect I do not think the hon. member is necessarily out of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Perhaps the Chair should remind the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters), in respect of the remarks he has just made, that an hon. member may be allowed to make statements or comments on facts, but when those comments go as far as questioning the integrity of a civil servant at a high level, we in this House must consider the specific situation. I am sure the hon. member would agree with me that members of this House would be quite unfair in passing judgment on people in authority in the public administration, because those people do not have an opportunity to come here and defend themselves.

[Mr. Skoberg.]

I think this is a basic principle the Chair must keep in mind. I am still in the position that I cannot accept the argument just made. I waited as long as I thought proper for the hon. member to change the course of his speech and perhaps speak more generally of the actions of the commission or something along that line, but he did not. The Chair had no alternative but to bring him to order.

Mr. Skoberg: Mr. Speaker, I was only doing what the president advised me to do at a hearing in Regina. He suggested that Parliament was the place to present my opinions or remarks. I will try to abide by your suggestion in this regard. My brief also said:

We are concerned with the absolute lack of consideration given to the basic ingredients of any nation if that nation is to achieve greatness. Without an efficient rail transportation policy Canada is facing a crisis and I respectfully suggest to this House that if the terms of reference seek only to regulate while failing to establish guidelines for an efficient and national rail transportation policy then this country is doomed to remain static and to failure in the transportation field. As in the government task force on agriculture, which adopted the philosophy that agriculture was doomed in Canada, the president of the Canadian Transportation Commission has adopted the policy that rail passenger traffic is a thing of the past in our nation and from that premise conducts public hearings.

I fail to understand how the commission can investigate itself, particularly if public pronouncements have been made as to the role of passenger trains in Canada by the president himself. For example, the MacPherson commission has recommended that a transportation research agency be set up as a separate advisory body. Its reason for wanting a separate agency was the fear that research carried out within an established authority which also had administrative authority would be used to substantiate decisions that had already been made. This point is well taken. It would not be the first time that governments have initiated special research studies to prove their own infallibility or to justify doing something they intended to do anyway.

I suggest that the commission is doing exactly what the MacPherson commission was worried about, namely, holding public hearings to justify doing something it intended to do anyway. When the railway transport commission was requested by one of the council appearing before the railway costing hearing to explain the criteria applied by the railway transport committee in determining whether a service is a passenger service the commission replied that the train or trains must be designated in public timetables as providing a regular year round service for passengers, and passengers carried on the train or trains must be sufficient in number and be travelling at such times that they could not reasonably be accommodated on alternative service.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I regret having to interrupt the hon. member, but I must remind him that his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Is there agreement to allow the hon. member to continue his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Mr. Skoberg: Mr. Speaker, I thank hon. members for allowing me the extra time. I might say, in respect of the remarks I was just making, that in addition to this expla-

nation, the railway transport committee stated the following:

—to protect the public fully in any case where there is doubt, the committee would incline towards declaring the service to be a passenger train service in order that the fullest investigation can be made.

I would suggest that they should have used plain language and said really what they are talking about in so far as passenger train service is concerned. Another factor I believe we should be concerned about is showing the concern of the Canadian Transport Commission about ground transportation problems. To appreciate the situation one has only to refer to the establishment of the Canadian Institute of Guided Ground Transport at Queen's University by the CNR, CPR and the CTC which will each contribute up to $100,000 a year for five years.

On should welcome the establishment of such an institute. However, after reading the press release in the *Gazette* of May 6, 1969, wherein Robert A. Bandeen told the Canadian Transportation Research Forum that the CNR and CPR should get out of the passenger train business because it does not make any economic sense and, after finding out Mr. Bandeen is vice-president for CNR Corporate Planning and Finance and has been named chairman of the institute, is it any wonder our rail passenger transportation is headed for oblivion? The Canadian Transport Commission failed to appoint one of its own members but, rather, someone from the Department of Transport to this institute, at a time when results from specific research studies are incomplete. I could go on in detail in respect of work being carried on by the Canadian Institute of Guided Ground Transport at this time. This work has not been completed, and still the Canadian Transport Commission goes along with the theory that the abandonment of rail transportation is proper.

On May 8, 1969, Mr. MacMillan, president of the CNR, was before the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications. At that time I asked Mr. MacMillan this question:

Has your company ever considered or discussed with your competitors the setting up of a national passenger train policy, in order that the entire nation may be adequately served by passenger facilities without duplication?

Mr. MacMillan replied:

Yes, we have—and we have done more than that. We have under way at the moment—in collaboration with the research section of the CTC, in which the CPR are participating—a study in depth looking to the formulation of a rail passenger network of a character which will be adequate to meet the needs of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, if one looks at that statement and the elimination of passenger train service since that time, one realizes that the research work which is going on really means nothing to the Canadian Transport Commission. I have some recommendations which I believe should be considered seriously in the interest of the whole transportation policy of Canada. I say that this is in the interest of our nation because it affects a comprehensive, national transportation policy. I further suggest that the president of the Canadian Transport Commission should tender his resignation. As I mentioned earlier, I have already written to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) in this regard.

I say that the Canadian Transport Commission should grant no further curtailment or abandonment until all research studies undertaken by the Research Division of the CTC or other departments of government into all guided ground transport studies and pollution control measures be completed and, further, that the commission should rescind its order to stop service on 400 miles of rail passenger service in southwestern Ontario. I also further say that the Canadian Transport Commission should give imaginative leadership in developing a transportation system in the interest of the user, the environment and the national economy. I say, too, that the personnel of the Canadian Transport Commission should not be determined by railroad influence or recommendations and a new approach should be adopted for filling CTC positions.

I also say that the railroads should be required to file annually with the CTC a public document showing what free trips were provided to individuals, organizations, the press, radio and TV, either on rail passenger, private rail car or subsidiary-owned airlines. Next I say that the CPR should be required to file an annual public statement showing what amounts CP rail has charged itself for rental of facilities owned by itself. Further, I say that the Canadian Transport Commission should immediately institute a comprehensive, professional, independent audit to assess railroad passenger cost estimates intelligently.

This suggestion probably answers some of the thinking of those who appeared before the commission. Then I say that the commission should immediately instruct the railroads to provide adequate and clean rolling stock for public convenience, and that the commission should cease and desist granting applications for abandonment on the balance-sheet alone, and take into consideration first and foremost convenience and service to the public of Canada. The attitude of "The public be damned" must come to an end. Last, I say that any loss in passenger train operation should be met by the resources of the railroads' other non-rail holdings and not from freight operations.

I am sincerely convinced that the non-rail holdings should offset any deficit in passenger train operations. It is not right that the users of freight services should have to worry about that particular deficit. Only through this method should the railways be obligated in meeting that deficit.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, as you have pointed out, that I am, and intend to be, critical of the president of the Canadian Transport Commission. I believe the president is convinced that the rail passenger train service is at an end in Canada. At the same time millions of dollars are being spent by other departments of government on the whole question of pollution and other controls, highway building and other things while the commission continues with these abandonments. I suggest this is a matter of concern to the nation as a whole and that Members of

Parliament must be concerned about the type of approach we take.

I thank hon. members for the extended time granted to me.

Mr. Rud L. Whiting (Halton): Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to join previous speakers in congratulating the mover of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, the hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel). As was mentioned earlier, the hon. member for Bourassa sits very close to me and has become a very good friend. It was my pleasure to have the hon. member visit my riding last fall to speak to a group of people in Halton. While there he made many friends, and I took the liberty of sending copies of his remarks to the people in Halton who met him. They wish him well and wish him continued success in his parliamentary career.

To the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas), may I say that the people of my riding have not had the pleasure of having him visit our part of the country. However, knowing him as I do, and from listening to the speech he made in this debate, I can say to him that he would receive a very warm welcome should he visit the riding of Halton.

The opening of a new decade is a time to renew our hopes and aspirations and to assess the values that have assumed importance in our way of life. It is a sort of stock-taking time wherein we look at the achievements of the past and weigh them against the problems that forever seek solution. It is time to reaffirm our faith in our institutions and in our democratic system. These thoughts were reflected in the Speech from the Throne when it referred to freedom of the individual and equality of opportunity as our most cherished possessions. It talked of the enjoyment of life as measured in qualitative rather than quantitative terms, and a society which encourages imagination and daring ingenuity and initiative.

• (5:50 p.m.)

As these remarks were amplified throughout the Speech, it reflected an optimism on the part of the government that the 1970s will be a decade of growth and expansion, not only in material things but in all things which would give Canadians a way of life that could be the envy of the world. I say this despite the agonizing test to which the country has been put in the past two weeks. Our greatest duty is for all of us to stand together and to uphold and support authority. Let us then work for the betterment of all. We have our problems; let us deal with them.

Agriculture is still a major problem, despite years of serious and determined effort on the part of organized farm bodies, departments of agriculture in every province and the federal Department of Agriculture to bring the industry a reasonable measure of economic and social stability. The importance of the industry is well known to everyone. When prices drop below the cost of production, when markets for the products of agriculture are inadequate in relation to the volume of goods that have been produced, then the industry is in trouble. Very few are the years in modern times that could be termed good, and many are the years that have been bad, with consequent bad effects on the nation's economy, expansion and progress in the pursuit of stability and security.

Marketing boards, acreage control, price controls, subsidies to ensure minimum prices and other devices have been resorted to in an effort to avoid overproduction and to ensure a decent standard of living for the agricultural producers caught in price squeezes and unmarketable surpluses. Through it all there have been humanitarian protestations related to exploding population, hunger amid plenty, waste through storage necessitated by lack of methods of distribution, problems of credits and payments, etc.

It is an open question when and how any of these problems will be solved to the satisfaction of peoples directly involved and those indirectly involved. But for the moment let us take a look at agriculture as one of Canada's industries. It is in a bad way, with rural slums developing and more and more farmers leaving the land, mostly for economic reasons. The movement away from the farms of this country is more likely to accelerate than to diminish. Of course, not all the farms being deserted are being abandoned entirely, but enough are being foresaken to constitute a threat to our basic heritage, the soil. The time has come for the development of a new philosophy regarding this heritage. Through past decades, through all time, the prime interest of agriculture has been to cause the land to produce more abundantly and at the same time to protect it from deterioration and misuse. The objective has been to produce food for the peoples of the earth.

In these things we have been quite successful. There is not the slightest doubt that in Canada we can produce most of the food needs of our peoples. If we had to, technological advances are such that we could double our production in less than five years. But we would be able to do so only if the plant, the farms and the ranches were not allowed to fall into disuse and disrepair. Manufacturers do something about it when they get in a cost-price squeeze or a situation of overproduction in relation to the capacity of markets to absorb. One of the steps they take is to seek new items to add to their line, and new lines that will keep their productive capacity in use.

One of the steps that could be taken by Canadian agriculture would be to develop secondary outlets for agricultural production. As well as being the food basket for mankind, agriculture should become a supplier of raw materials for our great and growing processing industries. What the crops would be, what needs industry might have for raw materials, should be researched for possibilities. These possibilities then would require further research to determine potentials for fibres or for

chemicals and pharmaceuticals, and certain crops might be grown as sources of the need materials.

Most, or at least much of Canadian agricultural research has been into problems of new varieties, heavier producing varieties, improved livestock and poultry, quality control and improvement, and so on. The time has come for greater flexibility in agricultural research programs. In this the chemist must have a dominant role. Perhaps the chemist can be to agriculture what the physicist and the mathematician have been to atomic power and the conquest of space.

Who will get things started? It could well be the departments of agriculture, federal and provincial, and universities. But the problem and the need for a solution for the salvation of agriculture will require the support of the entire community. Such organizations as the chambers of commerce and any other associations with chemists and chemical engineers at the command of their members could play a big part in the revolution of agricultural philosophy.

There was a period in Canadian affairs that extended through many years prior to the 1930s when the annual reports of our banks, railways and other large corporations contained special mention by the president, general manager or chairman of the board of the state of Canadian agriculture. These reviews almost invariably were loaded with advice to farmers, most of it gratuitous and little of it of any real value to the man making a living from the farm. It seemed that every successful businessman was an expert, if self-appointed, on agriculture. This went out of fashion during World War II and, perhaps fortunately, was never revived.

The time has come for revival on the part of business and industry in the well-being of Canadian agriculture, and the time has come for a much more serious and practical approach to a solution of the problems that beset Canada's farmers and other land-based producers. Now is the time to take positive steps to protect the heritage of the Canadian people, the land, against deterioration and misuse. The penalty for failure to come to grips with the changing scene in these changing times will be awful in terms of erosion, drought, pestilence and human misery, with a new low in poverty.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. Before calling at six o'clock, does the House agree to allowing the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) to revert to Motions?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Business of the House

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

FEDERAL COURT OF CANADA—RESTORATION OF BILL TO STAGE REACHED AT SECOND SESSION

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions extending far back with respect to the bill respecting the federal court of Canada. Discussions have been renewed today and it is agreed that we could pass this motion which would put the federal court bill at the stage it had reached last session, with further points that will be apparent when I read the motion. So with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I move:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of any Standing Order or practice of this House, the version of the bill intituled an act respecting the federal court of Canada, as reported with amendments from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs on Wednesday, June 10, 1970, in the past session, be deemed to have been introduced, read a first time, ordered to be printed, read a second time, referred to and reported by a standing committee, and that the said bill be ordered to stand on the order paper for consideration by the House at the report stage on or after October 28, 1970; and

• (6:00 p.m.)

That, in addition to any motion or motions to amend the said bill to be filed during this session under the provisions of section 5 of Standing Order 75 in relation thereto, any motion or motions to amend the said bill filed in the prior session under the provisions of section 5 of Standing Order 75 in relation thereto shall be posted for consideration when the said bill is called in this session.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish only to say that the minister is quite correct in saying that there have been consultations and I am happy to confirm that the motion as he has read it out does cover all the points we wanted to be covered in connection with the reintroduction of this bill. We are happy to agree to this motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Mac T. McCutcheon (Lambton-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I wish to agree with the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and to state that our party agrees.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, our group is pleased to agree to the proposal.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The House has heard the motion moved by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen). Shall the motion carry?

Motion agreed to.

At 6.04 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, October 22, 1970

The House met at 11 a.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

JUDGES ACT

AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE FOR RESERVE JUDGES

Mr. Hyl Chappell (Peel South) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-173, to amend the Judges Act (reserve judges).

Some hon. Members: Explain.

• (11:10 a.m.)

Mr. Chappell: Mr. Speaker, this bill will allow judges to retire at age 70 rather than 75, provided they remain reserve judges until the age of 75. It is anticipated that these few extra judges would clean up backlogs of cases and make access to the courts faster.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

NATIONAL SECURITY

REASONS FOR INVOKING WAR MEASURES ACT—ACTIVITIES OF FRAP—STATEMENT BY MINISTER OF REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. Was one of the reasons for the government invoking the War Measures Act that the government had "good reason to believe that the FLQ, which, as a front, has the organization called FRAP running candidates in Montreal, wanted to disturb the election by explosions of all kinds and by further kidnappings or even shootings"?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I want to read from the same article that the hon. gentleman is reading from.

Mr. MacEwan: It is very interesting.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): In the statements from which he is quoting, my colleague, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, also said: "At this moment in Montreal...there is an election. There is no relation between our action and the election itself." That was made quite clear by my colleague.

Mr. Stanfield: Is the Minister of Justice prepared to answer the question I asked? I will repeat it if I may, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I doubt whether that is necessary. I am sure the minister heard the question and should indicate whether he wants to reply or not.

Mr. Stanfield: Would the minister answer my question, whether this is one of the reasons that the government invoked the War Measures Act?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): No, sir. The reasons have already been given in speeches made in this House.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh, no.

An hon. Member: What reasons?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): It was quite clear that the situation with which we were dealing is a situation that existed throughout the province of Quebec, as evidenced by the letters of Premier Bourassa and the Mayor of Montreal, Jean Drapeau, and I think that has been made perfectly clear in this House.

Mr. Stanfield: Since there is a municipal election in Montreal, I believe within four days, will the Minister of Justice make a full statement today in the House as to the reasons for the government believing that FRAP is a front for the FLQ, as alleged by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion outside the House? Surely the people of Canada and the candidates and people of Montreal are entitled to know the reasons.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for York South.

Mr. Stanfield: I have a supplementary question—

Mr. Lewis (York South): As a supplementary question—

Mr. Stanfield: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I will return to the Leader of the Opposition. I believe the hon. member for York South wishes to ask a supplementary. I apologize to the Leader of the Opposition. I did not realize he wanted to ask a further supplementary. We will return to him in a moment.

FRAP—STATEMENT BY MINISTER OF REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION—ACTION AGAINST MEMBERS OF ORGANIZATION

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a supplementary of the right hon. Prime Minister

and ask him whether the statement made by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion to the effect that FRAP was a front for the FLQ was a statement which the government approves of and, second, does that mean, as it seems to me to mean, that under the regulations the members of FRAP are members of an illegal organization and are subject to arrest?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Well, Mr. Speaker, on the second point the hon. member is entitled to his own legal interpretation, but on the first point the answer is no.

Mr. Lewis: May I then ask the Minister of Justice whether he or his department has considered, or whether he knows whether the Attorney General of Quebec has considered, applying the regulations against members and supporters of FRAP and, if not, would he say whether it is right to call it a front for an illegal organization?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I just answered that.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Obviously the second part of the question is not in order. Perhaps the first part of the question would be acceptable from a procedural standpoint, but certainly not the second part.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, if I may repeat the first part of the question, perhaps the Minister of Justice would give an answer. My question was whether, in view of the allegation made by a colleague of his, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, FRAP is now considered an illegal organization by him or the Attorney General of Quebec, and is action contemplated against those associated with it?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): It is quite clear, Mr. Speaker, that the responsibility for the application of these regulations in Quebec is the responsibility of the Attorney General of Quebec. I have not communicated with him on that particular subject.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister whether he proposes to make any statement in the House or to the public at large in view of the extraordinary and alarming statement made outside the House by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, particularly in view of the electoral circumstances that prevail in the city of Montreal?

Mr. Trudeau: My statement was very clear and sharp, Mr. Speaker. I answered the question of the hon. member for York South by a clear no.

[*Translation*]

SUGGESTED POSTPONEMENT OF MONTREAL MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a supplementary question of the right hon. Prime Minister.

[Mr. Lewis.]

Considering the tragic situation in Quebec, could he tell us if a member of his cabinet has been in contact with a minister of the Quebec government with a view to postponing indefinitely the municipal election in Montreal?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Not that I know of, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

REASONS FOR INVOKING WAR MEASURES ACT—ACTIVITIES OF FRAP——STATEMENT BY MINISTER OF REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, why ask other ministers when the minister in question has arrived?

An hon. Member: He just came in.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion whether the information he gave so blandly in Vancouver yesterday was well founded or is it—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The right hon. gentleman knows, of course, that the question cannot be asked in this form. It was asked in the correct form by other members who preceded him.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I want to find out from the minister whether it is true that one of the reasons for the War Measures Act being invoked by the government is the fact that this FRAP organization, or whatever it is called, in Montreal was regarded as an instrument of wrongdoing?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have indicated to the right hon. gentleman that the question cannot be asked of the minister in those terms. In relation to a statement made outside the House by a minister, a question may be asked of the Prime Minister, and this has been done.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, surely there is not being built around this government a wall of protection when the minister is in the House and he is asked to answer directly.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The rules are very clear and they are applicable to all members.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. No one is more deferential to Your Honour that I am, but I have heard questions like this asked over the years. Either the minister spoke out of his hat or was endeavouring without any information to influence the election. In either case Parliament never had this information. This is another reason that a full statement

should be made regarding the situation which resulted in the bringing in of the War Measures Act.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I cannot quarrel with the statement made by the right hon. gentleman but if a statement of this kind were to be made it would not be as the result of an inquiry of the minister in question, but a request of the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice. My impression is that this is what was requested previously during the question period. The hon. member for Egmont.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I noticed that the minister is rising. In view of the minister's direct intervention in the municipal election in Montreal, I wonder whether he is now prepared to make a statement to the House, particularly in view of the serious charges that were in fact made by the minister outside the House?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege.

We have no intention of interfering, either directly or indirectly, in the municipal election in Montreal. There is nothing to withdraw from the statement I made yesterday. However, there has obviously been some confusion due to the fact that, because of my imperfect command of the English language, I used the English word "front" instead of the French expression "caution morale". I shall clarify this outside the House.

[*English*]

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, in view of the danger of innuendo and smear, will the Prime Minister not agree that the time has arrived for full and concise information as to the exact nature of the apprehended insurrection as asked for earlier in the House?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I address a very simple question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. In view of the statement he is reported to have made, would he not agree to make a statement on motions—I am sure hon. members would gladly revert to motions now to give him the opportunity—explaining the statement he made about FRAP and giving the House the evidence on which he made that statement which has smeared a good many innocent people?

Mr. Stanfield: Dictatorship.

An hon. Member: Including his own friends.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Would the Minister of Justice, as the chief law officer of the Crown, discuss this matter with his colleague to ascertain if his colleague has facts in connection with which there should be further investigation, and then report his findings to the House?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have already discussed this matter with the Solicitor General. He is not in the House today.

Mr. Stanfield: That's too bad.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I have nothing further to add to what the minister has already said.

Mr. Diefenbaker: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Minister of Justice whether, in the discussions he has had with the Solicitor General, consideration was given to the fact that the remarks made by the minister in question come within the provisions of the Hate bill legislation?

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister of Justice would indicate whether any other action has been taken to prevent FRAP from distributing political literature or, in effect, to make inoperable an aspect of the political campaign now being waged in the Montreal municipal elections?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, as has already been said, the bringing into force of the War Measures Act has no relationship to the municipal elections.

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. In order to clarify certain matters, can the minister say in the House whether or not FRAP is a front for the FLQ?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands.

MONTREAL—REMOVAL OF FRAP ELECTION POSTERS IN UNIVERSITY SETTLEMENT

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Justice. Will he undertake to investigate whether or not the police entered the University Settlement in Montreal and required that FRAP election posters be taken down, on threat of imprisonment? Does he not consider this action if it is correct, to be an infringement of the rights of the people in that area with respect to municipal elections? Also, what action does he propose to take with respect to this matter?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I will ask my colleague, the Solicitor General, to look into the hon. member's question.

WAR MEASURES ACT—HOLDING INCOMMUNICADO OF THOSE DETAINED, RIGHT TO COUNSEL—AMENDMENT OF REGULATIONS

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I ask another question. Yesterday the

Minister of Justice made the following statement in the House, as reported at page 422 of *Hansard:*

> It is my understanding that those detained have been given the right to contact parents and friends so that their whereabouts may be known. The Attorney General of Quebec made a statement this morning dealing with the right to counsel.

In view of the statement made by the Attorney General of Quebec yesterday that more than 300 of the persons detained are going to be held incommunicado and denied the right to counsel, may I ask the minister if he can clarify the situation inasmuch as he appears to be making one statement and the Attorney General of Quebec appears to be making a totally different statement?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I do not accept the premise upon which the hon. member concluded his question. I should like to table later in the day—I do not have it with me now—the press release or statement issued by the Attorney General of Quebec, if I have the permission of the House. The Prime Minister has a copy here which we can table so that it will be clear to the House what the Attorney General of Quebec actually did say. I would be glad to table that copy now, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member have a supplementary question?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I would like to go on if I may, Mr. Speaker, to answer the substance of the question of the hon. member.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, could this statement be made an appendix to *Hansard*?

Mr. Speaker: Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Editor's Note: For text of statement referred to above, see appendix.*]

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): With reference to the statement contained in the hon. member's question that those arrested were to be held incommunicado, I refer to the headline in this morning's *Globe and Mail*, "Choquette will detain prisoners at least 21 days incommunicado". I think I can say that that headline misrepresents the situation that exists.

The information I have, after conferring with the office of the Attorney General of Quebec this morning, is that 369 persons have been arrested under the regulations under the War Measures Act and that up until yesterday afternoon 55 of those arrested had been released. I also understand from the office of the Attorney General of Quebec that at least 48 more either have been or will be released today.

It is true it was my understanding after discussions with Mr. Choquette that the Quebec government recognized that the arrested persons had the right to instruct counsel on their behalf, and I believe that arrangements either have been or are being made to permit this to be done. Mr. Choquette refers to that in the statement I just tabled. It is also my understanding from the press communiqué issued by Mr. Choquette that the police have already notified the families of those detained in any cases in which they were requested to do so.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In view of the fact that the minister and the federal government drafted these regulations, not the Attorney General of Quebec, and the minister must therefore accept responsibility, is the minister now prepared to amend the regulations in order to assure the people of Canada that the persons now being detained or any persons who may be detained under these regulations will have the clear and undisputed right to legal counsel and to communication with their families?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): What the government intends to do, Mr. Speaker, is to introduce legislation at an early date to replace the regulations. The Prime Minister wrote the leaders of the other parties, including the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, asking for suggestions as to what should be included in the legislation. We would appreciate receiving a reply as early as possible so that we can proceed with this legislation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): A supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has a further supplementary following which I will recognize the hon. member for Egmont.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The minister is quite right in stating that we received an invitation from the Prime Minister to submit our suggestions. We are in the process of doing so and he will have them either today or tomorrow. In view of the statement made by the Minister of Justice yesterday, as reported in this morning's paper and on television, that the present regulations will be transferred into a statute, I ask the minister, if that is the case, whether this means that the invitation for opposition parties to make suggestions is pure hypocrisy and a farce?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That question, of course, cannot be allowed.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Justice on a question of privilege.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I hoped this question was important enough that it would not descend into the political arena, something the hon. member is seeking to bring about.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: You started it.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Speaker: Order. It seems to me that this is not very helpful. I would think that the minister who has just spoken did not indicate that he had a question of privilege. This is, again, a point of debate. The minister has invited debate in the same way as the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands has done, and I think it would be as well at this point if I were to recognize the hon. member for Egmont.

WAR MEASURES ACT ARRESTS—SUGGESTED USE OF INDEPENDENT OBSERVERS

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Bearing in mind the resolution recently presented to the federal government and the government of Quebec by the Canadian Council of Churches, may I ask whether the Minister of Justice has yet had an opportunity to consult with the provincial Attorney General as to the possibility of following up the suggestion that independent observers be allowed access to people held in custody so that there may be a minimum of future embarrassment or difficulty created because of prolonged or unnecessary detention?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): I relayed that suggestion to the office of the Attorney General this morning along with the suggestion made yesterday by the right hon. member for Prince Albert.

[*Translation*]

WAR MEASURES ACT—OPINIONS EXPRESSED IN LETTERS TO PRIME MINISTER

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

Considering I am receiving hundreds of letters from all parts of Canada congratulating the government on its position in the present situation, could the Prime Minister tell us whether he himself is getting a considerable number of letters—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Caouette: There is no oh's or ah's about it. I want to know whether he is getting a great number of letters from all parts of Canada expressing the opinion of the general public, not that of the crackpots who are in Parliament.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The situation is not improving. I will now take a chance with the hon. member for South Shore.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Témiscamingue will have to wait a moment. I have already recognized the hon. member for South Shore.

* * *

[*English*]

PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS

NEW BRUNSWICK ELECTION—OPPORTUNITY TO VOTE FOR CAMP GAGETOWN TROOPS ON DUTY OUTSIDE PROVINCE

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): I shall direct my question to the Minister of National Defence, Mr. Speaker. At the present time New Brunswick troops are out of Camp Gagetown on duty in Quebec. Has the minister made any provision for absentee voting by servicemen on duty outside their own province? If not, what action will be taken to ensure that New Brunswick soldiers are not disenfranchised in the forthcoming election?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): This question relates to the right to vote and the provisions which allow for absentee voting or the service vote. It is a matter entirely for the law of New Brunswick and it is therefore not within the power of the federal government or this Parliament to change the provisions of that law so that these people may vote. I did indicate when I was in Gagetown yesterday that the primary consideration was that soldiers should be in a position to discharge the duties they are now discharging in the interest of national security. But if, as I sincerely hope, it is possible in the very near future to bring some of the men back to the Canadian Forces Bases we shall make a particular effort to get the RCR back to Gagetown so that they will be able to vote next Monday.

* * *

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL SECURITY

QUEBEC—WAR MEASURES ACT—SUGGESTED FREE VOTE AMONG UNION MEMBERS

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I am back again, not with a statement, but with a question for the Prime Minister.

According to this morning's news, the union leaders Pépin, Laberge and Carbonneau are requesting immediate suspension of application of the War Measures Act in order, they claim, to save democracy.

In view of these people's claim that they are speaking on behalf of their membership, which, incidentally, is unfounded, does the Prime Minister intend to suggest that those three feather-brained characters hold a free

vote among their members in order to realize that 90 per cent of them are in favour of legislation aimed at protecting—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

* * *

[*English*]

VETERANS AFFAIRS

MEASURES TO INCREASE BENEFITS PENDING WHITE PAPER ON SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): I wish to direct my question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Since there has been evidence of continuing delay in the tabling of the white paper on social security, will the minister tell the House what measures are to be introduced in the interim to increase benefits for veterans receiving allowances and disability pensions?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): That would be a more appropriate question to direct to my colleague, the Minister of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: I was under the impression that a similar question was addressed to the minister a few days ago, but since I am not sure, perhaps the hon. member might like to continue.

Mr. Marshall: May I simply redirect my question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs?

Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs): I am sorry. Would the hon. member kindly repeat his question?

Mr. Marshall: Because of the delay in bringing in the white paper on social security, would the minister advise the House what interim measures are being taken to increase benefits to war veterans receiving war veterans allowances and disability pensions?

Mr. Dubé: This matter is still under very active and sympathetic consideration and when a decision is made it will be announced in the proper way.

ELIMINATION OF RESIDENCE RULE IN RESPECT OF WAR VETERANS ALLOWANCES

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): In the course of the consideration of veterans benefits, is the position of war veterans who live outside Canada and who would otherwise qualify for war veterans allowance being reviewed so as to eliminate the arbitrary residence rule now in effect?

Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs): All these questions are being looked into at the present time.

CLOSING OF LONDON, ENGLAND, OFFICE—CONTINUATION OF SERVICE

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): I have a question, Mr. Speaker, having to do with Canadian veterans living in the United Kingdom. Is the Department of Veterans Affairs office in London being closed and, if so, who will be looking after the many Canadian veterans over there? Also, what is being done to provide positions for those who are being removed from the offices they have held?

Mr. Speaker: Again I have the impression that this question has already been asked but in view of the importance of the matter the minister might wish to reply.

Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs): This question was answered last week, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Diefenbaker: No. This question was not answered. More evasion!

* * *

CONSUMER AND CORPORATE AFFAIRS

GUIDELINES RESPECTING FALSE AND MISLEADING ADVERTISING

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Is he prepared to tell the House what the guidelines are that have been set down to determine what constitutes false and misleading advertising so that the Canadian people can be made aware of them?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Over a year ago I made a statement setting out certain instances of misleading advertising which we would endeavour to reach under section 33(d) of the Combines Investigation Act. That statement received wide publicity among better business bureaux and retail merchants associations, who have been very helpful and co-operative in our misleading advertising campaign, so I am not sure what the hon. member is referring to.

Mr. McGrath: May I ask, then, whether the minister has resolved his jurisdictional conflict concerning this matter with his counterpart in the province of Ontario?

Mr. Basford: Without offering a legal opinion I might say there is no view of which I am aware which expresses any doubt as to our jurisdiction to administer section 33(d) of the Combines Investigation Act.

ADVERTISEMENTS FOR NON-LEAD GASOLINE

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): My supplementary question has to do with misleading advertising, Mr. Speaker. It arises from the fact that the National Research Council has established that non-lead gasoline, when used in cars built prior to the recent models, causes greater air pollution, not less. Has the minister consulted with his officials to determine whether or not these advertisements for non-lead gasoline are contravening the misleading advertising regulations?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member appears to be inviting the minister to express a legal opinion. I doubt whether his question is in order.

Mr. Basford: I did not take the question as asking for a legal opinion, Mr. Speaker. All I can say is that we are examining all of the oil companies' advertising—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

ALLEGED CENSORSHIP OF CONTENTS OF UNIVERSITY STUDENT NEWSPAPERS

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): I should like to ask the Minister of Justice whether RCMP officers were acting on the instructions of the government when they warned university student newspaper editors that action would be taken against them if they distributed newspapers the contents of which had been questioned by the police?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): That question is phrased in terms too vague for me to answer. In any event, I will refer it by way of notice to the attention of the Solicitor General.

Mr. Orlikow: Will the Minister of Justice undertake an investigation and report back to the House regarding the censoring of student newspapers across Canada, especially of editorials arguing against the implementation of the War Measures Act?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I will look into the matter, Mr. Speaker, but there is nothing in the regulations to which reference was made earlier today that in any way implies censorship of news coverage or public comment.

Mr. Orlikow: That being the case, would the minister look into the question of whether in fact the police have been misusing the regulations in the way suggested?

* * *

AGRICULTURE

CATTLE—CHANGES IN BEEF GRADING SYSTEM—CONTINUED USE OF OPEN AUCTION BIDDING

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the serious concern of many cattle producers over pending changes in the beef grading system in Canada, which appear to indicate a much greater proportion of rail grading as a basis of settlement to the producer, what thought or consideration is being given to western beef producers who rely heavily on the facilities of the open auction markets where their cattle are exposed to the bidding of several buyers, which seems to be a very satisfactory competitive bidding arrangement?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest that the minister reply to this question briefly. It seems to me to be one of a very general nature which would normally call for a

statement on motions. If the minister can reply quickly and briefly, it will be acceptable in those terms.

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I will comply with your suggestion. I do not believe there will be any interference with or any basic change in the auction method of selling most cattle, but there is a plan that is being worked out by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, the Canadian Cattlemen's Association and others, with some co-operation from my department, to change some of the bases on which beef is graded. As far as I can tell there is no agreement on the question at the present time, and I think that more work will have to be done before a new grading standard becomes operational.

* * *

PUBLIC WORKS

CHURCHILL—CONCLUSION OF REDEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Public Works. Can the minister say whether an agreement between the federal government and the government of Manitoba has been finalized with respect to a redevelopment plan for the town of Churchill?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I might tell the hon. member that we advanced this proposal to the government of the province of Manitoba several months ago. Although no agreement has yet been concluded, we are hopeful.

Mr. Simpson: Can the minister say whether the matter of a $10 million redevelopment plan for Churchill has as yet been placed before cabinet?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would not think that that question is in order.

* * *

COMBINES

FARM MACHINERY PRICES—INVESTIGATION OF LACK OF DECREASE FOLLOWING FREEING OF CANADIAN DOLLAR

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The minister may recall that I contacted him some time ago in regard to this matter. In view of the continued increase in the price of farm machinery and repairs, much of which machinery is imported and should have been reduced in price following the freeing of the Canadian dollar, is this inequitable situation being investigated by his department and, if so, will the minister make a statement soon in this regard?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we have accepted the recommendation of the Barber report that, apart from what my colleague the Minister of Agriculture would do relative to farm machinery prices, the Combines Investigation

Branch should examine the situation, and they are. However, it is established policy that the work of this branch is not revealed until either charges are laid in court or notice of discontinuance has been filed.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

QUEBEC—MEASURES TO ELIMINATE DISCONTENT

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the right hon. Prime Minister.

In addition to the War Measures Act implemented to control terrorism, is the government considering the enactment of other measures of a social and economic character likely to eliminate the main causes of current dissatisfaction in some parts of the country?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's question is obviously very important but he will agree, I think, that such a wide-ranging inquiry normally requires a general answer which should be given on notices of motions.

* * *

[*English*]

GRAIN

WHEAT—AVAILABILITY OF SPACE FOR DELIVERY OF HIGHER GRADES

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Inasmuch as up until now emphasis has been placed on movement of low-grade wheat, I should like to ask the minister when he anticipates that deliveries may be made of the higher grades?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, this question was put the day before yesterday, and I indicated that the Wheat Board has this matter under advisement. There is, of course, a good supply of No. 1, 2 and 3 grades of wheat in the elevators and handling system. Therefore there is no immediate need for their delivery and the space is required for these other grades. However, I anticipate that before very long it will be possible to open the first quota of a general nature for wheat.

WHEAT—CLOSING OF 1968-69 POOL—ALLOCATION OF FUNDS TO MAKE UP DEFICIT

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. In view of the fact that an Order in Council has now been passed closing out the 1968-1969 wheat pool, can the minister indicate how much of the funds allocated for the purpose of making up the deficit for the 1968-60 pool account have actually been put to that purpose?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, certainly I can before long give the hon. member the exact figure, but if I understand the purport of the question correctly, the amount allocated in the previous estimates was all required for the fund and in fact an additional amount will be necessary.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

CONTINUATION OF DESTROYER CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM —COMPLETION OF COST REVIEW

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. May I ask the minister whether or not he or the government is in a position to indicate if the DDH-280 program will be cut back by either one or two ships? If not, can the minister indicate when the construction cost review will be completed?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I cannot indicate that at this time. I hope that in a matter of several weeks I shall be able to announce at least those details about the ships.

Mr. Forrestall: I wonder whether the minister could indicate whether or not, during the period of the construction cost review, work is going ahead on all four vessels?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that it is, but I would have to check that point. It is at least so far as the ones in an advanced stage of construction are concerned.

* * *

PENSIONS

ENTITLEMENT OF CANADIANS OF GERMAN ORIGIN TO BENEFITS EARNED IN WEST GERMANY

Mr. Keith Hymmen (Kitchener): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Can the minister advise the House about his recent trip to Germany and his discussions with West German authorities on the entitlement of Canadians of German origin to their earned pension benefits?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would think that this is a question that should be answered by a statement on motions. There may be some urgency that is not apparent to me, and if there is the hon. member is welcome to give notice for discussion at the time of adjournment.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

WAR MEASURES ACT—PUBLICATION OF NAMES OF THOSE ARRESTED

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Prime Minister. Is it

true that the decision of the government not to make public the names of those arrested under the War Measures Act was made because it would be embarrassing to certain people, and are these people private citizens or are they politicians?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Joliette.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

SUGGESTED FREE DISTRIBUTION OF MILK IN SCHOOLS AND HOSTELS

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Whereas several recommendations have been submitted to this effect, may I ask the Minister to tell us whether his department is working on the preparation of legislation providing for free distribution of milk in schools and hostels this year?

[*English*]

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): No, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

HARBOURS

COME-BY-CHANCE, NFLD.—PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE IN CONSTRUCTING DOCKING FACILITIES

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, may I address my question to the Minister of Public Works. Can the minister say whether approval has been given by his department to a request from the government of Newfoundland for assistance to construct docking facilities at Come-By-Chance, Newfoundland.

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, in this particular matter we are waiting for more particulars.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

HEALTH AND WELFARE

INCLUSION OF OPTOMETRIC SERVICES UNDER MEDICARE

Mr. W. C. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. As the minister is aware, optometric services do not qualify at the present time for federal shared-cost benefits under the Medical Care Act. In view of the fact that there are only 660 eye physicians in the country to serve 20 million Canadians and in view of the fact that 65 per cent of eye care is provided by—

Mr. Speaker: Order. This sounds to the Chair like a speech, or at least a mini-speech. The hon. member should get to his question.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Scott: I shall make it brief, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister have any plans to include optometric services in the shared-cost benefits under the Act?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): There are no definite plans at the present time. However, the matter will be discussed at the forthcoming federal-provincial conference of health ministers.

* * *

INFORMATION CANADA

DISSEMINATION OF GALLUP POLL FINDINGS

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct this question to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of Information Canada and welcome him back to the House and the country. Can he assure us that Information Canada is not inhibiting the dissemination of the findings of the latest Gallup poll which shows a substantial Progressive Conservative gain and a major Liberal decline?

Hon. Robert Stanbury (Minister without Portfolio): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INDUSTRY

TEXTILES—DATE OF INTRODUCTION OF BILL ESTABLISHING GOVERNMENT POLICY

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce?

On May 14 last, the Minister stated that he would soon submit a bill on textiles which would state government policy in this field. Is he in a position to advise when this legislation will be introduced?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, this will depend on the order of presentation of the various bills in this House. The bill involved here is just about ready and I hope it will be passed before Christmas.

* * *

[*English*]

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

NEWFOUNDLAND—FILING AND PAYMENT OF CLAIMS OF DISPLACED LINCOLN CONSTRUCTION COMPANY EMPLOYEES

Mr. Ambrose Hubert Peddle (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador): Mr. Speaker, my question was for the Minister of Labour who was here earlier but seems to have evaporated. I shall address it to his Parliamentary Secretary. With regard to the abrupt closing down of operations due to financial difficulties of Lincoln Construction Company in central Newfoundland, which has thrown

some 250 men out of work, will the minister assure the House that the unemployment insurance records of these men will be immediately obtained from the company and that special provision will be made to expedite the filing and payment of unemployment insurance claims of those who wish to apply?

Mr. Ray Perrault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I assure the hon. member that his question will be brought to the attention of the minister and that a reply will be sought to this important inquiry.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the President of the Privy Council would tell us the nature of the business of the House for the balance of this week and the beginning of next week.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, first of all I wish to advise the House concerning how we propose to conclude the debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. Today is the last full day, the eighth appointed day, but there is a period of two hours owing to the debate arising from the interruption to deal with the establishment of the Constitution Committee. It is proposed that these two hours will be provided tomorrow afternoon from three o'clock to five o'clock and that the question on the main motion will be put then and if a division is requested it will occur on the following Monday after the oral question period. I suggest that this arrangement might be made an order of the House.

Apart from the arrangement I propose in respect of the termination of the debate on the address, the business for tomorrow will be called in the order listed on the order paper. The first order of business is government order No. 7, Bill C-2, in respect of the Canada Shipping Act—pollution. The second is government order No. 8 in respect of Bill C-3 concerning investment companies. The third is government order No. 9, Bill C-4 respecting the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act. The fourth is government order No. 10, Bill C-5 respecting Deuterium of Canada Limited.

Monday's business will be a continuation of Friday's business in the same order. Tuesday will be an allotted day under the auspices of the Official Opposition. On Wednesday we will deal with the report stage of the federal court bill which was restored to the order paper last evening. On Thursday we will conclude the federal court bill and follow with any outstanding business left over from Monday. I hope that on Monday next we will deal with the five references to committees standing in my name on today's notice paper. This, however, will be subject to further discussions with the parties opposite.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Peddle.]

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The House resumed, from Wednesday, October 21, consideration of the motion of Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Halton.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rud L. Whiting (Halton): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also wish to thank hon. members who greeted my rising to speak in the way they did. This is greatly appreciated, I assure them.

When I visit, as I regularly do, the communities of Acton, Erin, Georgetown, Milton and Oakville in my riding which I have the great honour to represent I try as often as I can to visit the local news media in these communities because I find that the people who represent these media can provide me with further information concerning what is happening in these communities. I also like to think I can provide them with additional information concerning various government policies. However, Mr. Speaker, I do from time to time receive calls from the news media. Sometimes I am asked to come down and visit the newspaper offices in my riding if there should be something in particular the people in these offices wish to discuss with me. This happened last April.

I received a call from the daily *Journal-Record* of Oakville. I was asked if I would come down to their office as they had something of importance to show me. When I arrived there I was taken to a room which I thought was a storage room. I was right; it was a storage room. There were boxes piled high containing envelopes, books, folders, brochures and everything imaginable made out of paper. This is what they had received from the federal government and various federal agencies over the last 12 months. It amounted to 185 pounds of paper which had not been opened, which had not been looked at, which was not wanted and which could not be used by this particular newspaper. To say that I was shocked or surprised is a gross understatement. Upon leaving the newspaper office I did a quick survey of other newspapers in my riding. I found out that they received the same material the Oakville daily *Journal-Record* had received. What did they do with this material? They put it in file No. 13, the wastepaper basket.

• (12:00 noon)

This prompted me to place on the order paper last March four questions which I would like to read to the House at this time if I may. Question No. 1: How many newspapers across Canada, both weeklies and dailies, received unsolicited materials such as newsletters, press releases, books and other documents from the various government departments during the year 1968-69? Question No. 2: What were the actual mailing costs involved?

Question No. 3: How much did it cost the respective departments to provide this material in those years? Question No. 4: How much of a saving could be realized by these departments, apart from mailing costs, if these unsolicited services to newspapers were cancelled?

When I received the answers to these questions—and I will not go into detail on the answers at this time—I was perplexed. The 18 departments which replied admitted spending $74,331.15 on these materials. Some departments noted that their figures did not include labour costs because they considered such work to be a routine part of their staff's duties. But this was an essential part of the information I requested. So the actual cost would, I think, be substantially more than the $74,331.15 of which I was informed.

Mr. Patrick Nicholson, feature columnist for the Thompson group of newspapers, did a survey of some 40-odd newspapers on this subject which revealed that this unsolicited material was used only rarely, that any important news that it contains is disseminated immediately by the Canadian Press wire service, and that in any event many of the releases were received too late to be of any value.

When you receive material that you do not ask for, do not want and do not need, you throw it out. It is what is called junk, and I would classify this as junk mail. In my opinion it is an insult to good business practices. Supporting this viewpoint are the findings of the task force on information which reported to the government last November. It issued a damning indictment of the information apparatus dispensing publicity for the myriad of departments and agencies that make up the federal government. The report said that the apparatus was characterized by duplication, incompetence and outright bungling, and it implied that its $148 million annual cost is almost a total waste.

Armed with these facts I went to Information Canada and laid this information before them. I had the impression that Information Canada agreed that this was a profitless way of communicating. I sincerely hope that the government will consider and support this viewpoint. I am not saying that this information should not be produced or should not be sent out, but I maintain that a mechanism must and should be found to make it more selective.

This government has urged the farmers, the industrialists and the businessmen of Canada to diversify. The government does not have to urge our national railroads to do this because that is exactly what they are doing. They are diversifying to the point where they have forgotten what their prime purpose is—to provide transportation of all types to the Canadian people. What disturbs me about this situation is that we, Members of Parliament, have very little to say about it. When people in my riding ask me: "What about the CNR, they are doing this and they are doing that", I have to admit to them that I have virtually no control over the activities of this government corporation. Yet every year the CNR comes hat in hand looking for money from the Canadian taxpayer, and we, the Members of Parliament, are asked to approve these appropriations.

I would like now to outline some of the problems being faced in my riding that are caused by the CNR. In Oakville we have numerous railway crossings. Three of them in particular, on Kerr Street, Chartwell Road, and the Ninth Line, are causing motorists especially much concern as trains are blocking these crossings a large percentage of the time and it is very difficult to lay a charge against the railroads for blocking a crossing for over five minutes. This is something that we could rectify by strengthening the governing legislation. Not only is this annoying but there is a safety hazard involved because located near the railway crossing on Chartwell Road in Oakville is a fire station. If a train were stopped on that crossing for a considerable length of time, not only could it have but it would have an effect on the fire engines and other fire-fighting apparatus getting to the place where they were required.

• (12:10 p.m.)

I move along, Mr. Speaker, to another community in Halton, the town of Milton, where some years ago the CNR built a bypass around the town. They required much fill in order to lay the tracks. What did the CNR do in this case? They opened up a pit and laid to waste approximately 60 acres of land. They broke every rule of conservation. When they were finished it was nothing but a wasteland. It used to be reasonably good farm land.

What happened when it rained? The top soil had been removed, and so the rain worked its way down to a pond which had been built as Milton's centennial project in Centennial Park. There are fish in that pond, Mr. Speaker. This pollution, and that is what it is, cannot help but have a detrimental effect on the life of the fish in the pond. In addition to making the pond a very unsightly place, what was once clear water now becomes very murky after a rain storm and takes days to clear up.

When this was brought to the attention of the CNR what did they do? They said, "We are not responsible for this; in no way can we be blamed for this," when in fact, Mr. Speaker, the blame lay firmly with them. I personally took up this matter with the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) whose department prosecutes—maybe that is too strong a word—looks after or investigates pollution caused by Crown corporations. The people of Milton and I are most grateful to him for his fast action. He sent out some of his officials and they looked at the situation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I am sorry I have to rise to inform the hon. member that under the rules his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous agreement that the hon. member continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Whiting: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members.

Officials of the Department of the Minister of National Health and Welfare went there and proved conclusively that the CNR was the cause of pollution and, Mr. Speaker, the matter is being rectified. The question I want to ask is: Why is it that the CNR in so many cases has to be pushed, has to be goaded, has to be pressured into rectifying such matters? Why do they not say, "Yes, we are the cause of this problem. We readily admit it. We are sorry and we will do something about it." But no, they adopt this belligerent attitude time after time.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think the most classic example of CNR bureaucracy took place in the town of Acton. This town is now virtually without railroad service emanating from it. The service has been transferred to the city of Guelph. The methods employed by the CNR to deprive this community of railroad service should be enunciated. Trains that used to stop at Acton now whistle right by. This means that anybody wanting to get on a train or off a train at Acton can no longer do so. This means that freight and express have to be picked up elsewhere, in Guelph. Then the CNR moved in and took out the telegraph service—

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Whiting: —leaving the town virtually without railroad service. But they had an agent in Acton, Mr. Speaker, and he had very little to do. Quite obviously, if there were no trains stopping there and no services to perform, what could he do? Well, Mr. Speaker, he had a telephone, and then they came and took his telephone out. Then, Mr. Speaker, they made application to the Canadian Transport Commission to remove the agent from Acton.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Whiting: He had nothing to do, and this was the first time that the people of Acton had any meaningful way to present their case against the injustices done by the CNR. We had a hearing in Acton last January and the pseudo-experts of the CNR, armed with their slide rules and brief cases bulging with data, much of it irrelevant, arrived there, and we put up a battle. I thought we put up a good battle, but when the ruling came down from the Transport Commission, Acton was without railroad service.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Whiting: They upheld the CNR.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

• (12:20 p.m.)

Mr. Whiting: After this ruling came down I could see just what would happen. The CNR flexed their muscles and said, "We won, we won. Now let us go and take away passenger service from Guelph to Toronto". This would deprive Georgetown, a town of some 16,000 people, of passenger service. Hearings were held in the city of Guelph which were attended by many members from both sides of this House. We worked together in trying to convince the Canadian Transport Commission that this should not be done. Strange as it may seem, the commissioners in this case said to the CNR: Whoa, hold it; you can just go so far in this matter. And they ordered the CNR not only to continue passenger service from Guelph to Toronto but to update the service and bring it into this part of the twentieth century. This is what I want to urge the CNR to do. The CNR should bring its passenger service from Toronto to Guelph up to date.

The coaches they are using are of early twentieth century vintage. They are drafty, dirty and uncomfortable. In no way would anybody ride in these coaches if they did not have to.

If the CNR would look on passenger service as a means of conveying people and as a money-maker and would tailor the service to that need by running trains at proper hours, I think we would see a great change in the financial picture regarding passenger services. I believe and I have advocated on more than one occasion in the House that the time has come when we must develop a national transportation policy in this country. We cannot have our railroads closing down lines indiscriminately. We must look at the broad picture because the railroads did a great job in building this country. They still have an important role to play in the further development of Canada.

I thank hon. members for allowing me to go over my time. I know this is a subject which concerns many and I urge the government to act on my suggestions and the suggestions made by others. We should adopt a national rail policy and bring the CNR, this Crown corporation, closer to Parliament. We could then have more to say about its operation. This could be done if at least one Member of Parliament were appointed to the board of directors of this Crown corporation.

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, in the concluding days of the debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne I appreciate having the opportunity to say a few words. At the risk of being repetitious, but I hope not redundant, I should like to congratulate the mover of the address, the hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel), and the seconder, the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas). They can now join that great fraternity of movers and seconders who have taken their place in this great chamber down through the history of Canada.

I propose to make a comparison between the first Speech from the Throne and the last Speech from the Throne I have heard in this place. I have heard about 15 Speeches from the Throne since I have been a member of this House, and I think it would be wise for us to take a minute or two to look at the first Speech from the Throne I heard in 1957. I might say that it is only two columns in length compared with the five columns of the speech we are debating today. With the new format of

Hansard these columns are almost twice as wide as they were with the old format.

We look to the Speech from the Throne to show some imagination, some vision, some great forethought and some programs to promote production, as well as ways to put people and money to work; indeed, we would even expect to find that more so in this Speech from the Throne as we have just completed the decade of the sixties and have now launched into the decade of the seventies. We should be looking forward to great horizons, visions and ideas. We do not seem to find this in the Speech from the Throne. If we were to describe it in the language of the late Mr. Churchill we might say: Never has so much been written about so little.

Let me quote a few passages from the first Speech from the Throne I heard:

> You will accordingly be asked to maintain modern defence forces—

It then states:

> In domestic affairs my ministers look forward to meeting next month with the leaders of the provincial governments—

Then it goes on:

> In the legislative program to be laid before you, it is fitting that mention should first be made of measures to improve the lot of the senior members of our society. Accordingly you will be asked to increase old age security pensions and to shorten the period of residence required to qualify for them. Changes will be proposed in the terms of assistance offered to provincial governments to enable them to increase the payments to be made under the Old Age Assistance Act, the Blind Persons Act and the Disabled Persons Act—

Then it states:

> You will also be asked to increase the scale of war veterans allowances and to enlarge the groups to whom they are paid. Changes will also be proposed in several sections of the Pension Act.
>
> In order to assure to the farmers of Canada a fair share of the national income, you will be asked to enact a measure to provide greater stability in the prices of their products. Every possible effort is now being made, and will continue to be made to seek new markets for agricultural products—

Then it goes on to state:

> Due to inability to market their grain, prairie farmers have for some time been faced with a serious shortage of funds to meet their immediate needs.

It also says we will be asked to discuss an advance payments program and we are told that the government will strive to secure additional markets for the products of our fisheries.

• (12:30 p.m.)

That speech also says that a national development policy will be carried out in co-operation with the provinces in "developing the resources of this great nation." The Roads to Resources Program constituted part of this development program. It says also that there is to be an immediate start on a program for the production and transmission of cheaper hydroelectric power in the Atlantic provinces. It goes on to say, "You will also be asked to provide assistance in financing the Beechwood project which has been under construction in New Brunswick." It goes on to say:

> My ministers will advance this national development policy further by initiating new discussions with the government of Saskatchewan in order to make possible the early commencement of construction of the dam on the South Saskatchewan river—
>
> My ministers will place before you a measure to ensure that those working in industries under federal jurisdiction will receive annual vacations with pay.

And so it goes, Mr. Speaker. That is what is contained in the first throne speech I had the privilege of hearing. It was short, crisp and to the point. It outlined all the government's projects and all the business and administrative measures it proposed to bring before the House.

What do we find in the Speech from the Throne we are now debating? We find many platitudes. I shall mention two or three of them, because the speech contains a few gems. On reading it one could suppose it is a report on the state of the nation's business. It does not put forward what we hope the government will do. As a matter of fact, I think one can prove this point by referring to the speeches which have been made by government members of this House. In those speeches the ministers dealt with subject matters that should have been dealt with in the Speech from the Throne, and they dealt with them as they considered they ought to have been dealt with. I think that proves my point, that the speech is really a report on the state of the nation's business.

I said I would pick out a few sentences from the speech we are considering. The following phrase is most enlightening. It ought to be included in any speech:

> The passing of the sixties and the beginning of the seventies—

Another sentence tells us that man must anticipate and plan. Still another tells us that:

> As Canada moves into the seventies, we are all invited to join in this bold enterprise—to share the excitement, to face the challenge, to pursue the distant ideal of a just society.

The speech does not spell out how this is to be achieved. Now I am about to quote a real "dandy".

> Every Canadian is a consumer of goods and services, millions of Canadians are employees.

Is that not a truly bold statement?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hales: The speech tells us that we may expect many white papers. Perhaps they will bring forward some explanations. It also states:

> It would be irresponsible to suggest that the economy is now in a satisfactory condition. When costs rise more rapidly than productivity, when men and women are unable to gain employment, when a reasonable distribution of the wealth of Canada is denied to certain sectors or regions, then these are matters for deep concern.

That is another profound statement. Has that not been the case ever since Canada became a nation? The speech also says:

So long, however, as Canadians who desire work are unable to find it; so long as persons on fixed incomes are unable to provide adequately for themselves and their dependants; then so long must the government strive to assist them.

There are some other "dandy" statements in the speech. It goes on to say:

An economy that is in need of adjustment; a society beset by a variety of tensions; an environment that has been abused and degraded; an international community that is under intense pressures—these are the problems that demand our urgent attention.

They certainly demand our urgent attention. The statement I am about to read is hardly appropriate under present circumstances, considering that the War Measures Act has been invoked:

A society is said to be judged best by the compassion and the fairness with which it treats those of its members who breach or are accused of breaching the norms of conduct which it establishes for itself. The Canadian record in this respect is of a high standard—

I am afraid that we shall all have to back-peddle with regard to that statement. I wanted to compare the Speech from the Throne that I had the privilege of hearing when first elected with the speech now being debated. It is always easy to criticize and it is much harder to be constructive. From now on I propose to be somewhat constructive.

I am at a loss to know why the Speech from the Throne did not deal with the results of some of the many trips which members of the House have taken. Let me begin with the Prime Minister, who went to the Far East. He visited Japan and Tokyo and had a ride on that great Tokaido express, sometimes known as the Bullet train, which it was my privilege to ride on with a group of parliamentarians when we visited Japan in June. I was amazed at the rapidity of that train and at its cleanliness and smoothness. We went from Tokyo to Osaka, a distance of about 300 miles, in a little over three hours, travelling at 135 miles an hour. I wonder why the Speech from the Throne has not mentioned the subject of transportation in this great country of ours. Why did the Speech from the Throne not lay down a long-term program for transportation in Canada?

Let us get away from the ad hoc development we have seen in this area and the curtailment of transportation services which has been discussed in the House so ably by the hon. member for Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo (Mr. Howe) and the hon. member for Hull (Mr. Isabelle). They spoke of the curtailment of transportation services, and particularly of the fact that the CNR has been discontinuing passenger train service. The hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) told us yesterday that in the great area north of Guelph, a city that I represent in this House, an area encompassing Owen Sound, Mildmay, Walkerton and other centres, the railway has discontinued its passenger train service. The people in that area are without passenger train service.

It seems to me that this government intends to increase our urban sprawl by developing the larger centres instead of trying to spread out the population and develop some of the rural areas of the country. Actually, we in Guelph have not too much to complain about, because the railways left alone the train service between Guelph and Toronto—at least, they left us the commuter train. It is to remain in service for a year at least, and then the matter will be reviewed. If the railways do not improve the quality of the coaches and do not give the people the type of service they expect, they will find that people will not want to use their trains. There is no reason why that commuter train should not be staffed with a stewardess in the morning who could deliver the morning newspaper to commuters so that they could read the morning news. There is no reason why they should not serve coffee on the train, why it should not be clean and why the windows should not be clean enough for one to look out of them. If the railways continue to display the attitude: "Well, we do not want any passenger business; we want to get rid of it," then, in future they will wish to discontinue operating this one commuter train between Guelph and Toronto.

May I refer again to the broad question of our transportation problems. I should have thought that the government, in the Speech from the Throne, would have been wise to say: Look, to begin with we are embarking on a 15-year program under which we will build a railway line from Montreal to Windsor, and the service to be provided is to be similar to that provided by the rapid Bullet train of Japan. During the first years of the program the crossings could be removed, and then subsequently station platforms could be elevated so that people would be able to step off the train onto a platform. No steps would be needed for one to get on or off trains. The equipment would then be planned and developed. We would then have a train that could travel between Montreal and Windsor in three hours.

• (12:40 p.m.)

It would have been better to buy some of the sub-marginal land around Kingston, a solid rock area, and establish a large international airport there to handle the jumbo jets. Passengers leaving the jumbo jets could then take the Torpedo train, arriving in either Montreal or Toronto in an hour's time. Vision and foresight of this kind are required with regard to the over-all transportation system of Canada, but this is not in the Speech from the Throne.

We must bear in mind that the density of population between Montreal and Windsor is in the southern part of the country. Surely there are enough people in this area to support a train similar to the one I had the privilege of travelling on in Japan. If this nation is going to develop, grow and progress we need more forward planning than what we have at the present time.

The first Speech from the Throne to which I referred dealt with the Roads to Resources program, how we would develop the Arctic, the northern part of Canada.

An hon. Member: And we did.

Mr. Hales: We did. At the time we were criticized for speaking about roads from igloo to igloo. We no longer

hear that expression. The program is being enlarged rather than curtailed.

The Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development, the Constitution Committee, the Science Council of Canada and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) have travelled throughout the Arctic. The Speech from the Throne does not state how the northern area of our country will be further developed.

A group of cabinet ministers visited some Latin American countries. On their return they made a short report. I thought they would have some ideas about improving trade, but the Speech from the Throne does not outline any proposals for trade with these countries. We must give very serious thought to the matter of trade.

Not long ago we used to hear the words, "If the United Kingdom enters the European Common Market", but now the words are, "When the United Kingdom enters the Common Market". What will happen when it does enter the Common Market? There are no outward views or visions with regard to this in the Speech from the Throne. Where are we going to pick up the trade we are bound to lose? The United Kingdom will be obligated to buy many products from members of the European Common Market when they become a member.

I wish to refer to some of the larger volume items of export to the United Kingdom. The figures I am using are for 1967. I am sorry they are not more recent. I am quoting from the Canada Year Book, 1969. When the United Kingdom enters the European Common Market what will happen to the dairy products, eggs and honey that we have been exporting to them? I will use round figures when quoting. Some of our exports to the United Kingdom in 1967 where dairy products, eggs and honey, $10.5 million; wheat, $123 million; wheat flour, $6.5 million; vegetables and vegetable preparations, $22 million; flaxseed, $10.5 million; office machines and equipment, $7 million. All these products are either grown or manufactured by members of the European Common Market. West Germany will be able to sell office machines and equipment to the United Kingdom at a cheaper rate than it costs for Canada to ship this equipment to the United Kingdom. This is a very serious matter. We should be projecting ideas of how we can overcome these calamities that are going to befall this country if we are not prepared to meet them. There is nothing in the Speech from the Throne about that.

While speaking about transportation I neglected to mention proposed areas for a new airport as an auxiliary to Malton airport. Apparently four or five areas are being considered for an auxiliary airport, one of which is Beverly township in my constituency. This area is close to the cities of Dundas, Hamilton, Galt and Guelph. The area has been surveyed and tests have been taken. I point out that the people of that area do not want an auxiliary airport. It would be very foolish to build an airport there because of the congestion and heavy population that already exists in that area. It would be better to build it somewhere to the north and west of Hamilton. Other areas have made representations to the minister stating that they would like the airport built in their area. From all outward appearances it would be much wiser to establish this airport in Amaranth township or the general area north and west of Toronto.

There are many other matters that should have been included in the Speech from the Throne. I now wish to deal briefly with the subject of agriculture.

When we pause to think of the mess that agriculture in this country is in today, we must lower our heads in shame. Over $100 million was spent so that the farmers of western Canada would not grow grain. Including the cost of all those who are paid to enforce this measure, the final figure will probably be near $200 million. The western farmers were told, "Do not grow grain. Do not produce what you are capable of producing. We are going to pay you not to grow grain." This was said at a time when in many parts of the world people are starving. They do not have the proper nutrition and food.

• (12:50 p.m.)

We would have done much better had we taken that $200 million we are spending on the Lift Program and bought an equivalent amount of stored wheat and given it to people in countries where they are in great need of it. Instead, we paid farmers $6 an acre not to grow it, and if they put their land into summerfallow we gave them $10 an acre. While we build up all this wheat in Canada, there are children going to bed here in our own country unfortified by good red-blooded meat or high protein food. Why? Because we do not have the cattle in Canada to make use of this surplus wheat. This is the result of lack of foresight and proper planning. Given proper planning there would be more pasture land in western Canada and a large cow-calf operation enabling us to use the grain to produce beef for as many as need it. Yet we have outstanding departments of agriculture in our universities and experimental farms across the country upon which millions of dollars have been spent. We have a federal Department of Agriculture staffed by highly-paid officials, knowledgeable people paid by this and other governments to project, plan and lay out programs.

When one thinks of it, it is really terrible that we should have let ourselves get into this position. And while we pay our farmers not to grow wheat we are importing about nine pounds of meat per capita from other countries—beef, lamb and so on. So we run a poor shop, really; we have made a mess of things in the field of agriculture, and all this time we are paying people a great deal of money to give advice. I do not blame the government. They pay people to give them advice and program these things. Of course, ministers can accept or reject that advice. But there have not been enough ideas coming forward, and that is where the trouble lies.

I have been saying for many years that we must find some alternative use for wheat apart from feeding it to human beings or to livestock. With the great sources of knowledge and research available today I am not sure but that we cannot make wallpaper out of wheat or ladies' silk stockings, for that matter. I suppose we can do almost anything of that sort today; yet we sit idly by letting the grain pile up. I will give one example. During

the first world war, Germany was in real difficulty. So what did they do? They took the humble potato and from that potato they refined gasoline which they used to run war machinery. If you can do that with a potato, what can you do with wheat? I criticize those who lack the mental air conditioning to put forward ideas in this field. This is what will put Canada on the road to being a great country.

If we continue to be presented with Speeches from the Throne such as the one before us, with its lack of imagination, lack of program planning and lack of foresight, this country will not move ahead. It will stand still.

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I should like very much to join with previous speakers in this debate in congratulating the mover (Mr. Trudel) and seconder (Mr. Douglas, Assiniboia) of the address on their comments as well as all previous speakers who have made reference to housing and urban affairs.

One of the important things we are talking about in this debate is choice—the ability and the responsibility to support and to continuously re-create in this country, in myriad ways and at every level, choices as to the kind of Canada Canadians want it to be.

Canada began under that imperative, Canada is evolving under that imperative, but a new ethic insists upon consideration of two chief things. First, that the traditional decision-makers of power must move over a little so that choice devolves upon the greatest numbers of people, people who are well enough informed to choose on considered merits; and, second, that the bases of choice have changed for many of us along with the growing material wealth, complexity, and concentration of our society. There is a growing recognition, for instance, that economic growth for growth's sake, to put it crudely, must be increasingly tempered by considerations, by choices, which put growth at the service of the social comfort and stimulation of Canadians.

These are not quite yet truisms for everyone but they form the goals of this government and, I believe, of other governments in Canada. Certainly they are at the very heart of the proposed formation of the ministry of state for urban affairs and housing. They are both its reason for being and the guidelines within which it intends to operate. Choices, evolved with a degree of understanding never before reached in Canada, must urgently be made as we move at rather an unnerving pace into a Canada which, it is predicted, will be 94 per cent urban within the next 30 years. We see a Canada developing, 73 per cent of whose population is likely to be established in only 12 major centres, a Canada whose population will soon have doubled, about 45 per cent of that doubled population living in only three great foci of national power, Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver. In these three places will be found vast numbers of people, if that is what we want, like New York, Chicago and Tokyo.

The Deputy Speaker: I am sorry to interrupt the minister but it now being one o'clock I do leave the chair to resume it at two o'clock.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

[Mr. Hales.]

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, before lunch I was making reference to the need for all of us in elected office to provide the mechanism whereby Canadians can exercise their choice under all reasonable conditions. I was also referring to the demographic projections for this country over the next 30 years, to a Canada with double its present population, 45 per cent of which would be located in Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver. I was comparing that series of events within the profile of what has happened in large cities south of the border and in other countries.

We start the question leading to choice by asking whether we want our cities to look like those cities, and whether they should act as cities have been acting in places like Chicago, Los Angeles, Detroit, New York and Tokyo. The whole process of rapid urbanization is pretty well inexorable. The sharpest pace of that growth is upon us now, in the decade 1970 to 1980. In the next three decades we will have to build a capacity to cope with what will be, in terms of numbers, a second Canada. We must now ask ourselves whether this urban Canada is to continue just to grow relatively uncontrolled, in a misshapen and unclean way, in a way that is too often inequitable.

Instead, I would prefer to think of a Canada of choice, of many co-operative choices; a Canada informed by consultative and co-ordinated efforts to create our own distinctive excellence. It can be a Canada that avoids the widespread social despair and the awful social unrest that growth run rampant has brought to other areas and which we have seen in very recent days so very close to us. This is not, let me emphasize, "airy-fairy" idealism; it is a pragmatic and practical approach, one that is within our competences.

In this country we still have the time and the resources to write our own urban history in terms of our own vision, rather than just have it happen. We can begin to give our environments a shape and a humanity of our own. We can choose environments that have clean spaces for people and that have deliberately blurred lines of social cleavage; environments that provide for the weakest a crucial sense of worth; environments that provide personal and family privacy while giving a sense of belonging, a sense of community without which few of us can cope with life.

Let me repeat the words I have just used—consult, co-operate, co-ordinate. These are meant to be neither soothing motherhood words nor words to gloss over any supposed lack of real intentions by this government. They are, in fact, precise indicators of how we will approach the problems posed by rapid urbanization in Canada at the federal level, as well as in our dealings with the provincial governments, who bear the primary responsibility, and with the municipalities that exist in the provinces.

• (2:10 p.m.)

So that this is understood absolutely and unequivocally, let me quote my own words which were read for me in a speech in Montreal on October 8, the day the government's proposed formation of this ministry was announced:

> And the federal government today recognizes in a concrete way that it is deeply involved, in myriad but often unco-ordinated ways, in the problems of Canadian cities already; it recognizes that it must transform that involvement in much more integrated ways. These will be ways, I want to emphasize to you, in which the watchword will be scrupulous and careful co-operation with the provincial governments and, through them, with muncipal governments. A co-ordination of federal roles affecting the cities—yes. Federal intrusion into areas not its own—no. Federal co-operation, consultation—maybe even some degree of joint planning if the provinces wish—yes. Federal movement into new jurisdictions, wielding new powers—no—not anywhere in Canada.

So, it is within the present constitutional boundaries that we will work. The constitution does not need to be bent, or broadened to implement an urban policy of choice. If we can get the kind of reasearch, planning and program co-ordination and co-operation that we hope for, if we can get the three levels of government working together in much greater concert, we can begin to stop duplication and waste, programs that conflict, programs that are instituted to solve one problem without real regard for other problems they may cause. We can begin to get decisions on whether we in fact want our cities to develop unconstrained; and if we do not want that, we can find alternatives to proffer.

This ministry of state for urban affairs and housing will first of all be concerned with bringing order in the federal House as it affects the cities. I need hardly note for hon. members how massively the federal government is in the cities already. We have powerful direct impact through housing, land assembly and sewage programs, with a great influence on the location, growth and structure of urban areas.

We have a similar influence through our use of a very great deal of urban space federally owned or leased, and an influence in taxes paid, urban demands created and incomes earned. I am thinking of where we locate public buildings, airports, railways, harbours, military centres, communications facilities and a score of other things.

There are now 112 federal programs involving financing elements of the urban process, and 131 research programs applying to elements of the urban process. There are 27 departments and agencies which have influence of one degree or another in the cities. I am afraid that in large part the federal departments and agencies have not worked well enough and interdependently enough with each other, and with provincial and city governments. We need not feel entirely ashamed or alone. No country has done this in a way that consciously seeks out and sets priorities, and that rationalizes scarce national resources, as we hope to do. We hope to make the federal involvement in the cities no longer a series of unconnected initiatives but parts of a better understood urban whole. Inevitably, there are federal, provincial and municipal considerations to almost everything done in that light so that anything less than effective tri-level co-operation simply cannot work.

We will co-ordinate and integrate the federal urban role in various ways. For example, the minister of state in cabinet and cabinet committees, and in bilateral and inter-departmental arrangements, will be involved with his colleagues in urban overviews of the various plans of other federal departments and agencies. There will be a secretariat, headed by a person with the rank of deputy minister, that will fully review the federal efforts in urban affairs and through consultation and agreement will carry further through the government systems the work of rationalizing, co-ordinating and planning. This secretariat is being put together now, Mr. Speaker, as an important research, policy planning, consultative and co-ordinative instrument.

An initial research process has already produced important understandings for us, and a report of this will shortly be made available to hon. members and to others. Now, our efforts will be expanded to draw together the very scarce human resources in this field to plan and work out possible priorities and strategies. We will hope to attract the best minds now diffused through governments, industries and universities and to return them again to governments, universities and industry in a continuous and cross-fertilizing stream. I sincerely feel that this more rational approach between governments and within the federal government will serve to protect provincial jurisdiction, helping to forestall past experiences when unco-ordinated federal departmental programming inadvertently distorted provincial and municipal priorities. That often happened simply, though irritatingly, because the effect of one federal program on another or on a provincial initiative was not considered in an urban context.

In addition to an urban secretariat, of course, the ministry shall have reporting to it, and increasingly co-ordinated into a more total urban effort, the Crown agencies of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation and the National Capital Commission. Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation's capital and expenditure budget is a potent force, and hon. members will know that I have switched its direction to the provision primarily of low income housing. Early this year, Mr. Speaker, as part of that low income housing program I earmarked $200 million of CMHC's budget toward encouraging specifically innovative, experimental ways of providing good quality housing for people earning between about $4,000 and $6,000 a year. The $200 million, and a little more, has been approved for 97 projects consisting of more than 17,000 dwelling units. They are projects involving novel techniques of construction, land use, financing, and they result from co-operation by CMHC, builders, non-profit groups, municipalities and several provincial governments. The results have been positive, Mr. Speaker, and give firm promise of developing even more and better cost-cutting, but not quality-cutting, methods to come. I intend to maintain next year specific federal incentives to further this search. I further intend to maintain the general emphasis of CHMC policy on homes for the low income group. This emphasis will

have produced roughly 50,000 dwelling unit commitments this year or 77,000 unit commitments this year and last.

In these two years, Mr. Speaker, our low income housing activity will have doubled all the government-financed low income housing ever built before in this country—and I am proud of that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Andras: It means that this year housing production directed to the low income group where the great need is, has risen dramatically although total housing starts this year will be about 180,000 compared with a record 210,000 units in 1969. However, when we talk of the total national need and when we think of the great middle ground of Canadians who must be served, let me emphasize again this government's commitment to one million new housing starts of all kinds in the five years from 1970 through to 1974.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Moreover, I am happy to inform the House that the housebuilding activity began increasing in the latter part of this year, because for the month of September housebuilding was running at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 194,800 starts as compared to 188,800 for September, 1969. In 1970, the first quarter, seasonally adjusted starts numbered 166,200. This dropped to 136,600 in the second quarter, but has risen to 185,800 in the third quarter. The main impact on starts of the CMHC special $200 million innovative program to which I referred and the additional 240 million of commitments authorized in August is still to be felt. All told, this year CMHC will have committed approximately one billion one hundred million dollars in its capital budget, of which about $960 million have gone directly to housing through programs under sections 16, 35, 36B and 40 of the National Housing Act, with the remainder having been invested in land assembly, urban renewal and sewage treatment loans.

As hon. members know, the private sector mortgage flow has been a serious problem this year. I have held a series of meetings with the approved lenders, banks, trust companies and insurance companies, setting forth capital requirements to meet our five year target of one million new homes, including the pick up of any shortfall this year from the average annual performance required. A second series of meetings with these institutions will be held before the end of the year to get their factual and realistic assessments of their participation. From this information, more specific steps will be considered to ensure mortgage flow. In addition, I plan to invite the senior representatives of the major pension funds of this country to meet with me shortly to discuss the need for increasing investments in residential mortgages by those extremely sizeable sources of capital.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, from the announcement of last week, I have become responsible to parliament for the National Capital Commission, which in a way is the *sine qua non* of all we hope to do. It is attempting to bring social comfort and beauty and an expression of national distinction to the capital region of our country to make it the exemplar of justly diffused dignity and opportunity, and we need that exemplar today as we never have before.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Andras: Let our national capital contribute to a national sense of direction in an atmosphere of co-operation and unity, and let that direction be prideful, affirmative and positive as we seek to draw together, particularly in these dark days. Let our capital be, in fact and in symbol, the reflection of a national agreement that is based upon linguistic, cultural and material equity. The National Capital Commission and this government will continue to press forward so as to ensure that the two official languages and the cultural values common to all Canadians are recognized by all governments concerned in these two cities, and in the capital region in general, so that all Canadians may have a feeling of pride and participation in their capital.

In more strictly urban terms, nowhere are there more layers of governments, degrees and opportunities of disparity, problems to be solved and beautiful examples of what can be done than in the capital region covered by the NCC. Here is where multi-level government co-operation in urban policy and programming can work and can be seen to work at its best. This is a leadership opportunity of an important kind. In a real sense, the minister of state responsible for urban affairs and housing shall be a sympathetic advocate in cabinet on urban problems for the provinces, municipalities and urban dwellers. Also, he will report back to them federal concerns and desires. In that process of catalyzing, consulting and co-ordinating, I am hoping there can be held soon a beginning meeting or series of meetings with provincial ministers to determine how best we may establish ongoing consultative processes.

I should like to say in passing that I am very appreciative of the public reactions of initial warmth that I have seen from provincial representatives. I am also happy about the very warm messages of approval and support from the Canadian Federation of Mayors and Municipalities and from many individual mayors. I assure them that ways by which municipalities can be helped to deal with the many problems thrust upon them will be foremost in all our thinking.

All our efforts will be directed toward giving Canadians choices about their future. Tentatively we can pose a few indications of what will happen if we continue as we are, which may be a sound option to take, but certainly we should understand it. The unconstrained future will see three vast and nation dominating urban enclaves 30 years hence. They will be Toronto, with a population of six and a half million, Montreal with a population of six and a quarter million, and Vancouver with a population of about two and a half million. Other Canadians cities will double in size, although their positions in relation to the three major centres may grow weaker. I want to repeat that this is a studied forecast of Canadian growth,

projected from current trends and in the absence of major policy changes at any level of government.

Even today, the so-called Montreal-Toronto corridor is a nation dominating entity. Already it has 40 per cent of the Canadian population. Two thirds of all cheques cashed are cleared through those two cities, 75 per cent of all head office corporate assets are in them, and nearly 90 per cent of head office assets of financial institutions is to be found there. Manufacturing costs in them ripple through the nation. There is a tremendous interchange between them. For instance, each week at least 50,000 people move by railway, road or air between Montreal and Toronto. I think that hon. members will not need to be reminded of more to suggest the national economic and political possibilities if this area extends its position of power in the next 30 years. It may be a wise option, but I think we would all wish to dwell upon it.

To get back to some specific problems, let me point out that the housing demand over the next 30 years of unconstrained future would be more than four million units for the three cities of Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver. There would be three million automobiles in Montreal alone, or in Toronto, by the year 2000.

I notice that my time has elapsed, Mr. Speaker. May I have the consent of the House to carry on?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The minister still has three minutes remaining to him. Is there agreement of the House to extending his time?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Andras: I would like to thank hon. members for their courtesy.

• (2:30 p.m.)

The next ten years will be the crunch period. The evidence of this is there. The postwar baby boom children are having families, with resulting pressures growing on family type dwellings in a trend that is emerging counter to the high rise building of recent years. Other factors are immigrants, 75 per cent of whom now come to Montreal, Toronto and Vancouver, and internal migration from rural to urban centres, and from small urban to big urban centres.

The ever sharpening demand for scarce urban space that is created by this population growth sets up an inter-connected series of causes and effects which we have to learn to understand if we are going to cope. How many hon. members will not already recognize to some extent this scenario, where land becomes so expensive as to preclude all but extremely dense residential downtown living; families with children seeking single family dwellings will have to commute several hours each day; downtown areas becoming congested, polluted and noisy; higher taxes and yet higher land costs as suburbs sprawl further; industries fleeing to suburbs leaving the poor without access that they can afford to jobs, and the inner city without a necessary tax base; steady erosion of stable neighbourhoods; economic uncertainty facing core dwellers; deterioration in the quality of their environment; creation of an increasingly explosive situation when people feel cheated and when they despair; increased segregation of economic classes with its resulting divisiveness in the community and between communities at a time when unity is this country's great need?

What really happens as a result of all this, Mr. Speaker, is that everyone's choice is diminished. The aged and the handicapped and the otherwise unemployable, who are the great bulk of the nation's poor, are trapped either in shameful housing in core slums or located unreasonably far out from the active life of the city that gives them interest. Land costs will spur the flight to the suburbs for those who can afford it, but then they will have to spend more leisure time commuting, and the more the suburbs expand the more the congestion on the commuter highways, and certainly the more congestion downtown. Higher incomes are diminished by higher taxes and by higher costs of urban goods and services. Pollution and sprawl, noise and congestion diminish one's aesthetic and health choices, and penalize the weak whose status we wish to improve.

Frankly, I do not know where the trade-off in all of this is. I do not know, and nobody I have talked to can tell me when the exact point is reached that a city is simply too big. I certainly do not propose what can or should be done to control city sizes. I have not computed all the national, social, economic or political implications. I do not have any hard alternatives or any preconceptions at this moment. At this point, this government and I see only some of the more evident problems, and they are enough to make us wish to co-operate with other levels of government to try to understand this process we are caught in, and to use it to help fashion the kind of Canadian environment that Canadians want. For there is another side to all these negative things that can happen, and that is the opportunity to direct and create living environments in the manner that we want, fashioning progress to our social ends rather than being overwhelmed by it.

Because we are young and relatively rich and our urban problems are not yet out of hand, we have opportunities that almost no other country has. I would like to think, and I do think, that this country will grasp those opportunities.

Mr. Stan Schumacher (Palliser): Mr. Speaker, as a member first elected in 1968, this opportunity to participate in a Throne Speech debate is another "first" in what has proven to be a long line of firsts for me over the past two years or more.

May I first congratulate the mover (Mr. Trudel) and the seconder (Mr. Douglas, Assiniboia) of the Address in Reply for the honour bestowed upon them, and say how much I admire their bravery for formally expressing thanks for this pretentious, and what now appears to be in many respects an irrelevant, document.

The first question that comes to me when considering the government's future program is: what is the justifica-

tion for keeping the Minister of Communications (Mr. Kierans) on the payroll now that his job has been transferred to the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Côté) in charge of the Post Office? Surely, it does not take a minister of full cabinet rank to report to this House for Telesat Canada, an organization that will not even be functioning for another year or so? And speaking about the irrelevancy of the Speech from the Throne, I ask what priority position the proposals of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) to amend the Criminal Code regarding bail and wire tapping will have in light of the proclamation under the War Measures Act?

Many hon. members have dwelt on the government's action of last Friday morning, both in this debate and in the special debate of last Friday and Saturday. Probably everything has been said that can be said, but because of the importance of the question of order in this country I feel compelled to make a contribution in the hope that it will add something of value to the subject.

What bothers me, Mr. Speaker, is that so far the government's actions are aimed entirely at the separatists of Quebec be they FLQ or PQ, that is the Parti Quebecois of Mr. Levesque, and are repressive in nature. The justification for this action is that order had to be preserved, and because of this the government has received widespread applause and support for its action.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the basic reason most of those supporting the government in this emergency action do so is that they feel the government is also going to do something about the long-haired, unkempt, unproductive and over-privileged hippie type protest movement that has polluted the countryside for the past three or four years, and that this is merely a first step. I would like to say that these people are right. I would also like to say that it indicates the scales have fallen from the government's eyes to reveal the extent to which organized crime and labour racketeering have infected the commercial life of the country, and in this respect that the trouble is not confined to one province. However my feeling, Mr. Speaker, is that the people of Canada are going to be disappointed once again because, while the government has taken a very dramatic step of a potentially repressive nature, there is no indication that it is prepared to act in ways to get at the real problems of the country.

Even in the light of the present situation in Quebec, the government is taking the position that it is the responsibility of the province to administer the regulations it has proclaimed under the War Measures Act. I suggest that the people of Canada are looking to the government for a much more positive approach, and would remind hon. members that section 91(27) of the British North America Act assigns to Parliament:

> The Criminal Law, except the constitution of courts of criminal jurisdiction, but including the procedure in criminal matters.

It is clear that the government has the power to supervise the situation in Quebec because if the regulations are examined we find the following delegations: First, regulation 7(1) reads:

> A person arrested for an offence under section 4 shall be detained in custody without bail pending trial unless the Attorney General of the province in which the person is being detained consents to the release of that person on bail.

The reference is to the Attorney General of the province of Quebec. Regulation 8(2) reads:

> A person arrested pursuant to subsection (1) shall be taken before a justice having jurisdiction and charged with an offence described in section 4 not later than seven days after his arrest, unless the Attorney General of the province in which the person is being detained has, before the expiry of those seven days, isued an order that the accused be further detained until the expiry of a period not exceeding twenty-one days after his arrest, at the end of which period the person arrested shall be taken before a justice having jurisdiction and charged with an offence described in section 4 or released from custody.

• (2:40 p.m.)

We have seen what has happened. Yesterday, the Minister of Justice for the Province of Quebec said he was going to order that everybody who had been detained be held for this period of 21 days, without any exceptions. It, therefore, becomes evident that there has been a delegation of federal power to the attorneys general of the provinces. In other situations, the Minister of Justice has not hesitated to tell magistrates and judges what to do with reference to first-time drug offenders, and in the case of magistrates they are neither appointed nor paid by the federal government. I, for one, cannot see why the government has felt compelled to delegate this responsibility to the attorney general or Minister of Justice of Quebec.

Surely, in a matter as serious as this, there should be uniform enforcement of the laws across Canada. I suggest we are not going to have uniformity of enforcement when we have to depend on ten attorneys general for the enforcement of the powers granted under this act. What we have here is the government putting on a show of taking charge of a serious situation when in reality the job has been delegated to the provincial authorities, presumably so this government can avoid being tagged with any unpleasant results.

One might well ask why the government has not used the facilities and staff of the Department of Justice in Montreal and in Quebec City to decide who was going to be detained and who was not, and what further action was going to be taken against them. As I understand the situation, this government has established branch offices of the Department of Justice in Halifax, Quebec, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver. These are not small offices. I understand the staff of the Toronto office exceeds 18 lawyers, and I assume that the staff of the office in Montreal would be at least of a similar size. For the life of me, I really cannot understand why the federal government has not followed through with this job instead of delegating it to the provinces.

One might well ask also why the government did not place the Quebec provincial police and the Montreal city police under federal direction and control, because this certainly is the first time in our history that the federal government has not had the responsibility for the enforcement of regulations under this act. We should also remember that the fundamental rights of all Canadians are being affected by these regulations. I am well aware

of the argument that if you behave yourself you should have nothing to worry about. The question is, who is going to be the judge of this behaviour, a provincial attorney general or the federal government? I, for one, would feel a little disadvantaged in Quebec at the present time because of my inability to converse in French.

I noticed that the leader of the Créditiste party said his wife felt disadvantaged because English speaking soldiers were assigned to protect his home in Hull. I do not know whether he is expecting a bilingual bullet or what, but I think if there is any force to his argument, in view of the fact we are dealing with the fundamental rights of all Canadians, the federal government should take the responsibility for enforcing the regulations which it put into effect.

The Bill of Rights is a very important document, and it is a federal statute. We are left in the position where the provincial attorney general can or could act, under the guise of these regulations, in direct contradiction to those rights. I would say that if this situation is as serious as the government implies, and we do not really have that many facts before us on which to base a decision but we have accepted the situation at face value, it should be dealt with by the national government. So far, all we have seen is an example of the government trying to suck and whistle at the same time, which is just not good enough.

As to the long term, the present trouble should indicate to the government that the experiment relating to capital punishment is a failure. If it does not, then surely the great increase in the murder rate all across the country, which I understand has risen by 55 per cent in the past three years, should make it conclusive. Another step that should be taken is a complete change in policy concerning the admission to Canada of United States draft dodgers and military deserters. These people just should not be admitted to Canada.

The people of Canada have shown that they are prepared to have their accustomed rights and freedoms suspended on a temporary basis in order that the government can deal with the present emergency. However, they also demand an end to the extreme permissiveness which they fell has contributed in a material way to the development of that emergency.

The municipal authorities of Montreal came to Ottawa last November and detailed explicitly the explosive situation that was developing in that municipality, largely through the efforts of the people who are now being rounded up under this emergency measure. Mr. Saulnier particularly said he approached the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) some time between February and November of 1969, warning him of these difficulties that were arising and asking that he take some action. No action was taken. Last January at a Liberal fund raising dinner in Montreal the Prime Minister pooh-poohed the FLQ and said they were a bunch of unimportant nobodies. There was warning, but no action was taken.

Because no action was taken, the sweeping powers in these regulations have not proven to be entirely effective to date. It seems like a lot of dynamite still has not shown up. I understand there is supposed to be over a ton of it floating around Montreal. We had a situation that was pooh-poohed and now we have very strong regulations in force that affect every Canadian. A national emergency has been declared by the government. I ask the government to act according to its words and take the responsibility for enforcing these regulations it has proclaimed.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues have done, I must at the very outset express congratulations to the mover (Mr. Trudel) and seconder (Mr. Douglas, Assiniboia) and commend them for the very creditable job they did, especially in the light of the material with which they had to work. I do not intend to deal at any great length with the content of the Speech from the Throne itself but rather with some other matters. I do want to make one or two observations which reflect my own view of the speech, and I have no hesitation at all in referring to the editorial page of the *Chronicle-Herald* of Monday, October 12. I should like to quote very briefly from this editorial because again I think this sums up my own feeling about the speech itself. In part, it reads:

> If Governor General Roland Michener sounded bored as he read the federal government's Speech from the Throne, at the opening of the new session of the Parliament of Canada in Ottawa on Thursday, who could blame him?
>
> It was a dull, uninspired document, whose rhetoric failed to cloak the government's disturbing complacency and continued disinclination to get its priorities right.

• (2:50 p.m.)

Mr. Stanfield: On the verge of greatness.

Mr. Forrestall: On the verge of greatness, that is right. I continue:

> Only in its references to the appointment of a new minister, and department, concerned with urban affairs, and in one or two other matters, did the speech bear any evidence of Prime Minister Trudeau's concern with matters of immediate consequence—

I suggest that these remarks are pertinent in 1970, inasmuch as we are all very familiar with the magnitude of the urban problems facing us. Sometimes one cannot help wondering if the Speech from the Throne,—and this applies to the present speech as well as to many which preceded it—which is a traditional part of our parliamentary procedures, is not being deliberately downgraded and deliberately written in condescending terms in order to further erode, as I have suggested, that part of our tradition which is enshrined in this institution, the House of Commons. I can only conclude that the government does not seriously hold it necessary to put forward clear and hard priorities, or that it simply does not understand them. The government does not understand the seriousness of the situation.

As I indicated, it is not my intention to dwell at great length on the Speech from the Throne. Suffice it to say that it is a personal disappointment to me in a number of areas. At the outset of my remarks, I should like to make a few observations, if I may. First, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see in his seat the Minister of Energy, Mines

and Resources (Mr. Greene). May I pay a tribute not only to our scientists but as well, and particularly, to the captain and the crew of the ship *Hudson* which has just completed a circumnavigation of the Americas. I had the privilege, and I personally thank the minister for this, of standing with one or two other Canadians at a dockside in South America and watching that ship come out of the fog. I could not help feeling very, very proud of being a Canadian and, as that day and ensuing days wore on, a very great pride in the work that the scientists on that ship had been carrying on so successfully. I was struck by the tremendous, very sincere and deep respect that the scientists of the department on board the *Hudson,* as well as of those who came from scientific communities in South America had for the skill and dedication of the captain and the crew. May I express to the minister my congratulations upon such a voyage being undertaken. I look forward as the months and years go by to a continuing evaluation of the information collected on this particular trip.

The grievous problems that confront Canada are very clear in the minds of those in the various segments of our country that are particularly affected. I am speaking in a broad sense. I doubt whether any of those engaged in the various sectors of our economic and national life are unaware of the depth of the problems facing them. They must be very disappointed, as I am and as I am sure thousands of other Canadians are, that the government apparently has not recognized the depth of those problems and given them any sort of priority.

May I now direct a few remarks to the area of national defence? If there is one area within the government that has been neglected, certainly for a number of years, it is the area of the Department of National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces. I should like to touch briefly on what I consider to be an urgent necessity, partly because of the events of the last two weeks, but more importantly, because of the events of the last three years. I am speaking of the urgency of increasing the budget for defence spending. I am sure that my purpose in making this appeal is obvious. I need only refer to the current review under way with respect to our four new destroyer escorts, the DDH 280's. It is important, in order that we may maintain our capabilities, for the defence budget to be increased in respect of a general re-equipment program and in respect of maintaining the strength of the Canadian Armed Forces at levels which are adequate to meet the commitments and obligations that we, as a nation, have incurred. From time to time we pay lip service to those commitments.

I cannot help wondering, Mr. Speaker, how the Canadian Armed Forces are to carry out those new responsibilities we have assigned to them, such as maintaining our sovereignty in the north and policing legislation introduced in recent days by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) with respect to pollution, as well as enforcing other Arctic pollution measures, with the present equipment we have. What is more damnable, there seems to be no apparent effort to design and construct equipment that is adequate if the armed forces are to police the laws and regulations now in effect in Canada. I hasten to say that those are enlightened laws; yet, if they are to be effective, we must be able to police and enforce them. We must, if we can—and I think this should happen during the present fiscal year—increase the national defence budget; we must increase it substantially if we want to maintain our credibility in the eyes of our partners, in the eyes of our neighbours to the south and in the eyes of our NATO allies. We must replace the Argus. I think the Argus will need to be maintained in service for considerably longer than the government is apparently willing to admit at this juncture. I think the elimination of the Argus, which is used in part in its present well known role and in part for the extended surveillance of the north, should not in any way delay or halt our moving ahead with a program to replace that aircraft with others such as the Nimrod or Orion.

There are experts who claim these are the best aircraft available for the job. It seems to me that if we equip our forces with this new generation of weapons, there is every reason to suppose, on the basis of that equipment, that Canada for the next ten or 12 years will have the finest maritime patrol aircraft in the world. We must, as I said a moment ago, ease restraints with respect to the national defence budget so that we can maintain a credible and balanced equipment program and a force structured to meet the external and domestic commitments that we have already undertaken and from which, hopefully, we shall not retreat. The failure to do this now is capable of interpretation by our friends and allies outside this country, only that we are further retreating into a position of isolation with respect to Europe and with respect to continental defence.

• (3:00 p.m.)

I have another pet subject to which I think we should be giving serious consideration, unless there was some understanding in connection with the report of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence, which report is based on the study by the subcommittee on Maritime defence. I wish to emphasize that it is now time for Canada to study a true submersible capability. The committee recommended that we do not acquire nuclear powered submarines at this time solely on the basis of cost. There is every indication that it is possible for us to acquire such a capability without becoming involved in the tremendous cost of new construction. I wish to be very emphatic in stating that the true submersible, the nuclear powered submarine, remains the only piece of equipment available that can operate 12 months of the year in our northern latitudes.

There are many reasons why Canada should have this equipment, such as the commercial application, the scientific application and the presence within our Department of National Defence and other government circles of knowledge of what is happening in our north. The most important reason is that it is the only piece of equipment that is capable of year round operation.

It must be a damnable burden for the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) to carry the responsibility of the CF-5 program. I have sympathy for the minister. There are very obvious roles for the CF-5 and

it would be impertinent if I pointed them out. The minister knows what they are. I do not understand why he is not getting on with the job and why this very expensive equipment is still rolling off the assembly lines to be put into storage.

With respect to surface forces, on the east coast we have now lost the two remaining operational ships with a mine-sweeping capability. If someone should decide to place mines in our waters, we would not be capable of removing them. What would happen if mines were placed in such places as the Gulf of St. Lawrence, the entrance to Halifax harbour or some other strategic east coast location?

In keeping with the extraterritorial responsibilities, consideration must be given to construction of a fleet, light in armament but adequate to carry out the policing and investigation roles required by Acts of Parliament in recent months as well as an effective role with regard to our responsibilities under ASW. The DDH-280 must not be changed or cut back. The necessary money must be found for this program in order that Canada may retain credibility in the eyes of our partners, particularly those within NATO.

In retaining this program it would be irresponsible for the government to decide to downgrade the equipment on these ships in order to meet the total overhaul cost. Within three months of awarding the contract for these new DDH-280 ships, it was known that we would not by any stretch of the imagination be on time or within the cost estimates. In spite of that, the replies to the four questions I placed on the order paper were that no changes were indicated in the over-all cost. I hope what we are now faced with is not a fait accompli in terms of government thinking, but it must be close to that with respect to the total cost of the program, half a billion dollars. Canadians would not have objected or reacted strongly if the government had had the courage to indicate that when it embarked on the program two or three years ago.

I wish to deal briefly with Canada's defence role in our north. Much has been said about this in the past 12 to 14 months. There has been a lot of talk about northern capabilities. This has amounted to nothing more than a program of testing the capability of equipment and training people in northern operations. I have contended for some time that the north could best be developed by people over whom we have total and absolute control. My wish is for a program embracing particular skills of the Canadian armed forces working in the north to develop communications systems, airports and communities. This would require thousands of people, including members of the armed forces, their wives and children. There should be orderly development of the north by people over whom we have some control with respect to the ecology and so forth. It is not sufficient to talk in terms of a couple of hundred of people if we want to do anything meaningful. This should be under the control of competent men within our armed forces.

I would now like to spend a moment or two speaking about future development of the metropolitan area, part of which I have the privilege to represent. During the 1970's, particularly the early part, the elected people must determine our potential growth and the form it must take. Legislators must not continue to proceed on the basis that industry is good, no matter what its nature or form.

I used to think it would be good to develop the Minus Basin tidal power so that reduction and refractory industries might be attracted to Nova Scotia, all of the pollutant industries. All that seemed to matter at that time was that industry was industry. I have since changed my mind 100 per cent and I make no apologies for it. Perhaps I have been enlightened by all the talk about pollution in recent years. In any event, I have changed my mind. I now believe we have the capability in the metropolitan area of Dartmouth and Halifax. I trust my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) will pardon me for consistently placing Dartmouth first; while Dartmouth is now an important part of Halifax, as the years go by I believe it will become less important. My feeling is that if economic generators can be found, this centre will produce a city of half a million people in the course of the next 12 or 15 years, based on clean industry. This is important.

• (3:10 p.m.)

We must find in the Atlantic provinces, we are told, an economic centre with a population of at least half a million before we can become self-supporting and say to the rest of the taxpayers of Canada: we no longer need subsidies or special help; we now have a self-sustaining existence. It is not feasible to attempt to develop more than one such centre in the Atlantic area at least in the foreseeable future. Many factors make this true, most of them apparent, but perhaps the most realistic is the rapidity with which technology and people's requirements are changing. We can, as has been suggested, develope an assembly-based industry involving a containerisation program and a full system of distribution. Parts would be brought into the area in containers, fed through an assembly process and then transferred to a distribution centre. This would be one industrial generator, and it would be a clean generator, not one which would pour pollutants into our air and into our waters.

A second generator which has been suggested by a number of well-informed, knowledgeable people would be the development of the downtown sections of both Dartmouth and Halifax. The federal government is in a position to play a large part here. Halifax has long been a financial and administrative centre of the Maritimes, at least, and over the next ten or twelve years, with careful thought and planning, this facet of our development could be expanded in an orderly way which would tend to enhance the quality of our environment rather than pollute it.

A third area of economic generation which I, and others, believe to be economically possible and feasible is one in which, again, the federal government must take the lead. It is the area of research and development programs. We have a sophisticated and closely interrelated research program in eastern Canada today con-

centrated in Halifax and Dartmouth and including such centres as the Bedford Institute, the National Research Council, the Nova Scotia research facilities, The Defence Research Board, research efforts in our universities, and so on. This activity should be geared to areas of growth, and in his context I refer particularly to the Bedford Institute. Today we have a responsibility to develop on the east coast of Canada and, hopefully, in the Halifax-Dartmouth area, an expanding research effort in connection with the sea and its resources, including those which are beneath the ocean floor.

To accomplish the development of the three main generators to which I have referred, a tremendous expansion is needed in terms of infrastructure, for example, water services—the whole bit. Specifically, in this connection, we need a hospital. It is to be hoped the government will act early on the suggestion of Mayor Thornhill of the city of Dartmouth to provide a much-needed hospital in that city. The mayor has been advocating this step for a long time and it is one which deserves the early attention of the government. As I say, we need help from the federal government in building up this infrastructure and it is necessary for us to proceed in this regard immediately.

In addition, I hope the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) will at this time reassess his position on the question of Fundy tidal power. There is certain evidence now available which calls into question the depth of the thinking upon the basis of which the government made its decision not to proceed with this project unless there was some marked change in circumstances. I hate to suggest to the hon. minister that he looked only superficially at the report of the standing committee which was presented to him, but I have a feeling he did not make a sufficient study in depth of the engineering work-up. He chose to rely almost entirely on the report of the committee itself, and with all deference to that committee, considerable objection has been found to the terms of their report. I have in mind, now, the deliberations of the international conference on tidal power which was held in Halifax earlier this year.

In closing, I urge the government to reconsider its freeze on national defence expenditure at an early date, so that we shall not entirely lose the credibility which remains to us among our allies. It is necessary to move now so that the cost of catching up will not be intolerable when the time comes to catch up. The need for a highly-skilled, well-trained and respected force has been clearly demonstrated to us in the last few days. I urge the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) to move swiftly. He has intimated that it is inevitable the budget strings will be loosened. I urge him to solicit the support of his colleagues so that this loosening may occur not in 1973-74 but in 1971-72.

Mr. Leonard Hopkins (Renfrew North): Mr. Speaker, first, I should like to congratulate the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene), who I see present in the chamber this afternoon, on the successful trip of the *Hudson*. This has been a very fine achievement. The recognition of this House should also go to those who are running the operation at the Dartmouth Institute of Oceanography and, as chairman of the National Resources and Public Works Committee, I should like to extend my personal congratulations to them.

We, as a committee, visited the Dartmouth Institute last May. There is one suggestion I would make to the minister at this time. I believe we are doing a lot of good work in Water research in this country not only at the Dartmouth Institute but also at the Canada Inland Water Centre at Burlington, Ontario. I think we should be distributing some of their informational pamphlets to our high schools and secondary schools across Canada. From time to time, I receive letters from students asking why certain things are not being done when, in actual fact, the matters are already in hand. I should like to see the minister and his staff adopt a policy of sending information packages on the Inland Water Centre at Burlington and also on the Dartmouth Institute of Oceanography to the libraries of all secondary schools in Canada. If we do not relay to the people information about what is being done, then we cannot justify to them the amount of money being spent on programs.

• (3:20 p.m.)

Secondly, may I congratulate the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and the cabinet in general on the strong measures, which at times have been unpopular, they have had to take to save the Canadian dollar and enable it to keep its value. It was heartening to hear it said at the recent International Conference of Finance Ministers in Europe that the Canadian dollar is in about the best position of the ten most developed countries in the world. I think this is a tribute to good management on the part of the cabinet and the Prime Minister.

Mr. Thomson: About the only tribute.

Mr. Hopkins: The hon. member can comment when he gets his turn. There is such a negative attitude on the part of some people at times that it is refreshing to get some positive and realistic statements on the record.

One thing we must do in the future if we want to institute policies that are effective is to spend more money on research. A good demonstration of the benefits to be derived from research is given by the Japanese in the way they have handled their coal and lumber industries. They have made in depth studies not only at their own domestic level but at the international level. They have compiled all kinds of data relating to those industries. This is one reason they are progressing so quickly and are in a position where they can buy raw goods from many nations of the world, manufacture them at home and then sell them back in finished form to the same nations.

It is proper at this time to congratulate the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources on his energy policy. He has had a very difficult summer with some trying moments, but I think the vision he has demonstrated will be realized.

I want to say a few words about transportation. It is my view that equitable freight rates and good roads are important in developing the Canadian economy, as are our very worth-while policies of regional economic expansion. We in the Ottawa valley have always been plagued with unsatisfactory road conditions. If there is one thing we badly need, it is a good highway artery.

Let me give the House a good example of what I mean. The bridge in the centre of the town of Petawawa that spans the Petawawa River was built before the first troops moved into Base Petawawa in 1907. Today, it is called upon to handle all the traffic moving into Base Petawawa from various parts of the country, as well as traffic destined for Chalk River. Invariably there is a big traffic jam right in the middle of the town of Petawawa during the rush hour, and it is nothing for cars to be lined up for three miles. One morning about two weeks ago the nuclear laboratories at Chalk River lost $2,000 in wages which the Crown Corporation had to absorb because employees were late through no fault of their own. Renfrew County Council has brought this problem to the attention of the Minister of Highways of Ontario. It sent a resolution to the Minister of Highways requesting the early completion of the proposed highway 417. The hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. McBride) and myself were asked to support this brief, and we did so.

In reply to my letter to the Minister of Highways, the Hon. George E. Gomme, I was informed that roads were not the only problems in eastern Ontario, and that if we had really wanted to admit it, another problem was lack of economic development policies. He suggested that if the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton and myself had succeeded in getting the area designated, this would have gone a long way toward solving our problems. In other words, the minister was trying to pass the buck to us. Let me tell the Hon. George Gomme that the hon. members for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton and Renfrew North have now done their homework and we are looking for him to do his. We want that highway and we want a new bridge at Petawawa. I see no reason for the federal government providing my constituents with a large number of jobs when their counterparts in the Ontario legislature cannot even provide decent transporation arteries for people to get to work.

If anyone wonders why I am spending so much time talking about a local matter, let them come to my house at week ends and receive some of the calls that flood in. I want to put the bread in the basket in which it properly belongs—at Queen's Park.

Mr. Aiken: We always blame Ottawa.

Mr. Hopkins: If we blamed Toronto as much as they blame Ottawa, we would be blaming them all the time. One thing I will say for this government is that it faces up squarely to its own problems and settles them.

Mr. Alkenbrack: Like unemployment.

Mr. Hopkins: The government is facing up to unemployment, too. The hon. member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) made some comments about the Department of National Defence. I do not think he mentioned the pay scales in the lower ranks, which is one matter that I suggest the new Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) review. I want to congratulate the new minister on his appointment and in the interest he is taking in his new job.

• (3:30 p.m.)

There are some things I should like to bring to his attention. The first concerns rental problems at Department of National Defence bases. I believe rents should be kept at a low level as an incentive, and as one of the privileges of members of the armed forces, because they do not have the same privileges when they are in block housing that they would have on civvy street. I think the whole matter of housing on DND bases should be reviewed. You know, there are times during long periods of peace when many people feel that the armed forces of a nation are out of style. It is my belief that it is healthy to be prepared and that it is healthy to keep a good force at all times. At no time should these people be given kicks in the teeth, especially at a time when we are asking them to perform a duty.

The average soldier today wishes to do a good job. It must be rather frustrating to him, however, while he is in the middle of performing a duty he has been asked to perform, to find there are those who criticize him, will not back him up, or in fact appear to be making statements on behalf of the people whom he has been asked to protect. We should always keep a proper perspective and remember that being unprepared is just as great a promoter of disturbance as anything else. If individuals interested in crime or in international controversies know that certain nations are not prepared, then such nations are open to attack from other nations or from criminals and so on wherever they may be.

Freight rates is another subject I have discussed in this House on other occasions. I deeply feel the day is coming when we must look at our two major railways in Canada in a realistic way to ensure that they provide the service we wish them to provide in order to tie this country together. They must not be allowed to go on charging high freight rates merely to balance their books. I think the burden of sharing the deficits of these transportation systems will have to rest with Parliament. Otherwise, large areas of this country will be prejudiced because companies will not settle in those areas unless proper freight rates are available to them.

This is a subject which is, and in the next 20 years will be, closely related to pollution. If we do not have an equitable freight rate policy to provide an incentive to industry to move into the slow growth areas of Canada in the next few years, then industry will continue to move into the large urban centres of Canada with the result that we will be required to spend more money on antipollution measures. Some of this money would be better spent on subsidization of freight rates and the provision of a better economy for the slow growth areas of this country.

I might give one specific example in this regard. I believe it is an example of the arrogance of the CNR. A company in my area which is in the wood business asked for rates for the hauling of logs a distance of approximately 200 miles. That company was given a rate something in the order of 54 cents or 57 cents, which would have added some $50 a thousand to the price of the lumber or plywood produced at the manufacturing level. This rate was questioned during a meeting which was held. The railroads came back with a rate of 27 cents. This points out very blatantly how well they did their homework in the first place. It would seem obvious that there are people in the sales division who announce a rate but who simply are not interested in obtaining that freight. It would seem there are only certain lines of freight in which they are interested.

So, what happens? In some slow growth areas, such as areas in which forestry is the basic industry, the products, in this case wood products, are kept off the trains and hence the traffic is cut back on those lines. Then, some day we will find that the railway has appeared before the Canadian Transport Commission with a sob story to the effect the line is not paying and will have to be abandoned. Such action can only produce more problems for areas of Canada which are already slow growth areas. I think Members of Parliament today, regardless of party affiliation, who come from slow growth areas should be on top of this situation every day so that we might have a policy which would be fair to these areas, and so that we might be able to operate as economically as possible in this nation. Instead of just complaining about unemployment, let us do something in this regard.

Let us put these far-reaching policies into operation in places in Ontario where the basic tax dollar will help industries and muncipalities which do not have a strong economic base at the present time. At the same time, let us keep the railroads in a position where they are in fact knitting together the economy of Canada instead of simply making runs between the cities of Canada without consideration for the smaller communities in between.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that pretty well rounds out my remarks, with the exception of a few comments I have to make concerning the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. The extra $100 million that has been thrown into CMHC is a good shot in the arm and I congratulate the Minister without Portfolio for that. But again, I should like to deal with the local situation because it seems to me that when certain policies are laid down, Renfrew county appears to be a buffer zone between the northern and southern parts of the province. When policies are laid down for northern Ontario, usually they do not apply to areas just below North Bay. The towns of Deep River, Chalk River, and part of the town of Petawawa qualify for CMHC loans, but the town of Pembroke does not qualify at this time. However, the city of North Bay with a population of 4,800 does qualify for CMHC loans. It is somewhat ridiculous to place the town of Pembroke with a population of about 16,000 on the same policy level so far as CMHC is concerned as the city of Toronto.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Hopkins: People in the town of Pembroke do not receive CMHC loans. As I said, we suffer because we are not included in northern Ontario, but at the same time we are too far north to be included in Southern Ontario. I think it is interesting to note that the smaller communities of Mattawa, Bonfield and the lower part of Nipissing have received little or nothing from CMHC simply because an instruction has been issued by the North Bay office that the Corporation does not want to be involved with housing in smaller communities.

Approximately 175 loans have been approved for the city of North Bay, but if my information is correct, very few have been approved for the town of Mattawa. I put this on the record because I want it brought to the attention of these officials, and I will be backing it up with letters. I want this reconsidered when the new budget for CMHC comes out.

Mr. Paproski: Let your constituents write to their federal member.

Mr. Hopkins: If they write to the federal member in my area, they will get service.

As a final note, I should like to congratulate in a very serious way the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) for the serious, dignified and discreet manner in which they have carried out their duties in the last few days.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, before I start my speech I should like to commend the hon. member for Renfrew North (Mr. Hopkins). I am quite sure that he is a positive person, but I noticed that even among his positive suggestions there appeared a few criticisms which, if they had come from the opposition, would likely have been referred to as negative. Anyway, I will try to be positive in my contribution to this debate, even though I am speaking from the negative side of the House.

Initially, I did not expect to take part in the debate, but a problem has come to the force in the last few days. I am referring to the chicken and egg war and the problems that have developed as a result of it. In Canada we have a Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) who, like old Macdonald, has a chick chick here and a chick chick there. At the moment he has too many chick chicks, not to mention a few too many eggs and a few too many turkeys. Not only that, but they are isolated in economic pockets in the country because they cannot cross interprovincial boundaries. This situation results from the marketing board legislation passed by the various provinces. It is regrettable that things have come to this pass, and for this reason I wish to take part in this debate.

Christmas turkeys should be going to the market now. In some areas they have not even been killed in the hope that some market development will take place or that the government will do something. So far, the federal government at least has been wringing its hands, and the Minister of Agriculture has been crying in his root beer, or whatever ministers of agriculture do. But I have not seen any action yet on this matter. The various provinces in Canada have initiated action through their marketing boards which has effectively stopped the transfer or shipment of eggs, poultry or turkeys from one province to the other. I would like to give one example in particular.

The lakehead or Thunder Bay is a natural marketplace for poultry products from Manitoba. It is a long way from the high producing areas of eastern Ontario, and as a rule it has been a natural outlet for surplus poultry products from Manitoba. Manitoba is now effectively cut off from this market. This is one example. In my own province of Saskatchewan eggs cost, if I recall correctly, some eight cents a dozen more than in Manitoba, again because of a marketing board regulation. Quebec, Ontario, and in fact all the provinces will, if they have not until now, be introducing regulations of this kind. In effect, it is an economic balkanization of certain industries. Let me suggest that if something is not done, this balkanization will escalate. This is something we should consider very carefully.

Recently Manitoba made an application to the Supreme Court of Canada to test the validity of these regulations. However, the application was turned down. I, as well as the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), asked the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and the Minister of Agriculture what the federal government intended to do about it. The federal government said, in effect, that so far as the legal position is concerned, they will do nothing. What else they might do, I am not sure. The Supreme Court has said "no" to Manitoba, and the federal government has said "no" to opposition members. What then is to be done? I suggest that the government should hasten to bring in some farm marketing legislation to take care of the situation.

Bill C-197 was not passed by the House last year, and the Minister of Agriculture blames the opposition for that. We in this party supported the bill with some reservations—what I think were good reservations—and we would have hastened this legislation through with some amendments designed to deal with this particularly awkward problem. I should like to express criticism of the Conservative party in this respect. They have balked at Bill C-197. I agree it is their right to do so, but I have not heard them say what they would put in its place to solve the problem we have at present. If they have ideas in this regard, I suggest that they hasten to tell the House about them.

Mr. MacEwan: Read the amendments.

Mr. Thomson: I would like to hear the specific amendments, and then we can talk about them.

Some hon. Members: Read them.

Mr. Thomson: I believe that the federal government, in putting forth Bill C-197 without clearing up this constitutional problem, is using the constitutional problem as an excuse. I think this interprovincial trade situation should be dealt with on the legal level as well as the legislative. Let us hope that the federal government will re-introduce the farm marketing legislation with some amendments, as has been suggested, to ensure that this will be a national marketing act. We do not want the chicken or egg industries balkanized permanently in Canada. We want a free interprovincial market for all products in Canada. I have heard that some people who raise hogs and beef in some provinces are being affected adversely. Some individuals who cannot ship their eggs or poultry to Ontario or Quebec say they will assist farm machinery manufacturers to produce farm machinery in Manitoba. I do not think this is a healthy situation to be developing in Canada. We should hasten to solve the problem now rather than allow it to escalate.

Nationalism, Mr. Speaker, has been described as the strongest religion in the world. Under the guise of nationalism we do things we would not even consider in other circumstances, up to and including murder. In Canada, we are cursed with an additional problem. It is provincialism, or if you like, regionalism. One of the reasons I have heard given for the fall of the Greek city states is that they never overcame their small, parochial local interests. In this day and age, with our modern technology, we should get beyond merely looking after small, regional areas and parochial interests.

• (3:50 p.m.)

One of the things which have developed since the end of World War II which has appealed strongly to me is the European Common Market. Instead of a lot of small countries fighting among themselves, looking after their own problems, these countries have joined hands in order to solve shared problems. Despite the problems that have attended the development of the European Common Market, I cannot help but admire what it has been able to accomplish. It has proceeded more slowly in some areas than was hoped, but it has proceeded very effectively in other areas. However, I have been disturbed at the tendency of Common Market countries to gather together to protect themselves against someone, or something from outside. If the Common Market is a good thing for them, I say it should be expanded to include all the countries in the world.

We in Canada are moving in the wrong direction. We are moving toward the development of local, provincial sections. This is not a good thing. We should be putting our house in order in an economic sense, and here I refer to agricultural marketing boards. Let us first solve our problem in connection with the regionalization of marketing boards, and then let us look for markets abroad.

At the moment we have a surplus of eggs, chicken broilers and turkeys, at a time when these normally go out in large quantities to market. The reason for such surpluses in some provinces is that producers have been cut off from their traditional markets. Because the feder-

al government has allowed this to happen, because it has done nothing to stop it from happening, I suggest it has some responsibility. I suggest that it should consider a purchasing plan of some sort to cover the immediate surplus problems experienced by the poultry industry, particularly for producers who have lost their traditional markets.

It may be argued that those who have over-produced for a market they did not have, do not deserve any protection. That is a separate matter. But I believe those who have lost their traditional markets have a claim on the federal treasury and the federal government should move quickly to assist them. I know this is an unpleasant matter. I know we have had programs for the purchase of surplus commodities previously. Such a program is not a happy undertaking for a government. It costs money, and there are other complications involved. But, Mr. Speaker, we have a problem. We have it now. Let us do something positive about it now.

We should re-introduce the farm marketing bill, make some amendments to it, and have it passed as quickly as possible so that we may avoid future situations such as this. I think some teeth should be put in the bill so that if provinces do not agree to allow farm produce to move freely within Canada, the federal government could consider sanctions against them, such as the withdrawal of subsidies as was done under the dairy plan. The federal government should also initiate some proceedings before the Supreme Court to clarify the position of the farm marketing legislation and the power of provincial marketing boards.

I wish to make one final point, Mr. Speaker. In the past we sold quite a few eggs abroad. I do not know if we sold turkeys and chickens in any significant amount. I am not even sure that there is a market abroad for these products at the moment, but we hear that there might be a market in Japan for pork, and possibly beef. I wonder if there is not also a market there for chickens and eggs.

I believe the federal government should undertake a more active research marketing program. Since becoming a Member of Parliament I have noted that a great deal of money has been spent on production research, in some cases with remarkable results. But, Mr. Speaker, extensive market research has not been undertaken, and I do not see any immediate plans to undertake it. We have not explored all the avenues available to us. It is high time we did in the interest of Canadian agriculture.

Mr. McKinley: I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question. He mentioned the Conservative party stand on Bill C-197. Could he explain the turnabout in his party's position after they found that the Farmers' Union opposed the bill without major amendment?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-L. Rochon (Ahuntsic): Mr. Speaker, I am now experiencing a deep feeling of sadness and with all the Canadian people, I mourn the death of a great patriot,

[Mr. Thomson.]

Pierre Laporte. This feeling of sadness is almost haunting me when I remember the man who had been honouring me with his friendship for several years. Indeed, I cannot forget that he fought at my side in the 1962 election campaign, when I was elected to the House of Commons by the constituents of Laval, and I now realize that there are times in life when words cannot convey all our deepest emotions and we have to remain silent. I will summarize those feelings as follows: Dear Mr. Laporte, may you rest in peace. To your wife, your children, your mother and all your dear ones who mourn you, my most sincere sympathy. They weep, it is true, but they weep for a hero whose name will mark our history in letters of gold.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Those who preceded me, Mr. Speaker, depending on their political affiliation, in turn approved or disapproved the measures advocated in the Speech from the Throne but, upon reflection, one can read between the lines and see the same concern in all members of this House: the greater welfare of the Canadian people.

Opinions may differ on the implementation of certain measures, that is human. But in these tragic times, why not overlook those differences of opinion, why not support one another? Then, each one of us can, in his own heart, be conscious of having accomplished his duty.

I am, Mr. Speaker, one of the eldest in this House. I lived through the days of the depression in the 30s. I lived through the years that followed 1935. I sat in the legislative assembly of Quebec during that time. Then, as today, there was unease and troubles, but perhaps somewhat less than now. Later on, from 1939-1945, that is the second world war, we lived very dark hours indeed.

I read the Speech from the Throne very carefully. In it, I perceived the determination of the government to continue pursuing a policy towards a better and more just society.

I could speak at length on each and everyone of the measures advocated. Others have done so before me. They have analyzed them. The members of the opposition have criticized them and some of the criticism was constructive. The members of the government party have explained the good they can produce, and that is why I shall not go into them again. I merely echo the constructive ideas we have heard.

Last year, when I spoke on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I pointed out something which seemed to me very important, that is, air and water pollution. I was then repeating what I had heard in Brussels during the sittings of the NATO science committee. I had been greatly impressed by the following words from a British delegate: "Tomorrow, the bottom of the seas will become the granary of the world." He went on to explain all that can be extracted from the rivers and the ocean, from fish to algae and underground oils. He concluded by saying: "That huge potential is to be protected, and one of the major means is by checking both air and water pollution, and international and national organizations will have to be set up, for in more than one

city in various parts of the world, normal limits have been exceeded."

Last week, the federal government suggested to us what he intends to do in that respect through the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis), who said in his speech on the shaping of our environment in the 70's and I quote:

—shaping our Canadian environment is the biggest challenge we face in the 1970's. It is a bigger challenge than unemployment. It is a bigger challenge than inflation...it is a bigger challenge than all of our financial and social problems put together.

As can be seen, in its efforts to implement its anti-pollution policy, the government is planning a frontal attack on the problem, and, not wanting to rush things or to go ahead blindly, it understands that in the face of the urgency—and that is the expression used by the minister—it must do the following and I quote:

There is a real urgency here. We have to act on the environmental front quickly and with determination. We have to move ahead of events, rather than from crisis to crisis. Our critical path, in other words, must be laid out ahead of time. We must have a plan to preserve the quality of our environment. We must preserve our wildlife and our fish and our trees. We must renew our renewable resources as quickly and as effectively as we know how.

Economic growth is essential. Social progress must also continue in the 1970's. But their spin-offs must not result in a deterioration of our surroundings. Economic growth and social progress, in other words, must be paced in relation to our environment. They must be managed in such a way as to improve the quality of life in this country.

Mr. Speaker, in its efforts to clean up air and water, the government is facing another equally serious problem, that of protecting the industries which have made Canada one of the foremost industrial powers in the world, and that power enables hundreds of thousands of Canadians to earn their living. Indeed our country has the largest pulp and paper industry and God knows to what extent that industry has contributed to the pollution of our waters.

The minister also said and I quote:

Kraft mills have installed settling ponds and built biological treatment ponds.

It seems that those facilities are so up-to-date that there is good fishing in the rivers near them and that even the tourist industry does not have to incur, as in the past, the loss of revenue not only quite considerable but essential to the economy of some areas in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to deal now with shipping. During the current session, we will have to deal with a bill already introduced by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson), which will help check pollution, when in force. Going still further, the government will ask us to pass another bill providing for the establishment of a Department of Environment, which will be something new if I may say so, as no other country has thought of doing that so far.

I said a while ago that at the time I was sitting on NATO's scientific committee, I heard things that struck me. Moreover, I had the opportunity to talk with the representative of Turkey and, having read an article written by the reporter Jacques Girard on a lecture given by Dr. Gustave Prévost, a Quebec biologist, I said all NATO member countries could perhaps, in order to check such a plague, create their own departments to keep an eye on polluting agents which, all too often, know no boundary lines.

Let me read parts of an article published over a year ago and which concurs with the policy which the government intends to implement. I will therefore quote extracts from an article published in Montreal in March of this year:

States must keep an eye on polluting agents which know no boundary lines.

This is a statement by Dr. Prévost, a provincial government biologist. He further added, and I quote:

Ottawa should have full jurisdiction on the measures necessary to fight water pollution and this for reasons of efficiency: uniform standards should be adopted throughout the country so that everybody could find an advantage in not polluting the water more than his competitors.

• (4:10 p.m.)

And there should be an attempt to internationalize these standards through negotiations with the various countries and with the help of the UN: polluters ignore boundaries. Requirements for effluents should be identical everywhere.

Dr. Gustave Prévost, a biologist who has been interested in pollution for about thirty years and was at one time Director of the Quebec Biology Board took this stand at the University of Montreal Saturday afternoon during a forum organized by the junior commission of the Quebec section of the Federal Liberal party.

Dr. Prévost attacked the position that Quebec has adopted towards Ottawa, giving as an example what was taking place in the Eastern Townships, at Lake Memphremagog. Here is what he said:

The waters of this lake, which lies mostly in the United States, finally flow into the Saint-François River through the smaller Lake Magog.

For three years now, the town of Newport on the American side of Lake Memphremagog has had a treatment plan and a sewage system flowing into the lake and carrying a large quantity of phosphates from detergents. Consequently, algae are found in the lake and this process will eventually spell biological death of those waters, as has happened in Lake Erie. Such a process cannot be reversed. In the long run, biological death turns a lake into a swamp...

And many of our lakes and rivers in Quebec are in such a state. The article goes on to say:

Dr. Prévost classifies water into four categories depending on the degree of pollution.

First quality water—real drinking water—is spring water, except when it comes from certain underground pools which are already polluted.

Third quality water is contaminated by infectious hepatitis, and that is what we have in Montreal. It can be harmful. It is classified as drinking water when it does not contain colon bacilli. But the treatment it undergoes—chlorine included—does not eliminate viruses, detergent residues...A few years ago, Lachine "drinking" water was rather like a "detergent cocktail". Also in Pont-Viau...

I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to ask again in this House for the dredging of the Mille-Îles and the Back rivers.

Also, in Pont-Viau, the "drinking" water brought in infectious hepatitis, virus disease...

Mr. Speaker, I have just described the condition of waters in the town of Pont-Viau and in several river-side districts of the City of Laval. Drinking water caused some cases of infectious hepatitis, a virus disease. I consulted several specialists about it and they told me that the drinking water in the river-side districts of Laval, particularly in some areas of Ahuntsic, Bourassa or Dollard, contains colibacillus, the cause of hepatitis. Like my colleagues from Terrebonne (Mr. Comtois), Argenteuil-Deux-Montagnes (Mr. Major) and all those who tabled this project, I submit to the authorities what I have been suggesting since I became a member of this House—dredging the Mille-Îles and Back rivers.

I am aware that this is a local issue but this is one of the rare opportunities when a member of Parliament is allowed to speak about things of real interest to his riding.

City of Laval, which was part of my large riding of Laval before it was divided up and before I was elected in Ahuntsic, has a population of more than 230,000 today. It is the second largest city in Quebec.

The total municipal property assessment amounts to well over $800 million and taking into account the density of the population on the southern shores of the Back River, on Montreal Island, and adding the population in the constituencies of Bourassa, Ahuntsic, Dollard and Lachine, we get a total of over a million people for an aggregate property assessment exceeding $1 billion. This only goes to show, Mr. Speaker, the importance of that area and the reasons for my keen interest in that part of my constituency. The low-water levels which elsewhere are considered only as a threat, border on disaster where my constituents are concerned and a great many of them already have left or are considering leaving the river-shore districts. This situation is largely due to the conditions resulting from the pollution of the waters of both rivers and in this wonderful area known for its natural beauties and glorious mementoes of the early days of Ville-Marie, there is a feeling of uneasiness which apparently tends to paralyse any tourist promotion as well as the normal development of this natural water passage from the St. Lawrence to Lake St-Louis, then to Lake of Two-Mountains and into the Thousand-Isles and the Back rivers.

Briefs were submitted to the authorities. In the past, members representing that region felt duty bound to warn the authorities. However, in 1963, in view of the serious situation, a committee on the canalization of the Thousand-Isles and Back rivers was set up and registered on July 10, 1963 with the Superior Court of Montreal.

On the following August 15, a steering committee comprising a president, a vice-president, a secretary, four directors and a legal adviser was created. The federal members of Parliament whose constituencies bordered the rivers supported the request of 30 mayors of the riverside municipalities. Finally, in October 1963, the federal ministers of Transport and Public Works instructed engineers of their respective departments to undertake the required preliminary studies and report thereon.

In 1964, the Minister of Public Works agreed to meet the authorities of Laval. With these authorities and river-side residents he visited the whole area. He came to the conclusion that for the benefit of the population and in order to prevent an epidemic, it was necessary to dredge these two rivers during the spring of 1965. Following the flood in the western part of Laval, particularly in the city of Laval-Ouest the minister reported to the cabinet that it was urgent to take action in order to prevent a disaster.

During the fall of the same year the new Minister of Transport, Mr. Pickersgill, went further and said: these two rivers will be dredged, because the welfare of an entire population is at stake.

On July 7, 1967, I received the following letter from the Minister of Transport:

Dear Mr. Rochon,

I am pleased to inform you that on June 20, 1967, the cabinet approved the principle of the Grand Moulin Rapids canalization project on the Mille-Iles River.

The project will be undertaken in order to make the river navigable from the Deux-Montagnes Lake to Pont David. A sum of $1,250,000 is involved.

The Department of Public Works intends to start construction as soon as possible in 1968.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, to stop the progress of inflation, a calamity we believe should be eliminated in the interest of the whole country, the government decided to delay the project and all those concerned understood that, in the general interest, it could wait. There the matter rested until the beginning of the fight against pollution.

Last March, after consultations with Ottawa, the Quebec provincial government—as well as the other provincial governments—decided to make the population aware of the serious pollution problem and on that subject, I quote an article by Mr. André Beauvais which was published in a Montreal newspaper:

• (4:20 p.m.)

Water pollution: Quebec efforts to develop greater public awareness

This year, the Department of Health intends to tackle with greater vigour the water pollution problem.

As early as May, the first phase of a long term program will be launched on a provincial scale with a view to awaken the public to the problem of water pollution.

Continuing in that vein, the riverside residents of the City of Laval as well as those in the riding of Bourassa in Montreal North in Ahuntsic and Dollard, were asked to send water samples to the laboratories of Laval or McGill Universities.

Over 55,000 samples were sent to those laboratories were colon colibacilli were found in almost everyone of

them, in larger numbers perhaps in samples from the Back and the Thousand Island rivers.

A doctor I met and to whom I asked about the results of those tests told me that the thyphoïd epidemic of five years ago had probably been caused by pollution in the Back river near St. François de Salles, Saint-Vincent, Montreal North, La Visitation and Ahuntsic. Samples were sent from all over.

Mr. Speaker, I insisted on speaking of dredging the Back and the Thousand Island rivers because the general policy of the government against pollution—and I would like this to be well understood once again—is in the interest of all citizens. I am convinced that my appeal will not go unheard.

For some time now, along with my colleagues the hon. members for Laval (Mr. Roy), for Duvernay (Mr. Kierans), for Terrebonne (Mr. Comtois), and others, I have been meeting with the responsible ministers. We are now doing a more thorough study of this problem. Engineers have told us what the situation is and we are now looking forward to the enactment of more comprehensive legislation on pollution, in the best interests of the Canadian people.

Mr. Speaker, before resuming my seat, I would not forgive myself if I failed to do what all the previous speakers have done, namely congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne (Mr. Trudel and Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia)). They proved worthy of the confidence of their constituents, and I am sure that after hearing them they had faith in their future in Parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I should like at the outset to congratulate very sincerely the Deputy Speaker, who will, I am sure, discharge his duties with dignity, as he enjoys the full confidence of all members.

I should like to congratulate also the movers of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne (Mr. Trudel and Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia)). They fulfilled their obligation admirably. In fact, it was normal in their case to put emphasis on the government's accomplishments.

I should like to congratulate also in a special way the previous speaker, who just made a magnificent speech, where he pointed out, among other things, that the human being had once again been sacrificed to save the dollar. Alleging inflation the government has allowed the pollution problem to get worse. Like the hon. member I think it is unfortunate that such conditions should continue and I heartily support his claims so that we may take as soon as possible the necessary steps to check that national plague.

The Speech from the Throne is the usual statement of the policy which the government intends to follow and of the pieces of legislation it expects Parliament to pass. This year's speech is no exception to the rule: it abounds in high-sounding sentences which are pleasant to ear and bring hope, but it makes no mention at all of the means the government will take to establish a truly just society.

However, the Speech from the Throne refers to the generation gap in the following terms:

> Because of the clash between these new values and the old, because of the quest by the young and the disillusioned for some resolution of attitudes, we live in a period of tenseness and unease. It is an age frequented by violence as desperate men seek ill defined goals; an age of frustrations as gentle men question impatiently old assumptions.

This last sentence is quite significant. Indeed this age of ours affords us perhaps a last chance to choose our destiny instead of submitting to it. But that is only possible on one condition, that man be not the slave of progress, but rather its master. And to that end, Mr. Speaker, it is essential that the government have the courage to make the financial reforms required to put our monetary system at the service of the people, when at this moment, we are its slaves.

Yet, the government seems aware of that situation. It also seems to understand that change is the most pressing reality, since it states:

> The decade of the seventies extends beyond our present vision, yet the momentum of change is already so overwhelming that man can no longer afford the luxury of reacting to events. He must anticipate and plan. He must accept that contentment and indifference are illusory; that the most dramatic reality is change; that there is more need than ever before to preserve as constant values truth, honesty, excellence and relevance; that a society which is not inspired by love and compassion is not worthy of the name.

Mr. Speaker, the economic dictatorship often denounced over 30 years ago by politicians such as René Chalout and Dr. Philippe Hamel, continued to reign supreme in Canada and mainly in Quebec, regardless of the government in power. The fundamental rights of the individual are not respected in spite of the extraordinary progress accomplished in the field of science and productivity. In 1970, sick people unable to make a living are still facing daily difficulties because of a lack of income that would allow them to meet their basic needs. There still are many destitute people who get a small allowance of $30 to $50 a month and this, in a country as rich as Canada. In some cases, and there are unfortunately too many, repeated inquiries are made, procedures are delayed while those in need are urged to be patient, and soon. But, at the bottom of their heart they feel abandoned and refuse to believe in the advantages that society can bring them. The administration is too slow. No account is taken of the needs and of the income of those people. We quite often receive complaints in this connection and when I happen to follow them up, I find, unfortunately, that the person who complains is justified in doing so. In that regard, I think it can be recognized that the reports of the Senate committee now making and inquiry across the country are not exaggerated and that the members are making recommendations likely to correct the situation.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Economic dictatorship was denounced by the great Pope Pius XI in his 1931 encyclical on economic and social problems, in the strong following words:

> In the first place, it is obvious that not only is wealth concentrated in our times but an immense power and despotic eco-

nomic dictatorship is consolidated in the hands of a few, who often are not owners but only the trustees and managing directors of invested funds which they administer according to their own arbitrary will and pleasure.

This dictatorship is being most forcibly exercised by those who, since they hold the money and completely control it, control credit also and rule the lending of money.

... This could even exist at the government level.

Hence, they regulate the flow so to speak, of the lifeblood whereby the entire economic system lives, and have so firmly in their grasp the soul, as it were, of economic life, that no one can breathe against their will.

This is so true that important and urgent projects are delayed from year to year, precisely owing to the shortage of money, that economic blood which must serve the nation rather than exploit it.

I am quite surprised to note that many individuals in a position to communicate with the public ruthlessly criticize the activities of politicians who are an easy target. They are unkind to politicians, but those same persons are extremely timorous when the established economic order, the financial and monetary systems are concerned. It looks as if they spend all their energy blaming the political order, but they do not dare deal with the stock market, lobbying, speculation, trusts, unrestricted competition, monopolizing, collusion, false advertising, kickbacks, disrupted trade due to the greed of unscrupulous agents. Yet, it should be done in order to improve and transform the system.

Mr. Speaker, the reform of our capitalistic system will be achieved by people who are respectful of law and order, and I believe that it is easily understood here that every one of us is working towards this goal. However there are outside elements of lawlessness at work trying to change our economic system. It is only a small group resorting to unethical means and it is the responsibility of the House to try and effect the change in peace and order.

If nothing is done our system will be destroyed by anarchic elements. It is up to us to make the choice while there is still time. One thing is certain: our system cannot remain what it is today, particularly in the area of distribution, where an abundant production is ensured by man's labour, by science, equipment and discoveries of all kinds. This accumulation of goods in the presence of needs that remain unsatisfied is an injustice which prompts the Canadian people to lend a sympathetic ear to those who advocate violence and disorder.

I think it is high time we reacted if we do not want to witness here what has happened in other countries.

In January of 1969 in London, the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) replying to a newspaperman who had asked him what would be the solution to the economic problems of Canada, the Prime Minister coolly stated that he would favour true communism as the ideal solution.

I hope that the newspaper reports of his words were incorrect because we, as Canadians, have better things to do than try to establish in our country a communist regime which has never proved satisfactory elsewhere. However, history tells us that in every country where there is a communist regime, that has been brought about through the action of a very small number of revolutionaries.

In an encyclical letter, Pope Pius XI said:

Social and economic organization will be properly structured and will realize its objective only if it provides all its members with all the goods that natural and industrial resources and a truly social organization of the economy are able to provide, these being sufficient to provide each and everyone with an honest living.

Mr. Speaker, no one is asking for more. We want the smallest and the weakest member of society to have the minimum required or a decent living.

We should all eagerly aim at such an objective. The Speech from the Throne deals with it when it defines what should be our society. In fact, we can read the following:

—a society in which human differences are regarded as assets, not liabilities;

—a society in which individual freedom and equality of opportunity remain as our most cherished possessions;

—a society in which the enjoyment of life is measured in qualitative, not quantitative terms;

—a society which encourages imagination and daring, ingenuity and initiative, not coldly and impersonally for the sake of efficiency, but with warmth and from the heart as between friends.

This is the definition given in the Speech from the Throne and I endorse it. If the government with the help of the Canadian Parliament could achieve this objective of a well organized "just society", I think it would solve a great number of our present problems.

Jacques Maritain said that all men had an equal right to the use of material wealth.

The family is the vital cell of society and the true aim of economic activities is to insure the true common good, that is to say the necessary minimum income.

The fruits of the present future production result, for the greater part, from social capital accumulated over generations and those proceeds should be distributed in a "social" way to each and every member of society, as his right.

With the coming of automation, labour, which was formerly the main source of income, is becoming ever less necessary. That is why we have hundreds of unemployed who, because of our present economic system, are not entitled to share the fruits of production because they did not contribute to it by their manual labour.

In an open letter to the former president of the United States some American economists and sociologists have stated that in consideration of the fact that production is liberating human work without being able to take advantage of it in a useful way, the first condition to be implemented in order to avoid unprecedented economic and social disorder is to ensure to everyone a guaranteed minimum income.

• (4:40 p.m.)

I hope that the reference in the Throne Speech to the guaranteed minimum income will not be an empty one and that this objective will be achieved.

It is precisely what the Ralliement Créditiste has been suggesting for years. But governments have turned a deaf ear to these proposals. Again, last week, we moved a subamendment inviting the government to increase family allowances; that would have a direct effect in helping families, since Canada is able to do it, keeping in mind the tremendous production in store and the great number of unemployed who are ready to produce more.

This proposal has been voted on in this House, and the two traditional parties have joined to vote against an increase in family allowances. I wonder then whether they lack logic and sincerity.

Agriculture in Quebec is experiencing serious difficulties. Industrial milk producers are operating in trying conditions. Indeed, I have been told once that truly good producers do not need to be subsidized by the government to operate at a reasonable profit.

Nevertheless, following the visit paid by the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on September 20th to Mr. Reebs, a St-Grégoire farmer, in the constituency of Nicolet, the magazine *La terre de chez nous* reported this incident:

> Mr. Reebs admitted to the Prime Minister that out of a yearly net income of $4,800, subsidies accounted for some $4,500.

I believe that he was exaggerating or else the journalist erroneously reported the figures. Anyhow, he was not exaggerating when he said that his net income was $4,800. This is a necessary minimum. However, I believe it is untrue to say that the subsidies amount to $4,500. I now resume the quotation:

> Needless to say that a cut in the subsidies would mean bankruptcy for me. I have been here for ten years only. You could tell me to turn to other types of farming; of course, there is the sugar-beet, about which I know a little, but this product is even more subsidized than milk, and you will not see me get into that—And what about cattle, said the Prime Minister?
>
> It is a proven fact that cattle requires three times as much capital, and it takes seven years to get something out of it—
>
> It will take me all my life. At the present time, I put back every penny I save. I have 20 years of experience in the dairy industry.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed true that we could progressively get the industrial milk producers who have to leave that field for well-known reasons into other kinds of production. Perhaps it would be wise to interest some of them in sheep-breeding. Judging from an advertisement published in *La Presse* on October 14, 1970, and sponsored by Steinberg's, there would be room on the Canadian meat market for a larger quantity of lamb.

The advertisement read as follows:

> Spring lamb from New Zealand. Why is lamb such a good buy?

You can find out in *La Presse* under date of October 14, 1970. Those people can afford to advertise like that. They are going to sell lots of New Zealand lamb. But the producers of industrial milk, with their small income of $3.60 per hundredweight, cannot afford such advertising, so the consumers forget about the milk producers.

In my constituency of Bellechasse, such breeding could be done very successfully.

I suggest that the government should seriously consider the possibility of promoting that industry which could use the farms which have been or will soon be abandonned, if the policy is not amended.

Is the government really serious when proposing its farm policy? We saw last year that a petition bearing the signature of 25,000 producers of manufactured milk was handed to the government in the House. I signed it myself. In that request, the petitioners asked that an emergency debate be held on the government dairy policy. When the session came to a close, the government had not dealt with that petition even if on several occasions I had reminded the House Leader of it.

It might be said that an emergency debate was held on the situation of milk producers. I admit it, but this was done through a motion from the member for Bellechasse. However, the 25,000 petitioners keep asking, when they meet us, whether their petition will be considered in a serious debate likely to improve the situation.

And I always tell them the truth, I hope, when I say that their petition has been introduced in the House and that one of these days, they may be able to see the results.

In any event, I know full well that industrial milk producers have make more than reasonable attempts to reduce their production, and at this stage, I would like to bring the fact to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) who is responsible for the dairy policy. A great many of them have met the requirement of the government, but I beg for mercy for those who remain in the dairy industry. Better prices should be guaranteed to them so as to increase their income and allow them to meet their obligations. I shall take up the subject again when we consider the estimates of the Department of Agriculture.

There are also possibilities for industrial development in my area and I am asking the government to see that the requests for subsidies made by those who do not hesitate to extend their facilities or by those who have enough initiative to create new industries are processed as quickly as possible, as this would create employment.

Yet, this is a very simple thing. In fact, the legislation exists, the estimates have been passed. On behalf of the industry I put the question: Why does it take so long to consider a request, to give an answer or to pay subsidies?

I also ask the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) to assure me that the town of Montmagny, presently in difficulties because of its large number of unemployed, be designated as a special area so as to enable the municipal authorities to carry out urgent public works projects and provide employment for the excessive number of unemployed in that locality.

Finally, I ask again that the government undertake immediately the dredging of Montmagny Basin so that greater use may be made of the harbour in that municipality, which would greatly help industrial development in that area. I will perhaps be told that the government has no money for this. To that, I would answer that, if this was for war purposes, the financial problem would not arise.

Funds for warfare are always available, bout no funds are available for achievements in time of peace. The situation is becoming increasingly repulsive.

Most unfortunate events are now taking place in Canada, and more specifically in Quebec. Injustices of all kinds lead to unrest which is disturbing to all those concerned with the common welfare.

It is certainly not by resorting to violence that the situation will be corrected as it necessarily must be. All nations that have resorted to violence have subsequently found themselves in worse straits. Speaking of violence, allow me to read two short extracts from a letter published in l'*Action* of October 16, 1970, in connection with the events we experienced, and which became even more tragic at the end of the week. This is what was said:

> To oppose violence without taking the means to eliminate those factors which generate serious social pressures, is to give evidence of ignorance or of hypocrisy.
>
> To expose open violence is easy, but this is not enough. One must seek out its sources, kill the roots which give life to violence and change the soil in which it so easily sprouts and grows. That responsibility should be assumed by this scandalized elite which is in great need of enlightenment before it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, in some countries, violence was reported to in order to change situations which did not please the man in the street. There were fights, brother against brother; there were mass killings and after the battle was over, the same people had to rebuild over their own ruins and accommodate their lives to the same economic dictatorship and to the same financial sharks.

I recall the unfortunate events which took place in France in May 1968, witnessed by myself and several Canadian members of this House.

Let us recall also that the Canadian Parliament of which we are members was unable to go on with its business for over two hours at the last session because of a group of young women who had been mobilized to protest.

Mr. Speaker, I never did understand, why authorities tolerate revolutionary training schools in our country. This has already been denounced by people outside of politics who nevertheless were exercising some authority and who had the courage to warn the population.

The present economic situation is disastrous for our young people because too many are without work. We know by experience that when we are young we are full of energy. If it is not spent on good achievements it is spent on bad endeavours.

It is sad for parents who have given up so many things to bring up their children, to give them a sound education, to see that because of unemployment—which we must make every effort to check—some people try to have them take drugs and to use them, not to develop our country but to foment disorder and spread destruction.

Mr. Speaker: I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

• (4:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, like other hon. members I wish to extend my sincere congratulations to the two hon. members who moved and seconded the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. Both hon. gentlemen delivered very fine speeches. It is always a great honour for an hon. member to be selected to perform this function. While I must confess I do not agree with all these hon. members had to say, I shall defend their right to say it. I should like also to extend my very best wishes to hon. members opposite who have been elevated to higher positions in the government since our last session. At the same time, I extend my deepest regrets to those on the government side who were called but obviously were not chosen. To these former Parliamentary Secretaries, I can only say "it is better to have loved and lost than never to have loved at all."

I am sure my constituents would want me to make reference to the recent turn of events in the province of Quebec, and at the same time express their sympathy to the bereaved family of the late Hon. Pierre Laporte. I must confess that while my initial reaction to the news of the murder of my fellow Canadian was that of shock and grief it was soon replaced by a feeling of extreme anger. I might say that as a relatively new Canadian, one who has developed a feeling of love and loyalty for this country and its institutions, I find it very difficult to accept what is taking place in our country at this particular time. In the light of the senselessness of the recent slaying, the sinister motives of a small minority of people in the province of Quebec who would overthrow our way of life and smear the good reputation of our nation at home and abroad, is it any wonder that as Canadians we all stand a little shorter in the eyes of the world when we realize that a mere handful of people is able to threaten that which we have treasured for so long and for which so many of our people have died. It is an extremely serious situation which demands that the full weight of the law be brought to bear on those responsible.

We on this side of the House fully appreciate the seriousness of the situation. We supported the measure taken by this government to, we hope, restore law and order in the province of Quebec. God knows, these measures were extreme and repugnant to most Canadians but, be that as it may, we agreed with the government that these measures were necessary and subsequently we supported them. We can only hope they achieve the objective at which they are aimed in a very short time. The invocation of the War Measures Act and the consequent deprivation of the civil liberties of our people is

not the sort of thing to which I take pleasure in being a party. However, like most Canadians, I am prepared to forgo certain liberties and agree to the suspension of the Bill of Rights if it means the restoration of my freedoms and those of all Canadians. If it is necessary for us to put up with the loss of some of our freedoms in order to regain one of our most fundamental freedoms, the freedom from fear, then so be it.

There is one thing I shall not accept. As I said, I did accept the fact that the War Measures Act was necessary to, we hope, restore law and order in the province of Quebec, but there is one thing which I as a Canadian and a member of this House of Commons refuse to accept. I refer to one of the underlying causes of the unrest which we are experiencing in almost every part of this country today. It is the government's total indifference toward the social and economic problems which have nurtured this unrest. This government, by its anti-inflation policy and its policy of deliberately forcing our people on the rolls of the unemployed, is in my opinion fanning the flames of unrest across this country, particularly in the economically depressed areas. If the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his government are determined to persist in their present illogical policy of fighting inflation and stabilizing the economy, then the real victims of that policy, the unemployed, the untrained, the old age pensioners and those on fixed incomes, should be given special assistance.

When a wage-earner, as a result of becoming unemployed, has used up all his savings, is head over heels in debt and reaches a time when his unemployment insurance benefits have expired and is therefore forced on welfare, how long does it take him to get back on an even keel? In too many cases it takes years; indeed, some never recover from this experience.

Having said that, I should like now to make a few brief comments on the Speech from the Throne. I say "brief comments", sir, because a document that is so empty, so devoid of any worth-while matter, does of necessity allow only brief comments. The Prime Minister is to be congratulated on his choice of script writers. After reading the Speech from the Throne it becomes quite apparent that its authors can look forward to a great future. As a matter of fact, if they continue to turn out such drivel, I contend that they have a much better future as writers than does their boss as Prime Minister.

• (5:00 p.m.)

I am sure that many thousands of unemployed people in Canada will be extremely pleased to know that their government intends during the present session to give consideration to the report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women. They will also take great comfort, I am sure, from the fact that there is no mention of any immediate plans on the part of this government to deal with the critical, government-induced employment crisis which we now have in Canada. I am sure that the many thousands of Canadians who are forced to live and to raise their families in homes and under conditions that are substandards, and in a great many cases unfit for human habitation, will be pleased to know that we are living in a society, as the Throne Speech says, wherein the enjoyment of life is measured in terms of quality and not quantity, in a society in which individual freedom and equality of opportunity remain as our most cherished possession.

I am sure, also, that our unemployed will be pleased to know that the Prime Minister's dream of a just society is not yet dead and that he is still pursuing it. Our young men and women who are forced, through no fault of their own, to live in the ghettos of our cities and whose address will automatically deny them a job for which they are adequately qualified, will also get great satisfaction from the Prime Minister's promise of a just society.

While I am on the subject of the so-called just society I would ask hon. members to talk to the fishermen in my riding in order to get their views on the so-called justice in our society. Let them ask the fishermen how it feels to be denied a chance to earn a living from the fisheries, by a government that is quite prepared to spend huge sums of money on compiling reports on the status of women, on bilingualism and biculturalism, on ministerial junkets and on multi-million dollar jet Stars; and having had the gall to do that, to plead poverty when we request them to provide a breakwater or other essential facility to enable our fishermen to provide a living for themselves and their families. I ask you, sir, in all sincerity: Where is the justice in a society that will condone that kind of situation?

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Carter: Another thing which was conspicuous by its absence from the Throne Speech was any mention of the very serious danger facing our marine resources—the danger of depletion. Like most hon. members, especially those from eastern Canada, I have a great interest in our country's marine resources. I was keenly disappointed that no mention was made in the Throne Speech of the need for immediate action by this government to put an end to the plundering of our fish resources by foreign fishing ships.

The Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) is well aware of the crisis facing our east coast fisheries as a result of the depletion of that resource. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) has publicly admitted that a crisis does indeed exist. People in the industry are aware of the crisis and have been pleading for government action, but I regret to say that none has been forthcoming. I am sure that the average Canadian living in eastern Canada, where fishery is a very important factor in the economy, must be asking himself why the government is so reluctant to take the necessary initiatives to stave off the impending depletion of this great marine resource.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp), who was in the chamber until a moment ago, can afford to spend weeks, months and perhaps years negotiating diplomatic recognition for Red China. He can afford to make trips to Norway and other Scandinavian

countries to speak to Chinese delegations about Canada's desire to recognize Communist China. Yet the same minister is unwilling to lift a finger to negotiate with the other communists, the Soviet Union, with a view to implementing a policy that would have the effect of conserving our marine resources to stave off their complete depletion. The answer is quite obvious. Most of us are not at all fooled by the minister's reluctance and by the unwillingness of the Secretary of State for External Affairs to try to negotiate on our behalf. I think the average Canadian is no fool and we are all getting the message loud and clear.

The Minister of Fisheries and Forestry is, of course, aware of this problem but he is obviously unable to get the necessary support from his cabinet colleagues and from the Prime Minister.

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): That is a decision for the hon. member who has the floor. Does the hon. member agree?

Mr. Carter: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Kaplan: Is the hon. member aware of the Russian-Canadian treaty that was signed yesterday dealing with fishing rights off the Grand Banks?

Mr. Carter: I am aware of one thing, that the hon. member's knowledge of the situation and of what happened between the Soviet Union and Canada is as good as any knowledge of nuclear physics. The hon. member should know—I inform the House of this, in the event hon. members are misled by what he said—that the agreement entered into this week by our government and the Russian delegation had nothing whatever to do with the Grand Banks, much to the shame of the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry and of the government of which he is a member. We contend that had some effort been put into it, and had the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry accepted our advice and suggestions, while the Russians were here and were prepared to sit down at the bargaining table we possibly could have negotiated an agreement which would have taken in the continental shelf, including the Grand Banks.

Mr. Bigg: He was misled by his own minister.

Mr. Carter: I hope the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr. Kaplan) is listening, because I believe he is one of those who share this view. The hard fact of the matter is that this government appears to have adopted an attitude whereby it is embarrassed to talk about fish. The word "fish" has been a dirty, four-letter word. We believe it is incumbent upon this government to immediately take an international initiative, not at the next Law of the Sea Conference but immediately, to convene an international conference on fish conservation and management. We feel, also, that if agreement among all nations is impossible, then Canada must take unilateral action to protect and conserve this vital resource. We believe—in fact we know—that Canada has every right to take such action under articles 6 and 7 adopted by the International Conference on the Law of the Sea in 1958.

We believe, also, that the Russians, who are the biggest offenders when it comes to plundering the marine resources of our east coast, have a tremendous investment in fisheries. They have outfitted large fleets of vessels to cross the Atlantic and fish in this part of the world. In view of that fact and in order to protect their investment, we believe they would be prepared to listen to reason and to agree upon some form of management control. Certainly, the least we can expect from our government is that they recognize the problem, endeavour to do something about it and do not use the ostrich psychology of sticking their heads in the sand and pretending the problem does not exist.

• (5:10 p.m.)

In case hon. members opposite continue to entertain any doubt about the gravity of the situation, I shall read the following statistics into the record: The catch, in quantity, of our inshore fishermen in Newfoundland has dropped roughly by half over the last ten to 15 years. quantity, of our inshore fishermen in Newfoundland has dropped roughly by half over the last ten to 15 years. The average catch of the average small inshore fisherman in Newfoundland is down to about 50 per cent of what it was in the mid-1950's. Meanwhile, the total catch in the northwest Atlantic by member nations of the International Commission of the North Atlantic Fishery increased from two million tons in 1958 to four million tons in 1968. The Soviet catch in this same area and during the same period increased from 117,000 tons to 741,000 tons. The cod catch of the member nations increased from 880,000 tons to 1,860,000 tons while on the other hand, in the period from 1963 to 1969, Newfoundland's total cod catch dropped from 450 million pounds to 300 million pounds, despite the fact that Newfoundland fishermen have been operating at their efficiency peak and are better equipped than they have ever been to prosecute the cod fishery. According to these statistics, and to people eminently qualified to speak on the subject, cod stocks on Canada's east coast could very well be in serious trouble within five years.

As for haddock, the statistics are frightening. In 1965 the total catch in the northwest Atlantic was 249,000 tons, of which the Russians took 129,000 tons. In 1968 the total catch was 97,000 tons, even though some nations had quadrupled their efforts. I would refer at this point to a statement made by the Minister of Fisheries on October 14, in which with a great deal of enthusiasm he announced that fishing for haddock on George's Bank will be closed to Canadian fishermen from October 23 until the end of the year in keeping with a conservation recommendation made by the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries.

In effect, the minister said that Canada is now prepared to lock the proverbial door after the horse has been stolen—because he knows, as do we, that haddock

stocks on George's Bank have been depleted to such an extent that scientists argue it is almost impossible for haddock to replenish themselves by natural means. After allowing the Russians and others to overfish, to plunder our stocks of haddock on George's Bank until there is nothing left for anybody to fish, these countries now agree to exercise some control. Why would not the Russians and the fishermen of other countries agree to this earlier? The fact is that today the stocks have been depleted to such an extent that it is not economically feasible to fish for haddock on George's Bank. Why was not the Minister of Fisheries able to enter into negotiations with the Russians and other ICNAF countries to bring about some form of management control over haddock resources on George's Bank? Before I leave the subject of fisheries, Mr. Speaker, I would like to impress upon the House and the government the need for immediate action to bring about international agreement whereby our fish stocks will be conserved and the danger of depletion brought to an end. I believe this can be achieved, but it will require great interest and pretty strong negotiation on the part of the Canadian government.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I hope the government will give the fishing industry the attention and priority it deserves. That industry may not mean much to the economy of people living in Don Valley and other parts of Upper Canada, but to certain parts of Canada, including the province I have the honour to represent, it means a great deal. We have a population of a little over half a million people, and 125,000 of our people derive a living either directly or indirectly from the fisheries. Is it any wonder that we are so anxious to have the government take the necessary action to prevent the total collapse of that industry? If the cod fishing industry fails, if we stand by and allow a continuation of what is happening, it is quite conceivable that within five years codfish will be a rare delicacy. The effect upon the economy of Newfoundland would be terrible.

I was pleased to read in the Speech from the Throne the government's intention to reorganize its urban activities under the direction of a full-time minister of urban affairs and housing. Housing, Mr. Speaker, plays an important role in economic development. To ignore the importance of housing and urban renewal, when considering development, is to ignore an important ingredient behind economic growth. In the Atlantic provinces, and especially in Newfoundland, housing stocks leave a great deal to be desired both as to quality and as to volume. While it is nice for CMHC and the DBS to bring out a forecast of housing needs for the next ten or 15 years, our prospects in the Atlantic area of attaining the desired target are very gloomy. Our prospects of ever attaining the number of homes suggested by CMHC as being required are very remote indeed, taking into account the Newfoundland economy, the financial condition of the Newfoundland government which is forecast and the limited financial capability of the vast majority of wage earners in that province to buy homes.

To those of us who have taken an interest in the housing situation in Canada, particularly in Atlantic Canada, it would appear that there is room for flexibility and experimentation by CMHC. The problems of the Atlantic region are somewhat different from those confronting most of Canada and, we feel, merit special attention. If I may be allowed to overgeneralize, the government's program to date appears to have been conceived to overcome the pockets of poor housing that exist amidst general urban affluence, while the problem in Atlantic Canada, especially in Newfoundland, is one of pockets of affluence in the midst of general poverty. In this regard we must stress the importance of taking regional differences into consideration.

• (5:20 p.m.)

A housing program policy should fit within the framework of a general social and economic policy, in which case the Atlantic area should be given top priority on the government's list for future expenditures on housing. A government that is seriously concerned with present housing problems and is interested in providing a better quality of life for all Canadians, should start showing its concern by making home ownership available to our wage earners who are on the bottom half of the income level. As the first step toward reaching that goal I would respectfully recommend to the government that it abolish the sales tax on building materials. The sales tax on building materials adds an estimated $950 to the price of a modest, three-bedroom bungalow. A government which continues to impose such tax is not serious in its professed desire to conquer Canada's housing problem.

If it is not financially feasible to remove the tax in its entirety, consideration should be given to a gradual approach starting, possibly, with a system of rebates on the amount of tax on materials used in houses costing $20,000 or less. This, of course, would have the desired effect of helping people in middle and low-income brackets who are buying homes in the $20,000 or less bracket. Let us face it; the average person who is at the middle or bottom half of the income level in Canada is the fellow who is buying a house for $20,000 or less. Such a rebate system should be administered so that the reduced cost resulting from the elimination of the sales tax is deducted from the purchase price of the house at the time of sale.

The government should consider the possibility of subsidizing interest rates to support home ownership for low-income families, including those involved in co-op housing. A subsidy program should be devised to help families who really need it. I am not too concerned about subsidizing interest rates or abolishing the sales tax on homes that cost $30,000, $40,000 or $50,000 because I feel that the people buying that type of house can well afford to pay the sales tax and the interest charged by the various lending institutions. I agree with the principle of building societies, as well as providing some form of tax relief on mortgage interest payments. I see no reason why a government sincerely interested in trying to solve the housing problem in this country would not agree to some kind of tax relief on mortgage interest payments on homes, again within the $20,000 or less bracket.

I agree with the concept put forward by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) in 1968 in a speech he made, I believe, in Windsor. At that time he pointed out the need for regional land banks and the establishment of a revolving fund out of which we would buy land in advance of development and later sell it to developers with the understanding that a reasonable price would be charged the purchasers of homes. It is quite obvious to all of us that—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I regret having to interrupt the hon. member, but I must remind him that his allotted time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Does the House agree that the hon. member may complete his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Carter: Thank you, sir, and hon. members for allowing me to continue. I hope that what I have to say will justify the tolerance I have been shown.

Getting back to housing, I recommend that we abolish the sales tax and give some form of tax relief on mortgage interest payments. I recommend the establishment of a land bank financed by a revolving fund. I feel, too, that we should give some thought to amending the National Housing Act so that housing authorities, municipal, provincial or what have you, would be able to purchase existing houses for subsidized rental. I cite an example in my city where the three levels of government, municipal, provincial and federal, embarked upon a program of building subsidized rental housing. The cost of these homes in the final analysis exceeded $20,000 per unit.

In every city in Canada—and I speak with some authority of the city of St. John's, Newfoundland—there are probably hundreds of homes for sale at prices that range from $8,000 to $15,000. These houses probably still have 25 or 30 years of life. They could be purchased by a housing authority for a sum much less than the cost of building subsidized rental housing of the type that we have. These houses could then be rented to people in the middle and low-income bracket in the same way as rental houses under a subsidized rental plan. I feel this could work.

While I am talking about housing and the need for subsidized rentals for people suffering hardship because they are at the bottom half of the income ladder, let me make a few remarks about social assistance and welfare in this country. I do not think I am saying anything that has not been said before when I say that this country will never achieve its potential prosperity or high level of economic maturity as long as a major segment of our population remains non-productive. When you consider that 20 per cent of any population, whether it be in the province of Newfoundland, Ontario, Manitoba or indeed any part of Canada or the world, is forced by economic circumstances and legislative restrictions to live off the fat of an already flabby economy, you realize that society is indeed in trouble.

I suppose my province is no different from most provinces of Canada. It is a little worse off, yet no less proud or desirous of retaining independence. But because of lack of opportunity and restrictions in legislation governing social and welfare assistance, many of our people have been sentenced to a non-productive and demoralizing existence—through no fault of their own and without even having committed a crime. In my opinion it is imperative that we take a long hard look at the Canada Assistance Plan. The formula proposed last year by the Atlantic provinces for improved cost-sharing arrangements and the plan to make more federal funds available appear to warrant urgent and careful consideration by this government. This concept strikes at the very root of federal-provincial fiscal and monetary arrangements as they affect the slow-growth areas of our country.

This is one area in which a national formula, as far as I am concerned, is not the answer. Neither is it rational to have the same precise, rigid form of legislation which governs areas such as those covered by the Canada Assistance Plan applying equally to each province. For example, Newfoundland might disagree with some of the provisions of the act in so far as they restrict our province from developing programs which are tailored to our unique needs. We would still want to avail ourselves of the federal contributions available under the social assistance plan.

• (5:30 p.m.)

People on welfare, whether they live in St. John's, Newfoundland, Alberta, Halifax or New Brunswick have but one burning desire. I am not prepared to accept the theory that people on welfare enjoy welfare. They do not want to stay on welfare. Neither is it true that most of them think they have found their niche in life and are happy to stay in it. I do not accept that theory because I know it is not true. It may be true for a very small minority, but the majority of people on welfare have been forced to accept welfare as a result of circumstances over which they have no control. They do not like it any more than we would like it.

These unfortunate people are asking for a place in life where they will not be discards or cast-offs because through no fault of their own they contribute little to the productivity of our country; and by the same token, we contribute little to them. Surely, Mr. Speaker, there must be some way in which the province, the nation and the individual can contribute one to another. At the moment this government seems less than willing to talk about amending the Canada Assistance Plan in a way which would allow the provinces the power of discretion and to renegotiate the terms and conditions of the plan as well as the limitations it now imposes upon them.

There are many areas of this country where resources and public service needs lend themselves to wiser utilization of the federal and provincial funds now made available through welfare. In many parts of Canada welfare

funds could be more properly used for the development and improvement of the quality of life, while at the same time allowing those burdened with the stigma and humiliation of welfare to be redeployed creatively. As I have said, the average person who has been forced by circumstance to accept welfare is begging for a place in the sun. He wants a chance to work so that he can stand tall, walk straight and again earn the admiration of his family, wife and friends. I am sure the average fellow on welfare does not want to feel that he is a parasite, or that he is living off the fat of the land. All he wants is a chance. It is up to us to amend the Canada Assistance Plan so that these people can be given a chance to work for a decent wage. They do not want to work for welfare—I make this distinction—they want to work for decent wages and regain that which they have almost lost, their self respect.

I shall conclude, sir, by making some brief remarks about the problems of some other very important people in our society who seem to have been given the other end of the stick. I am referring to our senior citizens. Most of us who have had occasion to talk to these people recognize that financial problems are their biggest worry. The biggest worry of our senior citizens is not old age; it is poverty. These people have given the best part of their lives to their country, and I contend that they deserve something better than they now have. Surely we as a society are under an obligation to see that our senior citizens do not suffer and are not humiliated in later years as a result of money problems.

In Newfoundland there is also great concern among those who have reached middle-age and upper middle-age. There is a need across this country—this applies particularly to Newfoundland where a very high proportion of these people are unskilled—for more initiative in manpower retraining programs. A frequent complaint of many Newfoundlanders who are middle-aged is that they are completely left out of the labour market because of their age and lack of training. Yet these people still have the responsibility, in many cases, of raising a young family. No level of government has ever seriously studied this problem or taken concrete action to solve it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Aurélien Noël (Outremont): Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity during the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne to make a few remarks that I find appropriate.

First of all, I should like to join with my colleagues to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, the hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel) and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) as well as the new Deputy Chairman of Committees of the Whole House, the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Laniel).

Almost four months ago, on June 29, 1970, the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) delivered to the Canadian nation the following message on the 103rd anniversary of the Canadian Confederation:

The day we are celebrating, July 1, offers the opportunity to reflect together on the Canadian reality and recall its singularly favourable character.

Thanks to the immensity of its territory, the abundance of its resources, the stability of its democratic institutions, its atmosphere of liberty, the good will and tolerance of its citizens, Canada is one of the most privileged countries of the world.

We certainly have problems to solve. Various pressures interfere here and there with our good luck. There is still too much distrust and resistance between the two main linguistic communities of the country; there is too wide a gap between those who own more and those who own less; divergent interests between the various parts of Canada tend to create isolated areas; and a frequent lack of understanding between the older and the younger generation is prejudicial to a good and fruitful friendship.

Very fortunately our problems are not as big and as serious as the conflicts which are afflicting and tearing apart many countries. They are nevertheless real problems and we cannot ignore them. On the contrary, we must do everything to smooth them and to settle them, because they give us an opportunity to transcend ourselves.

In tackling and overcoming them, we have an opportunity to build a society where fraternity will have replaced distrust, where justice will have conquered poverty, where altruism will have won over the egocentrism of areas and where mutual understanding will have brought generations together.

In a world always under the threat of injustice and revenge, hostilities and wars, Canada certainly has an exciting task. If indeed it succeeds in reconciling the oppositions that are pulling it apart, it will have shown that men, however different they may be, can, when it is their wish, live as equals and brothers.

We live in a country of unlimited hopes, where the variety of languages, cultures and minds offer us the possibility of rare enhancement. Let us be proud of it. And all together, with determination and enthusiasm, let us work without respite for the unity and the advancement of Canada.

• (5:40 p.m.)

These words express a fervent and sincere wish oft repeated by the Prime Minister. His government has indeed resolutely set itself to work since 1968 in order to assure a better administration, to strengthen the bonds of Canadian unity, to stabilize the Canadian economy, to improve the individual's status before the law and in his relations with his fellow citizens, in matters of unemployment and job security, in matters of housing and others dealing with environment, etc. Many studies have been carried out and others are under way in order to find ways to improve human conditions.

Unfortunately, problems over the past two years have developed too quickly and have been too complicated considering the time we have had to examine and solve them. Furthermore, we are the neighbours of a great country which, unwillingly, adds its own problems to ours.

The Speech from the Throne and the long list of bills tabled by the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) point out the means by which a more just society can soon be achieved.

The tragic events of the last few days have thrown Canada into an unfortunate and unforeseen situation, used as we were to live in a country where attacks on democratic principles were not taken seriously. For a rather long time there had been dark clouds above the horizon, but it is mostly since 1963 that the storm had been gathering in the distance. The ones who shouted beware were considered as prophets of doom. Incendiary slogans replaced the ambitious guidelines of the quiet revolution. Veiled incitement to a change in our political system soon gave way to unruly demonstrations. "Mein Kampfs" of all sorts are published and the true aims of their authors are printed in black and white. At the same

time, bombs explode in mail boxes and in a plant where a strike is on. There are thefts of arms, dynamite and bank hold-ups. In the meantime, Quebec politicians say that their province is different from the others. Some talk about equality or independence; others about sovereignty and association. Everyone has a theory of his own.

Publicity surrounding those events is well organized and well controlled by people in most of the media. Some people become worried and warn the authorities. The answer is always the same: Do not worry, freedom of speech must be respected. There must be no limitation of a freedom for which such a high price was paid. Newsmen, press attachés, old and new, become the most eager champions of freedom of expression. Most of them do so in all sincerity. Here is what Jacques Tremblay wrote in *La Presse* for Tuesday, October 20, 1970:

> —for many years, right-minded people sided with the theoreticians of crime, as a means of collective liberation. In order not to appear to defend the Establishment (which is bad for the reputation of a "thinking man"), one had to somewhat support "revolutionaries", didn't one? Some recognized their many literary qualities; others found a sentence they were in agreement with; and still others accepted the objectives but rejected the means. Finally, by splitting hairs, you can sanctify the devil himself.

As events develop rapidly, there are increasingly more acts of violence and of greater scope: Bombs go off at the Montreal Stock Exchange. The data centre at Sir George Williams University is destroyed. There are demonstrations in front of McGill University. Several editors blame the Montreal police force. On October 7, 1969, there was the Murray Hill incident and the police strike in Montreal. And that is not all. Six persons were killed in seven years. There were trials, a few convictions, several parolees. The educated frustrated are becoming dangerous. Recent events have traumatized us. There must be an end to that. The only thing one could do has been done, intelligently and courageously.

We must now learn from these events. We are all responsible to various degrees. We must study the true causes of all the ills of our sick society. The causes of the unrest which bred violence are numerous and varied.

One of the main causes of violence lies in the injustices which our social order breeds and tolerates, too often because it does not have time to cure them. To this one must add the lack of confidence and the impatience of the young in the face of the problems they foresee in the future. Finally, individuals and groups react differently to other causes.

Although the task is difficult, we must not hesitate. All levels of government must cease to indulge in petty politics. If we want to save our democracy, let us place democracy ahead of partisanship. Let us set up priorities, which is something Parliaments do not always do.

The first duty of a member of the opposition is to criticize, conscientiously and reasonably, what legislation the government introduces, with a view to finding its weaknesses and making suggestions to improve it. In that respect, some improvement can be seen in the work done in committees. The second duty of a member of the opposition is to criticize in a responsible manner. The opposition does not have the right to keep harassing the government with all kinds of pestering, with an eye to its own political interest. The population is more responsible than that.

Let us get down to work with determination. Let us not waste any more time, because there is none to waste. Let us redouble our efforts to discover new means of social, economic and political action, in order to bring those who have more closer to those who have less, without disturbing the balance which must be maintained at all costs. It is essential to provide means of communication between the various groups which make up society, and to fill at last the ever widening gap between generations. Let us train an army of qualified and honest missionaries in order to make the people aware of the problems facing governments. People will be willing to discharge their responsibilities, if everything is made quite clear to them. Let us find a means to create a new positive motivation.

[*English*]

Mr. W. C. Scott (Victoria-Haliburton): Mr. Speaker, I should like to begin my remarks by extending congratulations to the hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel) and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas), the mover and seconder of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I should also like to express my appreciation for this opportunity to add my comments to the excellent speeches that have been made by my colleagues from both sides of the House.

Like all my colleagues, and indeed all Canadians, I had been looking forward to the presentation of the Speech from the Throne. I was hoping that at long last the government would offer proposals to this House for measures, as the hon. member for Frontenac-Lennox and Addington (Mr. Alkenbrack) expressed it the other day, that would clear the way for the enormous backlog of serious problems facing the country.

I recall that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) urged the Canadian people to give him a majority government so that he could enact the kind of legislation that would reverse the trend in this country toward regression and depression. The Prime Minister promised employment for all who would work. He promised a society wherein all Canadians would have an equal opportunity to prosper, equal rights under our laws and a voice in their government. We were told that if he were given a majority government and a mandate, he would create a just society based on the prosperity of the individual through participatory democracy.

The words and phrases have changed, Mr. Speaker, and the leadership has changed—but the situation remains the same; in fact, it has worsened rather than improved. Unemployment has increased to the point where we can say to the world that we are the champions. We are the undisputed title-holder in the game of unemployment. That is our position. The government is playing a dangerous game with our national economy, and the Prime Minister has told the Canadian people that if they don't like it, they can lump it.

• (5:50 p.m.)

It has been repeated in the House over and over again that we in Canada have everything we need to provide

adequately for our people. We can provide jobs for those who are willing and able to work; we can provide adequate health services for the aged and the sick; we have the wherewithal to provide for those who are unable to work. I find it strange that while less fortunate countries are working desperately to provide jobs for their people and to stimulate growth in their national economies, the government of this wealthy and vigorous nation deliberately retards our economy in an avowed attempt to create prosperity. We shall enjoy prosperity in Canada, we are told, just as soon as the government has brought inflation within bounds.

The price we have to pay for this prosperity, we are told, is massive unemployment, loss of foreign markets for our products and higher taxation. What a formula! What a dream! The fact is, it is not a formula; it is a new set of rules for the old game of politics. And it is not a dream; it is a plain, old-fashioned nightmare. I must admit, in all seriousness, that when it comes to sloganeering, this government has no peer. I am reminded of the just society, but only for a brief moment. Just as the just society begins to fade into the lexicon of governmental catch-phrases, I am told to take heart again; that I am now standing on the threshold of greatness. I plead with the government to deliver us from such greatness. After seven years of such greatness I doubt that our sensibilities and our economy can absorb much more. I am also absolutely certain, that the unemployed in our country would trade their greatness for a job. I am equally certain that the elderly people in our country would trade their greatness for an adequate pension.

This would be a good opportunity, to enlarge on the question of old age security and to ask a simple question. How could it be that in a country which rivals most countries of the world in natural and human resources, we cannot solve this problem? We have legislation on the statute books designed to provide for people who have no other means of support or who have inadequate incomes at a time in their lives when they are no longer productive. One would quite naturally suppose that their needs are being served. But that is far from the case. We have legislation, true enough; but it has been bent, twisted and reshaped to the point at which no one can really say just what the legislation is supposed to achieve, or for whom.

To add to the ineffectiveness of the law, the old age security offices are so poorly managed that it is a miracle that anyone at all is served by this vital program. That should not really surprise anyone, Mr. Speaker, because inefficiency is not restricted to the social security program; it is the order of the day for this government. We have the resources, we have the trained, talented minds in this country and we have the will to solve this vexing problem. What, then, is the hold-up?

For some reason which no one has ever explained, the elderly, the handicapped and the pensioners are placed in a neat little square which has been labelled "Fixed Income". Because they have a nice title they are expected to keep quiet, to enjoy the good things in life and to not bother the government: the government, after all, is busy holding back the economy, creating unemployment and new cabinet positions. We are led to believe that the government cannot be expected to tackle our difficult problems when it is easier to provide for people who do not want to work. It is far easier to provide hostels for hippies, millions of dollars for the Company of Young Canadians and say to the country, "Today belongs to the young. The youth of this country must be served whether or not they want to work, contribute to society and pay taxes." I refer, Mr. Speaker, to those of our young people who find it easier to label themselves revolutionaries and intellectuals and talk through their beards about the brave new world they are going to create.

Our government appears to be preoccupied with these people—and not just with those who have developed in our own society. We say to the hippies, the yippies and the draft-dodgers and deserters from the United States, "Come to the promised land. Come to Canada and work against our government and our institutions."

It is time we extended the great promise of our land to those who have contributed to it with their labours, their loyalty and their respect for its laws and institutions. It is a truism that a man who cannot provide for his own children has nothing to offer those of his neighbours. I am not against foreign aid, Mr. Speaker. I would go so far as to suggest that we should continue to show compassion and understanding for the plight of the underdeveloped countries of the world. However, I consider it irresponsible for a government to commit itself to giving hundreds of millions of dollars to other nations when there are people in Canada who are needy, sick and elderly and who look to a government in Ottawa for understanding and assistance. They might just as well be looking to the moon.

We talk every day about the problems of the sick, the elderly and the destitute, and I wonder if the government feels that talking about the problem is all that is necessary. I wonder if the government really believes that by talking about these problems they will just fade away. I say to the government that it is time to look after the needs and the aims of our own people. After they are satisfied, if anything is left we can ask ourselves whether we really want to open our borders to people who cannot make a go of it in their own society. It becomes increasingly difficult to understand why our government, alone among governments of the western world, does not see fit to establish even minimum standards of conduct for immigrants and prospective citizens of our country. Are we so badly off that we are willing to make citizens from the dregs, the cast-offs and the misfits of other societies?

Judging from the government's performance in providing jobs for native-born Canadians, I cannot believe that we really need the tens of thousands of malcontents and cop-outs who have been accepted into our country in recent years. I am just as conscious as anyone else of the need for a haven in the world for those who have been oppressed and who have been denied an opportunity to express themselves. There are times, however, when it is more prudent to speak from the head than from the heart.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. It being six o'clock, I regret that I have to interrupt the hon. member.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie)—National Parks—Prince Edward Island—Establishment of second facility; the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau)—Health and Welfare—Action to reduce the cost of hospital, medical and dental costs.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session.

Mr. Scott: Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a word about the paradox of our armed forces experimenting in new and radical organizational concepts. I am not opposed to new ideas, but the wisdom, or the lack of it, in our new military policy appears to have the government squarely over the barrel at the present time. The government has been warned repeatedly from this side of the House to give full consideration to possible and probable future contingencies both domestic and foreign. They were warned repeatedly by members of the official opposition to give due consideration to the morale of whatever armed forces we were left with when the experimenters were finished.

As a member of NATO, as a member of the United Nations and as a free nation that is responsive to forces at work in a world committed to the downfall of freedom, Canada has a minimum requirement for trained and equipped armed forces. Yet we are below our required minimum at the present time. Anyone who doubts this is invited to explain how Canada could meet its present commitments to NATO and the UN when the bulk of Canada-based combat troops are presently performing guard duty in the province of Quebec and in Ottawa. It has been demonstrated beyond any doubt in the present crisis that we have at the present time only sufficient forces to deal with a large-scale domestic crisis. On the other hand, if the troops committed to foreign service were stationed overseas at the present time, we would be powerless to deal with a situation such as the threatened insurrection in Quebec.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel).]

We could adopt the NDP philosophy and follow the advice of people such as Melville Watkins. We could forget about national defence altogether and disband our armed forces. However, I doubt that any straight-thinking Canadian would buy that argument after recent events. It was typical of the present government's leaning toward NDP philosophy when the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) stated in Halifax that the reductions in armed forces strength would continue, in spite of the cogent lessons any responsible person would learn from the present crisis.

The need for adequate, trained forces to assist the civil power could not be demonstrated more clearly than by the events of the last few days. If our armed forces are to function in their second major role, as an arm or tool of foreign policy, it is only common sense to suppose that planning should be on a forward-looking rather than a backward-looking basis. We know now that armed insurrection can occur in Canada. It would be foolish and irresponsible for the present government to stick to yesterday's policies just to prove they are immovable. They are not immovable. The government are just being obstinate. We have fresh information on which to base our military requirements, information that was not available to us a few weeks or a few months ago. We know now that we can experience armed insurrection in this country and that it could get out of hand quickly.

• (8:10 p.m.)

I call upon the government to suspend the present policy of forces reduction for the time being and allow this House to debate the question of Canada's present and future needs in the way of military forces. Wait until the present crisis has passed, then examine the issue coolly in light of the new evidence available.

I will deal for a moment with another aspect of that question and call on the government to move soon on the recommendations of the Woods commission report and the report of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs. I call on the government to move quickly to table legislation on these recommendations. The people who will be affected have done their part. They cannot be expected to do more. The onus is now on the government to do its part and ensure that the hardships being borne by our veterans are lessened. All recommendations respecting veterans pensions and allowances have been approved by the government members on the Veterans Affairs Committee, so there is a consensus. There is, therefore, no good reason for the government not moving at an early date to present legislation to this House.

Before I conclude my remarks I should like to touch upon one more serious problem that we as a nation must face up to if we are to survive. We have a situation in our schools and universities wherein we tolerate radical and revolutionary professors. We literally turn our impressionable young people over to these professors and stand by while they are instructed in seditious and inflaming philosophies that are alien to our way of life, our system of government and our code of moral conduct and behaviour.

We know the end result of this attitude on our part. We are witnessing the result this very day as armed troops patrol our streets and guard Canadian officials from other Canadians. Some of these instructors are new Canadians from Europe and the United States. Some have allegedly fled other countries to escape repression, only to preach the same doctrines of lawlessness and hate on our campuses. We must decide whether we can logically accept the risks involved in the name of free expression or whether we should take steps to curb outright sedition before it manifests itself in bombings and kidnapping, murder and insurrection.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I should like first to congratulate the movers of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne (Messrs. Trudel and Douglas (Assiniboia), as well as the new Deputy Chairman of the House committees, the member for Beauharnois (Mr. Laniel).

Tonight, I should like to deal with the revolution in Quebec, which is a current topic in Canada. How did it start? Who organized it? Who wants it? What are its basic reasons? What were the warnings received by the government and what are the remedies?

In 1960, Mr. Speaker, the Quebec Liberal party came into power and, later on, it was said over and over again that this political party was making a quiet revolution.

Now, the quiet revolution was only a step towards a not so quiet revolution that we now experience. In the name of this quiet revolution, the axe was applied to our confessional educational school system so that it could be left open to anarchists and atheistic teachers as well as to books that have sowed the seed of revolution in the minds of Quebec youth.

And today, one wonders why these revolutionary matches have caught fire and engendered the developments that we know.

The teachings and teachers of the past are no longer worth anything. Then, we are charged with having provided backward education until today. That was the beginning of the quiet revolution, prelude and first act of the true revolution.

Quebec's educational system has been directed so much toward revolution that in September 1969 one of the optional subjects taught in several junior colleges of Quebec, notably that of Trois-Rivières, was communism.

The first issue of *Education-Québec*—the official publication of the Quebec Department of Education, under the signature of Education Minister Guy Saint-Pierre—dated September 16 last, features on its cover the picture of a priest dressed in black, whose rotten head bears the inscription "Karl Marx, founder of world communism". The idea is to show that the moral and religious education that we were given was rotten and will be replaced by atheist marxist training. Such is the explanation appearing on the cover of the official publication of the Quebec Department of Education.

The infiltration of the CBC by communist revolutionary socialists took place under the innocent eye of the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) who is aware of marxist penetration into the Crown corporation for which he is responsible before Parliament.

Infiltration was easy for revolutionaries from all over the world who came to Canada to assist the cause of world revolution by injecting their venom into the CBC and all other means of mass communication.

Here is an example, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Cohn-Bendit, who organized the student revolution in Paris in 1968 and remained more than an hour in the hands of the RCMP in Montreal, because they would not let this man come to Canada, was let into this country. Who gave orders in Ottawa to authorize that revolutionary to come here in June 1969 to promote his cause, world revolution?

Seeing that he was gaining ground in Canada, he thought he should come back in February 1970. Each time he came to this country, that revolutionary was received by Professor Stanley Gray of McGill University. The CBC—with public funds—and the CTV network gave him a nice welcome and very good publicity. He stated that his goal was to promote democratic revolution; in other words, revolution, period.

In fall 1968, the twelve organizers of the world revolution appeared on the BBC in London and a few weeks later the CBC reproduced that interview. And among the twelve who took part in the broadcast were McGill University Professor Stanley Gray who represented the Canadian revolution.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, I shall give a few other examples.

In May 1970, another Quebec personality tolled the knell and sounded the alarm. A publication *La Revue Colombienne* gave a summary of the speeches of Mr. Justice Alexandre Bastien, honorary deputy of the Order of the Knights of Columbus, following a dinner in Crabtree, Quebec. Here are some parts of his speech as reported in the publication:

Some atheistic revolutionary socialists are using the CEGEPs as a platform for the diffusion of their ideas.

Mr. Justice Bastien strongly condemned all those who, according to him, are trying to enlist the young in the revolutionary movement in Quebec ... (revolutionaries) are doing all they can to attract young people in their association in order to destroy what is left of traditional values.

Later on, Mr. Justice Bastien violently denounced the present tendency to secularize everything here.

... "Vallières and Gagnon are gods who are given undue importance and are proposed to our youth as models". Speaking about Charles Gagnon, Mr. Justice Bastien stated: "Over the weekend, he was in the Rimouski area where he spoke in a CEGEP. They are paid atheistic revolutionaries.

Mr. Justice Bastien went as far as to say that at present in CEGEPs, on university campuses, those people (atheistic and socialist revolutionaries) were paid to start a revolution. He even added that certain atheistic teachers were teaching catechism in our schools ...

...in Quebec and this, after the quiet revolution of the Liberal party in 1960.

Going a little further, Justice Bastien reproved the way the information media are invaded by atheists who are socialist revolutionaries. "It's as plain as the nose on my face!", said he.

"Blow up everything!" This is the first stage in the revolutionaries' program; then they come up with a socialist dictatorship and communist slavery.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a copy of the newspaper *Le Quartier latin*, issue No. 3, volume 53, covering the period September 10-23, 1970. This publication which, besides being sold in thousands of newsstands in Quebec and especially in the CEGEPs, is delivered for cultural consumption to the student population, proves to be a revolutionary, socialist, separatist and communist publication from the first to the last page. On the outside front cover, there is a revolutionary monster ready to pounce on the flaming outline of the city of Montreal.

For the information of the House, I would like to read an article published on the first page of that paper and entitled:

Open letter to secondary school principals:
Mr. Principal,

You have a very good job which you no doubt cling to very much. You have power and you no doubt cling to it very much also. For instance, you have the power to force a boy, or a girl, to wear short hair as you do, to study what they do not feel like studying, to refrain from saying what they really think, to refrain from doing what they feel like doing... about eight hours a day. Other principals as powerful as you are also exploit older people in places different from yours and which are generally called, plants, companies, businesses. As for yourself, you exploit your guinea pigs in schools.

True, you are sincere, honest, morally blameless. You are not an ogre and are not being accused of plotting.

You are merely a poor devil trying to save his skin, his history, his future, his interests. But, in so doing you are threatening the present days of the students, of the young who have the right to be different from you, even to be against you. We also are defending our lives, we also have our rights. That is why we cannot accept that you be our pal and even less that you pity us. That would be an abdication for us.

Consequently, we want you to know that the struggle in progress between you and us is a struggle to death, that if you do not voluntarily give up your post as director, we will throw you out ourselves and then we will completely destroy your position, your title, your privileges and your laws. In short, we will put an end to your reign, that being the only way to bring about some changes in a society which rests upon exploitation, your society. It must die. We will see to it that it disintegrates and dies.

A little further on, one can see what kind of intellectual food is served to the young.

The next page explains the technique to be used to provoke revolution in Quebec. For instance, mention is made of films and I quote:

The largest possible number of people must be allowed to see controversial films!... there are Quebec political films and we can get some from outside quite easily.

What have our police done up to now to make it harder to obtain such films? I go on with the quotation:

—we would like groups or individuals in cities (or CEGEP) who want to show films to communicate with REZO.

And a little further a plan of action is given by the school co-operatives, and I quote:

—the direction which could take student co-operatives in Quebec.

[Mr. Rondeau.]

—to gain control over production of teaching manuals.

Farther, you can read the following:

It is quite certain that co-operatives will become a sort of practical laboratory for courses in technical administration and even animation... thence the importance for the co-ops to take part in the development of a free information network in Quebec... Information as what allows to intensify struggles at school.

...The S.D.S. calls upon all students who are aware that school... does not meet our needs in any manner to form school committees... so as to get one foot in in order to inform and conduct struggles at school.

Then an inventory of activities in various schools of the province: Christophe Colomb School, Meilleur School, De Lorimier School. I quote again:

...What is important now is to get organized into school committees so that the struggles should be guided and planned...

We are presently a group...

I shall now quote the letter of the vocational adviser or reporter responsible for revolutionary activities in the CEGEPs of Victoriaville:

We are now a fairly influential group, due to the creation of various movements such as the V.M.U.P.T. (meaning: vote now, live sparely later) the A.M.P.J. (Dirty association of youth problems), and others.

Everything is about to blow up in Victoriaville.

Meeting places: on weekdays, at the CEGEP, on weekends, at the Fin Gourmet, at the Central tavern and at the Marocain.

Mr. Speaker, if I keep on reading this letter, you will recognize the FLQ manifesto broadcast recently on the CBC. This manifesto is the same one that is used for the world revolution, except that it changes names from country to country. The tactics and the objectives remain the same.

Throughout the periodical, they show how to ferret out discriminations, minor or major, and urge people to make use of everything likely to set citizens against each other. They use vulgar language to destroy everything. On page 12, you find the following:

When traitors celebrate
...Trudeau's faithful doggie...
...Cadieux, that old idiot...
...Thibault, as a good dog...

Counter violence by violence,

At night, down town, we had a ball: the demonstration... was like an evening of justice for the people.

Molotov cocktails crashed into shop-windows

...the dogs, numbering 75, charged the demonstrators and clubbed them to their heart's content.

In the meantime, Thibault and the federal gang were taking it easy in a fashionable hotel north of St-Jérôme.

The federalists kept on celebrating cyncism, celebrating the daily application of the sweating system...

...In St-Jérôme, they are beginning to counter violence through violence, that's for sure...

• (8:30 p.m.)

A little further, it says:

Fight violence with violence!

And still a little further, it says:

—the dance of the incompetents—The roads system, it's only crap—citizen's committees to educate people, so they will no longer get screwed.

A little further, there is caricature of the Mayor of Montreal with the following caption:

A scare-crow to knock down!

FRAP sympathizers are requested to knock down the scare-crow of the city of Montreal. Further, there is a description of the political prorgamme of FRAP, an organization which is fighting for municipal election in Montreal.

On another page, there are four heads with these words:

—always aim at the head and aim at the right one.

In effect, the heads are those of the President of the United States, Mr. Nixon, of the Prime Minister of Canada, of the Premier of Quebec and of the Mayor of the city of Montreal.

"Always aim at the head and aim at the right one." A parallel is drawn between the situation in Quebec and the one that existed in May 1968 in Paris. Further, students who have acted like men are congratulated. It also says:

The Boston police is looking for four militant students suspected of a $26,000 holdup at the State Street Bank and Trust Co.

But here is the most surprising thing of all: an advertisement covering 45 per cent of a page of the magazine was paid by the Public Service Commission of Canada, with the Canadian taxpayers' money, to support such a revolutionary magazine.

On page 33, individuals who would like to earn $60 to $80 per week are invited to show a film to Quebecers twice a night.

On the last page but one, we find ourselves in the year 2010. It says:

The PQ was right.

And there is the picture of René Lévesque who in 2010 will be 88 years of age.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to establish a relation between the methods and the aims, as published in *Le Quartier Latin.*

The report submitted to the federal government by the authorities of the city of Montreal with regard to the Company of Young Canadians has been simply ignored.

The revolutionary methods that are being advocated in all university papers across Quebec are exactly the same as those drawn to our attention by the city of Montreal authorities in a report submitted to the federal government last year.

The government of the time, which is the same one as today's, had been fully warned of all that was going to happen in Quebec, but unfortunately the worst is still to come. It had been forewarned by the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the city of Montreal at the time the brief was submitted.

Who therefore has played a double game in Ottawa and has ordered to ignore the report which outlined coming dangers and events?

Who therefore in Ottawa pretends to be on the side of democracy by denouncing terrorists while at the same time not taking the necessary steps to avoid revolution and prevent events such as those we have just witnessed?

Some things in Ottawa make me wonder.

For a year and a half, the Canadian authorities had been having talks aimed at the official recognition of Communist China. And, in the House, the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) kept telling us that the discussions were proceeding and that no agreement had been reached.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe much more in planning than in coincidence. How is it that right after Mr. James Cross' kidnapping, namely the day after, and when the whole Canadian population had this event in mind and everybody was greatly disturbed, the government took advantage of the collective psychological tension of the Canadian people to announce the official recognition of Communist China?

The people of Shefford and the Canadian people do not mind the lack of cultural relations with Communist China. The FLQ made everybody feel edgy but the events it has created have helped the Canadian government to get the recognition of Communist China down the Canadian people's throat.

We shall soon see hundreds of embassy attachés from Communist China walking through the streets of the main Canadian cities and to do what? First, visit all the Canadian Chinese and convince them of the greatness of the Peking government. Second, they will indoctrinate these people then start the implementation of the strategies dictated by Communist China's government. We will then have to face the experts of a government that achieved power through more sophisticated and better financed methods than those of the FLQ members.

Reading from the little red book entitled *War Weapon,* a valuable document in China, I would like to quote practical advice given by world revolutionaries. At page 147 it is said about Robert Williams, an American terrorist:

—He made a trip to Cuba and returned a fanatic supporter of Fidel Castro. In 1961, during a racial demonstration in Monroe, Williams killed a policeman, then kidnapped a white couple to use them as hostages. To evade the law, he fled to Cuba where he was welcomed as a hero. He worked for Havana radio from where he broadcast to the United States delirious calls to terrorism and riots—

From there he went to Communist China where he now lives and publishes *The Crusader*—

Through that publication, he directs Chinese communist infiltration in other countries throughout the world. I resume the quotation:

In the June 1964 issue of *The Crusader,* Williams wrote, "The weapons used by the fighters for Afro-American freedom must

make up the poor man's arsenal: Molotov cocktails or gas bombs, bombs made by injecting caustic soda or acid in the metal of electric lights." But the bomb Williams calls "Black power" which is gigantic, will be more effective against tanks and armored cars.

It can be made with empty bottles three quarters filled with gas and the last quarter with heavy oil.

I could continue describing the methods and tactics advocated by those who have dedicated themselves to worldwide terrorism, and who, today, are in Communist China, where they are protected, and from where they can later spread their revolutionary ideas throughout the world.

I doubt very much that someday we can identify those who until now, because they have played fast and loose, have protected and helped FLQ members, by keeping silent for a while and who later on deplored the damages caused and foreseen, by a barrage of words, by recognizing the tragedy, and making pious statements.

In the face of these facts, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make the following suggestions to the government:

First of all, it should reintroduce capital punishment and secondly, exert a much stricter control on immigration.

Thirdly, it should clean up all media, radio stations, newspapers and television, and even, if necessary, close down the C.B.C., and not wait ten years to act.

It is essential to clean up the education system in the province of Quebec, its teaching body, amend the Criminal Code so as to provide penalties for all revolutionaries, fomenters of disorder and organizers of training schools in revolution, to declare illegal any revolutionary publication, to clean up the National Film Board, where Quebec culture has become the revolution and crudeness, to establish a much stricter censorship, based on morals, applying to all films to be shown in theatres or on television, to exercise a much stricter control on book and newspaper stands, which provide, at the present time, all necessary information on revolution, even instructions concerning the purchase and the manufacture of firearms or deadly weapons, also to control the purchase and the manufacture of firearms, dynamite or any other deadly weapons, to strictly supervise the so-called movements of social animation, to improve and relieve the congestion in our judicial system, in order not to give rise to criticism, which, in some quarters, has become ridiculous, owing to it slowness.

And the last proposal that I have to make and which is not the least, is to correct the deficiencies of the present bad capitalistic system, which indulges in abuses, in scandals and in mass social injustices, and which bears in itself the seed of its own destruction, by allowing revolutionaries to use its deficiencies and its abuses as an excuse to destroy everything, and bring about their so-called revolutionary, earthly paradise and their socialist communist system.

The father of the phony capitalistic system at the present time is socialism, and its grandfather is communism.

[Mr. Rondeau.]

A sound capitalistic system, as promoted by the Créditistes, allows all and everyone to be capitalist in the true sense of the word, that is owners not only of the wealth produced by every citizen, but also fo that which science, technology, and modern standards produce today in man's place.

Reverend Father Georges-Henri Lévesque said in 1936: "If you want neither communism nor socialism, suggest social credit, because it will put in your hands a terrible weapon against its enemies".

• (8:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, my first words must be words of congratulation to the hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel) and to the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) for their excellent speeches on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I cannot be as complimentary about the Speech from the Throne itself, particularly in view of what has developed since the Speech was delivered.

The Speech outlines a Canada in which the answers to all the problems that beset us have been found. I am sorry it has taken the dramatic effects of the last ten days to show that such is far from the case. We have talked about this matter in depth for several days; very few corners have not been delved into in this regard. I will try to make a positive contribution in the few minutes allotted to me to speak during the Throne Speech debate.

In 1957 and 1958 the people of Canada responded to a vision, and although it was laughed at in many quarters it was certainly taken up by the people of Canada. One of the largest mandates given to any government was given to that great leader from the Prairies who in fact started us on the road to a broader, wider and deeper Canada. The story which was written during the five years that government was in office has become fairly well known. We reversed the backward trend, we sold the excess grain, we turned back the unemployment figures to reasonable levels and we pegged the Canadian dollar at a level which enabled us once again to get into the markets of the world. We trained the young people of this country, who up to that time had not been trained, for a new and vigorous approach to the last 25 years of the twentieth century.

It is now time for us to forget about those things which divide us and take another look at the idea of vision which we fostered. Perhaps we need panavision in order to get a broader outlook. We must return to the approach we had in 1957 and 1958, and spend very little time looking into the reasons why we cannot get together. We must outline to the people of Canada, particularly to the young, the reasons this was, is and will remain the finest country in the world. If we succeed in this endeavour, the Speech from the Throne might have meaning and we might be able to put some flesh on the dry bones of wishful thinking. To achieve this will take work on the part of us all.

My friends to my left are still fighting the old, class war. One would think there were still money barons around who had all the money while the working people had nothing. The class war is as out of date as the dodo bird. What we need is more effort by all of us, including that great middle-income section of Canadian people who no longer live in poverty, without hope and in despair because of something cooked up by crackpots. This despair is invented for cheap, ambitious, political reasons.

Perhaps it is not popular to ask people, old or young, to go back to work. I suggest we have been spoiled. Many people in Canada take advantage of all levels of government which have been over-paternalistic and have told the people that somehow, by some easy means or socialistic panacea government can make it possible for them to live the good life without effort and without taxation. This is not the case. We must start with another new and dynamic plan. We must not think that any one government has all the answers. We must ask all Canadians to pull up their socks, roll up their shirt sleeves and get back to work.

I have been a labouring man most of my life and I have worked for far below the average national level of income. I know that most of the people of Canada are willing to go to work provided they are given the required leadership. We must stop talking about shorter work weeks and less work, and think of more effective work. We must think more of what we can do and ask ourselves, to paraphrase Mr. John Kennedy: What can we give to Canada?—rather than: What can we expect Canada to give to us?

The government can take the lead in this regard. It should take greater steps toward full use of our natural resources. It is not good enough to wave the anti-United States flag and say that all our troubles are caused by U.S. ownership in this country. Most of us who know anything, know that without United States capital Canada would be about as undeveloped as Baffinland. Many blame the United States for putting money into Canada and say that in this way they have violated our rights. They have done no such thing. They have made one of the best investments in the world—in the present and future development of Canada's natural resources.

• (8:50 p.m.)

I hope that governments at all levels will take a good look at how we can encourage Canadians to participate in the development of their country. They must work harder, use their imagination and self-control. The government should be prepared to encourage the development of Canada and the participation of Canadians in that development by granting sensible tax concessions. There must be a sensible survey of our resources.

We ought to allow our young people to work in the development of our country. Instead of giving them free education, we ought to encourage them to go out during the period they are not attending university and help survey our natural resources. We should pay them well and make sure they are completely free of income tax so long as they are using the money to pay for their own education. They should try to reverse the present trend instead of looking for help from a socialistic and paternalistic government, if they want to be part of the great Canadian adventure.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bigg: That adventure, I suggest, ought to be embarked upon not only with the vision of the generation that I represent but with an ever greater vision, greater dedication and harder work. The rewards, I suggest, will be very much greater and our young people will be better Canadian citizens for knowing that they worked and paid for the education they received. They ought to know, particularly those of the lunatic fringe who are so anxious to tear down the institutions we have built for them, that our life savings have gone into those institutions; that many of these institutions have not yet been paid for and if they are torn down, neglected or not used the generation now maturing will have to rebuild them and pay for them twice. Not only will they have to pay for the buildings which we have not yet paid for, but they will have the added burden of rebuilding the institutions which they require.

There is no easy or short road to the good life. It is hard to put into words the irresponsibility of those who go among our young people and tell them that, in these times when opportunities were never greater, they are ignored, they are hated, they are misunderstood and that the world owes them a living. We can well imagine how much of the trouble we are presently facing in Canada is the result of this kind of talk. Nothing that my mother, father or grandparents ever said encouraged me to take the law into my own hands or destroy the institutions and the opportunities they worked so hard to provide for me. If that sounds "square", if it sounds unduly right wing, perhaps that is because I am not capable of putting over my story.

I ask those who are more eloquent than I to use their eloquence and to put this very short and simple story over to our young people and to all those who live in Canada and, do not appreciate the good life because they have never known anything else. Yet they are willing to risk throwing away not only the good life but the very freedom that makes the good life possible.

The vision of 1957 and 1958 took into account the fact that Canada is a land of different and varied regions. Those of us who took this vision to heart saw that our merchant navy in the Maritimes lagged far behind the merchant navies of other nations in its ability to carry Canadian products to the world. Because that vision was not pursued with the energy with which it should have been pursued by that and subsequent administrations, Canada has almost no merchant navy. It is not too late to build one. In the Maritimes there still live men who understand how to build ships, how to man ships and how to carry our goods to the nations of the world. Many people there have spent their lives fishing on the sea. Because of shortsighted policies, their fishing grounds are no longer capable of supporting them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bigg: Those fishermen are not looking for handouts. They want to see the Canadian merchant navy rebuilt. Although I am no seaman, I think I can say that if we adopted a rational policy for putting Canada's merchant navy back into operation many of those fishermen would be only too pleased to carry the Red Ensign across the oceans of the world in the proud manner in which Canada's merchant navy carried it in the past. That would not only solve the problem of the unemployed and discouraged fishermen in the Maritimes but it would help to build up a whole new, modern industry in eastern Canada.

I move farther westward in my remarks. In Ungava, and probably in Baffinland, there are still virtually unlimited resources of medium grade iron ore. We should develop these and make sure that we have dynamic new plans, particularly in central Canada, to use Canadian iron ore resources. With proper utilization of power grids and atomic energy there should be no unemployment in central Canada. We would then have dynamic policies that would put Canadians back to work, not necessarily with a 60-hour week but with a 40-hour week. Labour should get together with management, instead of always struggling with it, and say eloquently, "We the labouring people of Canada, who are the most willing workers in the world, wish to get together with our industry, which is the most willing industry in the world, and together for the good not only of the people of Canada but of all the world we shall produce cheap, good and efficient steelware." If that can be done in Japan, it can be done here.

I now move on to speak of the Prairies. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we can come up with better solutions than programs under which farmers are paid for not growing grain. The government called this the Lift program. The lift to what? Did it lift the Canadian economy? Fortunately, mother nature took a hand and showed us how stupied we were, even in one year, when we told farmers not to grow food that is needed by the hungry peoples of the world.

The answer we gave in 1957 and 1958 is still valid. We must not concentrate most of our energies on establishing marketing boards, which I think are necessary if we are to have orderly, shared marketing. Marketing boards for the small domestic market will not be good enough if we are to keep prosperous the Prairies and the agricultural industry of Canada, which is only now coming into its own. Most of today's Canadian farmers are technicians. The farmer has more than doubled his output.

I take joint responsibility with the administration when I say we must do more than merely establish a program of production controls to ensure the sharing of a very small domestic market. I say that because in heeding the dynamic vision which this party put forward, Canada must look outside her shores and see what the world needs in the way of food. Canada's vision must become part of the world's vision, if we are to feed the hungry peoples of the world. What has happened to the vision of a world food bank?

The present administration has decided to recognize Red China. I hope that the question of trade was mainly in its mind. If trade was the reason for recognizing Red China, I go along with it. The evolution of trade between Canada and Red China is a good reason for Red China's seeking a seat in the United Nations. Can we be assured that seating Red China in the United Nations would be to move toward peace and world prosperity? I venture to say it would not, because of the threat to world peace posed by Red China and Russia. If Canada, the United States, Red China and Russia each donated one-quarter of their defence budget to the food bank, that would certainly solve well into the twenty-first century western Canada's problems with regard to trade in world markets.

• (9:00 p.m.)

There is not enough arable land in the world for all people to enjoy the standard of living to which we are accustomed. It is not good enough to follow what is referred to in the Speech from the Throne. We pat ourselves on the back and say, "Things have never been better in Canada." This is the first time I have been aware that one of the peculiarities of the beaver is to put his head into the sand like an ostrich. The Canadian beaver is intelligent, hardworking, industrious, has good humour, the ability to build dams and to conserve. By hard work he stores enough food during the summer to keep him alive during the winter. This is what Canadians are used to. These are our virtues, and it is time we returned to them. In order to bring about these ideals we need a white paper on taxation which would improve the atmosphere so that people would return to work willingly and devote their efforts to making Canada a better, freer and safer country in which to live.

Our financial wizards should take a close look at bank rates. A few years ago the majority of the members of this House were talked into raising the ceiling on bank rates. We were assured that this step would not cost the man on the street any more money; indeed, we were told it would cost him a good deal less. It was to be easier for a man to obtain the money with which to buy a house. All the virtues were brought forward. It was suggested that young men would be able to afford a home for their families. What has happened? We have never before experienced the degree of inflation we have had since the so-called improvement to the Bank Act. We need co-operation from the Canadian financiers.

I think there is something to be said in favour of the criticism of the banks by my friends to my left. It might be a good idea for some of us to study the untoward profits of banks. Many stocks in Canada are decreasing in value. In the last five or six years it has been better to invest in the chartered banks of Canada. Why? It is the safest money in the world. Therefore, the banks should be satisfied with a smaller margin of profit on their investment. Many of us have had to gamble our personal resources to compete with those who manufacture boots in Czechoslovakia or textiles and pottery in Japan. Canadians are being asked to gamble while those in charge of the finances of this country sit behind their

mahogany desk, protected by our democratic laws. I say without equivocation that they are making unnatural and unnecessary profits. Is this the co-operative society of which we hear so often? A co-operative society should be more than a two-way street between the taxpayer and the labourer. We should ensure that when it costs $2,000 to manufacture an automobile, the customer is not charged $7,000.

My home province of Alberta has almost unlimited resources. I venture to say that if the whole population of Canada moved to Alberta it could be fed, clothed and housed. There would be enough resources to support all the population. The resources of Alberta have not been developed to the fullest extent because we have not taken advantage of all the opportunities. We have been too busy quarrelling amongst ourselves. We have been concentrating on bilingualism, biculturalism, communism, non-communism, socialism, non-socialism and many other matters. If you want a red herring, just add an "ism" at the end of a philosophy and you can talk about it forever without accomplishing anything.

The people of Canada are thoroughly fed-up. Sometimes I think the people are willing to accept a type of dictatorship or unholy triumvirate which would take over and do their thinking. If this happens, it will be the fault of hon. members of this chamber for not having developed a dynamic plan and insisting that our leaders put the plan into action.

I would be remiss in my duty if I allowed the fourth estate to get off scot-free. I have often heard members of the press say that no one in this House takes his job seriously. They often state that we are not present in the chamber. Looking around this evening, there may be some excuse for saying that. However, there are not very many in the press gallery to disagree with me tonight. As a rule there is one lone observer in the gallery. He runs back and tells the rest of the boys how we neglect our duties. I suggest it is time the fourth estate took a good look at our country and considered more carefully the leadership that we have. The person with the loudest voice does not always have the most intelligence—otherwise I might be the prime minister.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bigg: Some members speak with quiet voices in this chamber. They do not receive press coverage. Although they do not have dynamic personalities, they talk in the language of simple truth. They are honest and reliable. They believe in virtues such as hard work, honesty and responsibility. Some of them do not have their garments plucked in public, nor do they appear with roses in their hair. We know truth when we hear it. I sometimes wonder if this fact is recognized by the press gallery. I venture to say that on many occasions I could get more press coverage if I wanted to be small enough to buy a case of beer. If that is the price of truth and publicity, without which any politician will die politically, I am not willing to pay the price. I have heard some members of the press gallery confess that they supported one stand or another because they received a bottle of whisky at Christmas.

• (9:10 p.m.)

I do not expect to make the press tonight. It would not be the first time one crying alone in the wilderness was neglected. I claim I am not alone, though I also claim that in many cases it is useless to speak the simple, flat truth. It is more dramatic to desert one's leader in times of trouble. That gets press coverage. It is more dramatic to abandon one's principles so you can plan "way out" things like the artist and the poor musician. Very often today they cannot make a living without being "way out". Painters are no longer allowed to paint pictures of the beauties of the forest, of the mountains or the sunset; they have to delve into their twisted minds and paint their erotic dreams or sadistic experiences under LSD. Then they are poets; then they are painters. I hope the day will never come when to be a suitable member of the House of Commons one has to be "way out" in everything.

More and more I feel the permissive society has gone too far. I voted in this House for the abolition of the death penalty. Little did I realize that I was doing away with the death penalty for treason. Very seldom do we get an opportunity to vote black or white. I for one think the penalty for selling one's country should still be punishable by death.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am informed that the hon. member's time appears to have expired. He may continue with the consent of the House. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Bigg: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps I have reached a good place at which to end. I started out to make a plea for a new look at our economy, to make a case for a dynamic plan for the development of Canada. But at the back of my mind is still this cloud which is hanging over us all. Before I sit down I want to make this plea. This may be a good time to take a look at some of the old values; it may be a good time to take a look at some of the old penalties for some of the old crimes. Little did I know that the penalty for treason, for selling one's country, for openly supporting anarchy and shedding innocent blood, as we have just witnessed, would ever be condoned individually or collectively by the Canadian people. I must admit I was wrong, and at the first opportunity I hope to stand up and vote the way I should have done a few months ago.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Ambrose Hubert Peddle (Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador): Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne delivered a week or so ago began by offering belated birthday greetings to the Northwest Territories and Manitoba, and birthday greetings in advance to British Columbia. The Speech ended by asking divine providence to guide us in our deliberations. Between the birthday

greetings and that prayerful supplication is sandwiched a deluge of, to my mind, the most preposterous, cliché-ridden, philosophical pap which ever purported to represent a preview of a government's legislative program. In a country like Canada, in days such as these, to try to relate this speech to the government which recently invoked the War Measures Act cannot fail—to quote both Sir Winston Churchill and the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker)—to boggle the mind.

I do not want you to misunderstand me, Mr. Speaker. I was not in the House on the invocation of the War Measures Act but I support the government in its action and I take this opportunity to go on record as saying so. But I do not and I cannot have much respect for a government which presents this document to the Canadian people and expects them to lap it up. If His Excellency the Governor General was somewhat embarrassed by having to read it, I can understand. And when the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) sat over there and smirked and giggled while our leader was subjecting the Speech to the scorn and the ridicule which it deserved, I think I understand this, too, because I feel sure that the Speech was deliberately intended to be ridiculous.

I cannot accept for one moment that the Prime Minister, who is widely noted for having quite an intellectual capacity, could possibly present this document to the Canadian people other than with tongue in cheek. In order to continue his show of disdain and contempt for Parliament and its traditions, it is very possible that he deliberately allowed this Speech to be made knowing full well that it was completely out of touch with reality, that it conveyed nothing to the great majority of the people. The Speech was a fitting opening to a Parliament in which he obviously does not believe.

There is only one other alternative I can think of, which is that the Prime Minister commissioned one of those hairy gentlemen with big, purple goggles—like Tiny Tim—to write the speech and that he himself did not have time to read it before it was sent to the Governor General. Hon. members can take their choice of these alternatives; either one of them to me is most discomfiting.

Take the first paragraph in the Speech following the birthday greetings, in which is this gem:

> The passing of the 'sixties and the beginning of the 'seventies reminds us that Canada faces a new age.

Has it not ever been thus? In every decade have we not faced a new age? If this is not emphasizing the obvious, I do not know what I am talking about. The Speech continues:

• (9:20 p.m.)

> —an age which will be subject to forces not all of which are yet comprehended or understood, forces which shall proceed from external as well as internal origins.

I think that means from inside and outside. It continues:

> It is a new age not so much because of changed circumstances, but new because of changed values and attitudes.

[Mr. Peddle.]

Seriously, what does this jargon mean to the British Columbia lumberjack, the Ontario construction worker, the Nova Scotia farmer or, of all people in Newfoundland, the fisherman? I will tell you what it means—a great big, fat nothing. It is meaningless. It is words and more words. It talks of changed circumstances, changed values, changed attitudes.

The Newfoundland fisherman, lumberjack or miner cannot afford the luxury of these philosophical ramblings. He is too preoccupied with trying to live. I thought that this was a speech for all Canadians. There are people in Newfoundland who are too preoccupied with trying to pay the taxes that are extracted from them, not only by this government but by three or four different forms of government, and somehow decently support and educate their families on what they have left. The circumstances of these people have changed very little. Their values, except the value of the deflated dollar, remain of the highest. As for their attitudes, I think they are admirable and they have changed little—and I for one hope to God they do not change.

The second paragraph of the Speech is similar to the first, only worse. I feel once more compelled to quote it:

> Because of the clash between these new values and the old, because of the quest by the young and the disillusioned for some resolution of attitudes, we live in a period of tenseness and unease. It is an age frequented by violence as desperate men seek ill-defined goals; an age of frustration as gentle men question impatiently old assumptions.

There is more of that sort of things, Mr. Speaker. I agree there is a quest in Canada; there is no question of that. It is a quest not only by the young and the disillusioned but by the old and the disillusioned and by the middle-aged and the disillusioned. Indeed, by the whole human population of Canada which is disillusioned. Certainly they are seeking some ill-defined goals. They are looking for some resolution, some crystallization of this will-o-the-wisp attitude on the part of the government. Tenseness and unease, I agree, do exist not only in Quebec but all across the country. They exist in the minds of those people whose very temperaments do not lend themselves to violence. There are thousands of desperate people across Canada today, and they are indeed seeking ill-defined goals.

One ill-defined goal that they are seeking is how the heck they are going to get through the winter with no income, with no job and in many cases with no unemployment insurance. How do they feed, clothe, shelter and educate their families under these conditions? There is your ill-defined goal, the ill-defined goal that cries out for definition by the government. But does the government define it? No. The government goes off at a philosophical tangent and talks in terms that can only be understood, if they are capable of understanding at all, by some people who occupy very comfortable niches in our universities or some such place. Certainly it is not a Speech for Canadians.

Then there are the "gentle men" who "question, impatiently, old assumptions". I agree that there are, but not in the way the government presents the picture. There is the old assumption that the government should be truly

concerned and preoccupied with, above all others, the problem of unemployment instead of spending its time and energy dreaming up this type of meaningless, impractical, foolish, philosophical "guk". I cannot find words to express just how I feel about the sort of statements I find in the Speech from the Throne which was delivered a few days ago. Let the government, for heaven's sake, not try to tell the unemployed, the struggling pensioner, the hardworking farmer, the woodsman and the fisherman that "the life-support systems of the biosphere may collapse unless man reverses his present course and begins to live in harmony, rather than in competition, with his environment".

These people I am talking about have their problem with life-support all right, but in much more practical and everyday terms than are suggested in the Speech from the Throne. By all means let us be concerned about pollution; I will subscribe to that. Let the scientists pursue and test their theories. Let the government show its concern by taking action. Let all concerned Canadians co-operate in the fight against pollution. But let us not get so up-tight on the subject that we forget the mental pollution that exists in the minds of honest, hardworking people who so much want the opportunity to earn a decent living, people who get no such opportunity but instead are forced to swallow their self-respect and head for an interview with the nearest welfare officer. This should be a matter of prime concern in this country today.

It would be very difficult to convince the fishermen and farmers of this country that they must today discontinue competition with their environment. The fishermen of Newfoundland have been competing with their environment in a life and death struggle for centuries. I know of no other way in which they can earn their living. It seems to me it would almost make more sense to tell the Atlantic Ocean that it must begin to live in harmony with the fisherman than to tell the fisherman in Newfoundland that he must live in harmony with the Atlantic Ocean.

I suggest a little commonsense in the Speech from the Throne, for a change, would not hurt. I suggest we have an environment that we could not possibly live with if we did not fight it. Perhaps the speech did not take into consideration at all the fact that there are other parts of Canada besides the great urban centres. However, it may be the Prime Minister who should get a more thoughtful and knowledgeable speechwriter.

I move on to the next paragraph of the Throne Speech, which almost paralyses me with its profundity. It begins:

> The decade of the 'seventies extends beyond our present vision—

If that is saying that we are not clairvoyant and cannot look ten years into the future, that is quite an admission.

• (9:30 p.m.)

> —yet the momentum of change is already so overwhelming that man can no longer afford the luxury of reacting to events.

I am sure this government must look pretty silly to the world today, in light of events that have occurred in the past few weeks and—I am very serious now—bearing in mind the warnings that have been given to it over the past few years, warnings which it refused to heed or pay any attention to. Now we get the statement that man can no longer afford the luxury of reacting to events. Then we find these words:

> He must anticipate and plan. He must accept that contentment and indifference are illusory; that the most dramatic reality is change; that there is more need than ever before to preserve as constant values truth, honesty, excellence and relevance—

Here comes the clincher:

> —that a society which is not inspired by love and compassion is not worthy of the name.

So, Mr. Speaker, you will understand why I am suspicious of the author of this document—make love, not war nor work. But to become serious for a moment, I have a feeling I have read those or very similar words before. Those words, in my opinion—I shall not offer an opinion as to whether they were intentional or otherwise—are of the type which serve only to encourage those who would tear down our traditions, upset our laws and set our social order in jeopardy. I ask hon. members to couple those words with a previous line in the Throne Speech:

> —man may be facing his last opportunity to control his own destiny rather than be subject to it.

Mr. Speaker, what do we have when we just sort of go through the Throne Speech and extract this type of statement? I shall repeat it again because it is worth repeating—man must control his own destiny rather than be subject to it. In times like this I very seriously doubt whether that statement should be emphasized responsibly. Although I would rather believe this is not intentional, it strikes me that that sort of suggestion could only lend encouragement to those elements which are today trying to tear us apart in this country. Let me again read these words:

> —man can no longer afford the luxury of reacting to events. He must anticipate and plan.

Here again I very seriously question the wisdom of such a statement in a Throne Speech at a time like this. Then we have these words, "contentment and indifference are illusory". Again, I very very seriously question the motivation of a government that tells its people in time like these that contentment is an illusion. I cannot help feeling this way, because obviously something is wrong. I hope the Canadian people have received copies of this Speech and will read it as I did. It is frightening just to think about the interpretations which might be put on these words by the very people who are causing our difficulties.

Then we see these words, "the most dramatic reality is change". This is spelled out very clearly in the Throne Speech. Again, I very seriously question the wisdom of this government lining itself up with that sentiment at this time. Then it says, "not inspired by love and compassion is not worthy of the name." I cannot help but wonder whether those words will not be interpreted in certain circles a meaning, not inspired by love and compassion is not worthy of continued existence, because

any idiot knows our society is not inspired by love and compassion. Who is trying to kid whom? If we are trying to suggest to the people who are on the "love kick" that this society is not inspired by love and compassion—and we know it is not—then the message could very easily be interpreted to mean that not only is society not worthy of the name but it is not worthy of continued existence. It does not take too much of a cynic to read that into the Speech, Mr. Speaker.

This is the type of thing I am talking about which takes up the majority of the Throne Speech. It most certainly takes up a number of the opening pages. What is the government suggesting? Is it suggesting it will legislate love and compassion, as it presumed to legislate hatred last year in the bill passed in this House to control racial hatred and so on? That is not likely.

I am very concerned about the very great emphasis placed on such words as "freedom" and "liberty" in this Speech. It is not, God forgive me, that I have anything against freedom and liberty, but when I read a speech in this day and age when the country is bothered with grave crises and I see freedom and liberty still emphasized and not much emphasis placed on the need for continuation and strengthening of law and order, I become very worried indeed. It strikes me as being very significant that the speech emphasizes so strongly freedom and everything while showing no concern for what the Canadian people would expect to be there at this particular time.

Again I say I am not suggesting this has been done wittingly or knowingly, but I cannot escape the thought that this Speech does in effect give a great deal of encouragement, and sort of the green light, to the small minority which is hell-bent upon destroying our social order in this country.

• (9:40 p.m.)

The whole backbone of the Speech is to be found in the following phrases—the new age, the changing of attitudes, entering an age of tension. We are told in the Speech that this is what we can accomplish if we use foresight, stamina and enterprise. Ours may be, if we wish it, a society in which human differences are regarded as assets and not liabilities. I did not know there was ever a time in Canada's history when human differences of the right kind were not regarded as assets rather than liabilities.

It almost suggests to me that I am being asked whether I have been involved in a good demonstration lately, or a riot; and it suggests to me that if I was not, I should be ashamed of myself. We are told that ours may be, if we wish it, a society in which individual freedom and equality of opportunity remain the most cherished possessions. I have no doubt about that. That is what we all aspire to. We are told of a society in which the enjoyment of life is measured in qualitative, not quantitative terms. That sounds like a statement that is made to the very rich, to those who are happy and content and to those who have their bellies filled. Then, I think, we can start thinking in qualitative rather than quantitative terms. But try using this philosophy for the consolation of the large number of Canadian people who cannot afford the luxury of giving these words a meaning.

We are told about a society which encourages imagination and daring, ingenuity and initiative, not coldly and impersonally for the sake of efficiency but with warmth and from the heart as between friends. This takes the harm out of the other things that I do not like so well, but it does not work. We are told the following:

> As Canada moves into the seventies we are all invited to join in this bold enterprise—to share the excitement, to face the challenge, to pursue the distant ideal of a just society.

It is not the Just Society of a couple of years ago—written in capital letters—but just any old just society, not even capitalized. On June 18, 1968, Canadians were led to believe we would have a just society. Now it becomes a distant ideal that we have to pursue. The Prime Minister says he does not want to sloganize any more.

There are a couple of very vague references to our economic situation. There is a reference to the sale of wheat. The government is pleased at the widespread public response to its invitation to comment on the White paper on taxation. We used to hear that type of pious platitude in Newfoundland when I was in that legislature. I think the House would like to hear of this. Some years ago the minister of finance of Newfoundland put a large tax increase on the price of cigarettes. In announcing that increase he said in his speech, "It is my sincere wish that this tax will discourage people from using this vile weed," or words to that effect. Notwithstanding that, it put another $4 million or $5 million dollars into the treasury. I do not think this government is pleased, as it alleges to be. I think it is just trying to get out as gracefully as it can.

I would give any amount of money to know who is the actual author of the Throne Speech. I think all Canadians should have a copy of it, because I think a day will come when it will be a collector's item. I would like to conclude my remarks with the words used by the Governor General to close the Speech from the Throne: "May Divine Providence guide us in our deliberations"—because with the government we have, we need all the help we can get from above.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): Mr. Speaker, it is not easy for one to follow the hon. member who preceded me, and it is not easy for one to look at the Throne Speech and see the things that he saw in it: one really has to be as bright as the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). However, the Speech from the Throne amuses me also.

I could talk about many things that are contained in the Throne Speech, such as the distant ideal that was mentioned by the hon. member, and the philosophical words that are used therein to describe the way we are going in Canada and the way in which we are facing the new decade. I could talk, also, about the White paper on taxation, but I must confess that like the hon. member

who preceded me, I see nothing in the Speech that would affect my constituents. Therefore, I should like to talk a little about my constituency. First, I would like to quote the following paragraph from the Throne Speech:

> As Canada moves into the seventies, we are all invited to join in this bold enterprise—to share the excitement, to face the challenge, to pursue the distant ideal of a just society.

What does a just society imply? What does it mean to you, Mr. Speaker?

An hon. Member: He cannot answer you.

Mr. Comeau: I wish Mr. Speaker could answer my question, because obviously the just society has different meanings to different people. I would think that a just society means at least one that is somewhat equitable, a society that takes care of the poor, a society that helps a man to buy his own home—and I see the minister in charge of housing here—a society that provides employment. I do not refer to a welfare society but a society that permits a man to earn a decent living, a society that leaves the individual free and not dependent upon the state.

• (9:50 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but it seems to me there are conversations of an informal style going on in the chamber, and this is not in keeping with the dignity of the House. Perhaps the hon. member might now continue.

Mr. Comeau: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps hon. members are getting tired and would like me to call it ten o'clock.

An hon. Member: Don't do that.

Mr. Comeau: Very well. The Speech from the Throne continues:

> So long, however, as Canadians who desire work are unable to find it; so long as persons on fixed incomes are unable to provide adequately for themselves and their dependents; then so long must the government strive to assist them.

Well, I'll be darned! As the hon. member who preceded me asked, who can contradict that? We all agree that we must strive to do these things. We all agree that we must provide jobs. Every government wants to achieve certain objectives to provide employment. But what is this government really doing about it? Everybody knows that this summer we had the highest unemployment rate of the past ten years. Yet every Throne Speech that I have read since becoming a Member of Parliament has said we must strive to assist these Canadians and help them provide for themselves.

We all know that pensioners are having a hard time. I have been sitting in this House for over two years, and just about every second day the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall), the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and other hon. members have made inquiries about increases in pensions, increases in veterans pensions, increases in old age pensions and more assistance for superannuates. In the 2½ years that I have been here, the same answer has been given. It was given again today. That answer has always been, "This matter is under active consideration. We are thinking about it. We are bringing in a white paper." We were supposed to have the white paper in June, Mr. Speaker. Again today we were told that it is being actively considered by the government. The government knows very well that pensioners, not to mention people on low income, simply cannot live on what they get. We do not have to remind the government of this every second day. But nothing is done.

It is very strange that each of the 264 members of this House knows that pensioners are having a hard time. Yet nothing is done. We know that they cannot live on what they get. Everybody admits it. A House committee admits it. Opposition members have tried to push the government into action. We have dealt with this question on allotted opposition days. We ask questions every second day about it. The government admits the reality of the situation, but nothing is done. It is very strange that we all agree that something has to be done but we do not do anything about it.

Why is it that governments do not practise what they preach? If the government really wants to do something about pensioners, let it do something about them. Why does the government keep on fooling the people? Why do we say we are going to do something? During every election campaign we say we will do this and that, but between elections government promises seem to fade away. They bring in Throne Speeches such as the one we received a week ago. I shall read another fantastic statement in the Speech from the Throne as follows:

> We stand on the threshold of greatness.

Yesterday the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) stood in this House and told us how enormous were the resources that we have in Canada. Every now and then the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) stands up in this House and tells us how great our economy is; that it is in great shape and we are going ahead. I wish I understood their vocabulary, Mr. Speaker, because theirs and mine just do not click. I cannot understand the words they are uttering. I cannot understand why, if we have such a good economy and our resources are so plentiful, we now have the highest unemployment of the past ten years. That is not clear to me.

In my area unemployment sometimes rises to as high as 20 per cent of the work force, probably because most of the work is seasonal, most of my constituents are fishermen. My area is heavily dependent upon fisheries and marine resources of all kinds. We have many times brought this fact to the attention of the minister within the past couple of years. We have pointed out that there are many problems connected with the fisheries. The hon. member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Lundrigan) made a great speech on this subject the other day. The hon. member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse) and the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Carter) have also spoken about it. We have emphasized the fact that foreign nationals are exploiting our fisheries. For many

years the hon. member for South Shore has been hollering about this problem, but nothing seems to be done. It is just like the situation regarding the pensioners.

What will happen if things continue the way they are now? My goodness, we will be on pension, and if the pension is only at today's rate it will be a very skimpy life for us. The situation of our marine resources is very serious. On that note, Mr. Speaker, I will continue tomorrow. I hope hon. members will come back and hear me finish my remarks.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

NATIONAL PARKS—PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—ESTABLISHMENT OF SECOND FACILITY

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, after listening to the strong strictures of my colleague from South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) and the sparkling, scintillating and sardonic speech of my hon. friend from Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador (Mr. Peddle), I have the feeling that this is rather a poor night for a philosopher. Nevertheless, I will refer to the question I asked the other day of the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) concerning the establishment of a second national park in Prince Edward Island. This question was prompted by my anxiety concerning recent press releases in the Charlottetown and other newspapers which suggested a departure from the program which the minister outlined in the House last session.

On March 13 I asked him about the establishment of a second national park in our province and his reply, I thought, was most favourable. It was:

> —this project has not been definitely announced. My Parliamentary Secretary met with the Premier of Prince Edward Island this week, and they made considerable progress with this plan to establish a second national park in Prince Edward Island. No agreement has been drawn up yet and federal government payments will come under the policy established in British Columbia where we paid 50 per cent of the purchase price of land situated along the coast.

• (10:00 p.m.)

The minister also said that his Parliamentary Secretary and the Premier of Prince Edward Island had agreed to start drafting an agreement, all of this on March 13, 1970. In a recent newspaper I read of meetings between the minister and the Premier of Prince Edward Island held last Labour Day. Later a federal parks spokesman, I suppose alias a well-informed source, to use the jargon of bureaucracy, was quoted as saying:

> The province must provide the land for a second park free and clear for development. Because land must be expropriated this involves some heavy provincial expenditures for the P.E.I. budget.

[Mr. Comeau.]

I would say he is darned right. It would involve a great expenditure for the Prince Edward Island government. This is a serious de-escalation of Dominion government commitment. No longer do we hear of Ottawa paying 50 per cent, the arrangement which was made with the affluent province of British Columbia some time ago. Now, if we read it right, it is all to be paid by the province of Prince Edward Island. Surely little P.E.I. should get a deal at least as generous as that given to that wealthy empire on our west coast. If not, what has happened since the ides of March, 1970? Why does our province not now rate the same formula which the minister revealed in this House during his welcoming years?

It was, I believe, common knowledge that the site chosen for the second park was in the far eastern part of Prince Edward Island, in Kings County in the constituency of my hon. friend from Cardigan (Mr. McQuaid). I know this area well, having spent the first ten years of my life—just a few years ago!—in the area. It contains one of the most beautiful beaches on this continent. I refer to the south lake area. This is near the north lake area which is now becoming the tuna capital of the Atlantic area.

If there are problems in reference to this location, perhaps because of the propinquity of much of the adjoining property to the finest agricultural land, thus creating an economic problem, I think we should know quickly and precisely what the current attitude is. There is now considerable currency given to the suggestion that the federal government may have withdrawn from its commitment to offer a second park, and that instead it will substitute a substantial extension of the one now existing which happens to be, according to figures and observations, one of the most popular national parks in this country, as well it might be because it is one of the most beautiful.

This park, with its hundreds of thousands of visitors, is far too narrow for the kind of development that is important for modern recreational needs. Even if the second park promise is not repudiated, the P.E.I. park as it now exists must be enlarged to meet the demands of its ever-enlarging flow of visitors to our province, so welcome in our midst. If this is to be done, it would be only fair that Ottawa make at least as good a contribution as was promised in reference to a new park. The P.E.I. government, with its limited resources acquired some 30 years ago the original land for the present site and turned it over free to the Dominion government. If there is a new policy for new parks whereby the 50-50 deal is abandoned, surely with the extension of the existing park, where the province provided all the land, at least that 50-50 generosity should be forthcoming. I use the expression "at least" in reference to a province which built its hopes upon the promise of having a second park.

This, sir, is my reasonable suggestion. I expect the eminently reasonable Parliamentary Secretary, a colleague for whom I have high regard, will be able to come forth with a reasonable response to my suggestion, and if he has been advised to temper reason with generosity, I shall not demur.

Mr. Judd Buchanan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I take great delight in reassuring the hon. member and in making perfectly clear that there has been no abandonment of interest on the part of the government with respect to a second national park in Prince Edward Island, in the area of East Point.

On September 7 last my minister met with Premier Campbell and members of his cabinet to discuss with the province possible plans for the development of a park in this area. The province is anxious to ensure that they have thoroughly explored all options and alternatives with regard to the best use of recreational lands and with regard to the very heavy increase in tourist traffic which has occurred in the province in the last few years. This increase, I understand, was particularly heavy in the season just completed.

The minister's discussions with the province were cordial and constructive. It was made clear that the federal government is prepared to proceed, depending of course upon the conclusions of the province as to the course of action which would be most appropriate for them.

Again I should like to reassure the hon. member that the financial basis would be as stated by the minister on March 13 last, that is to say, the federal government would assume 50 per cent of the costs of acquisition and assembly of the necessary lands on the same formula as was established in British Columbia with respect to Long Beach Park.

Mr. Macquarrie: Hear, hear!

Mr. Buchanan: We expect to hear further from the province in due course. I am sure that when a decision is reached, my minister will be making an announcement jointly with the province.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.10 p.m.

APPENDIX

Montreal, October 21, 1970

PRESS RELEASE REGARDING INDIVIDUALS DETAINED IN APPLICATION OF THE ORDER-IN-COUNCIL ADOPTED UNDER THE WAR MEASURES ACT.

In order to dispel concern which seems to have arisen in certain circles and to anticipate the spreading of false reports or interpretations, the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Quebec, Mr. Jérôme Choquette, wants to clarify here and now in what manner the powers granted by the order-in-council adopted under the War Measures Act are being applied.

The Minister of Justice has announced that there will be no abuse, on the part of police services involved, of those powers, requested in these unprecedented circumstances.

Therefore, although simultaneous detention of some 300 individuals throughout Quebec, 250 of them in Montreal, creates substantial concrete problems, the police have already contacted the families or individuals the detained persons have requested to have informed.

A group of investigators and attorneys has been set up to study the record of each of those detained as promptly as possible, in order to determine whether they are to be indicted and brought before the courts or released because of lack of evidence. It will, however, be readily understood that the task of dealing with such an impressive number of files under present circumstances will inevitably take some time. However, instructions have been given to proceed with all reasonable haste.

The minister has also announced that he recognizes the right of the individuals detained to retain services of counsel, but here again there are administrative problems, which are being overcome.

The minister has emphasized, however, that it cannot be expected that the task of attorneys and investigators dealing with the examination of the detained individuals' files will be completed within the initial period of seven days provided by the order-in-council and that he therefore intends, where such action is justified in the light of information submitted to him, to extend the detention period to twenty-one days. We will however accept to release, as and when information becomes available, those persons against whom no crime or infraction under the order-in-council can be imputed. Indeed, during the past few days some fifty individuals have already been released.

As regards the provisions of the order-in-council declaring the FLQ to be an illegal association and prohibiting all support of the said group, the minister has announced that he would deal firmly with any persons violating the order, or in any way supporting the FLQ, and particularly the kidnappers of Messrs. Cross and Laporte.

Finally the minister strongly denies all insinuations to the effect that persons detained have been ill-ill-treated in any way.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, October 23, 1970

The House met at 11 a.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

INFORMATION CANADA

ANNOUNCEMENT OF FEDERAL IDENTITY PROGRAM

Hon. Robert Stanbury (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce the adoption of a federal identity program for all operations of the federal government and administration.

The main purpose of this program is to provide a co-ordinated and readily recognizable means of identifying federal activities. We believe that the interests of Canadian confederation are served when the people of Canada understand the realms of responsibility of the governments which serve them, and when they are able to identify the source of government services available to them. For this reason, it seems desirable to have a simple system of distinguishing designs, familiar to all Canadians, to identify federal activities. The program which we are adopting does not supplant any existing emblem of Canada. There has never been an emblem which represents the Canadian government as an entity within the Canadian nation. This program is intended to fill that need.

• (11:10 a.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker, the design consists of two devices from the flag; a red bar with a red maple leaf on a white square to its right, followed on the right by the bilingual identification in black of the Canadian government, the department, agency or other unit or function of the federal government. The bar and leaf may, on occasion, be rendered in black when use of colour is not practical.

Members may be aware that, in the absence of an identification system designed for all federal activities, departments have increasingly adopted their own designs so that, at the moment, there are more than two dozen different identifying designs in use by federal departments, to say nothing of boards and agencies. Many of them contain no element suggesting a relationship with the government of Canada. The new federal identity program will replace this multiplicity of designs in everyday use.

The coat of arms and the flag, of course, will continue to be used and honoured as emblems of Canada, the nation. Indeed, we believe that the adoption of a distinct design for identifying federal government activities will enhance the prestige and dignity of those symbols representing the nation as a whole.

The new program will be implemented gradually, starting on a limited basis immediately. During the next three months, a careful evaluation will be made of its application to stationery, signs, advertising, and so on. General introduction will commence early in the new year and continue until the end of 1973, as existing stationery stocks are exhausted and signs or vehicles need repainting or replacement.

When the new design has come into full use, Canadians will be able to identify more readily the activities of their federal government and its role in our nation. In this respect the program should be a significant means of strengthening Canadian confederation itself.

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the minister for his courtesy in providing us with a copy of this two-page document half an hour ago. I will be equally as brief in my comments as he was in making the announcement because, quite frankly, the substance of the document deserves brevity, to say the least.

I must say I believe that statement made by the minister today is a sad reflection of the priorities of this government which seems to be preoccupied with pomp, circumstance and symbols rather than with the substance of nation-building. The bread and butter issues seem to go out the window and we are supposed to have symbols and cake in our bellies rather than policies of this government. As all hon. members know, this is an unprecedented time in our history; yet the minister stands up in this House and puts forward a mouse that the mountain has produced, a policy on symbols for this land which makes me wonder whether the situation in Canada is as serious as we have been led to believe, or is it a sham? Are the minister and the government completely insulting and showing no respect for the intelligence of the Canadian people and displaying their usual nerve in bringing forward this statement, or is it just naïveté on the part of this minister? We want statements on policy, not symbols on paper, and it is high time we got them.

Is this symbol of the government of Canada another step on the road to big brother in 1984? This country has had a symbol for Canada which we have all respected, a coat of arms which spells out Canada. Are the House of Commons and the people to have a government of Canada symbol, which right now should be in black or are they to continue with the coat of arms? There are many questions we could ask, but I shall not take the time of the House today in insulting the intelligence of the people of Canada any more than they have been

insulted by this statement. We want statements on the War Measures Act, on the right to counsel, the protection of our rights, and on where the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion stands in respect of FRAP.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will recognize that his comments at this time should be on the statement and not on what might have been, should have been or ought to have been in the statement. I would ask him to direct his remarks to the statement.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, I will conclude with about one sentence.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nowlan: Words fail me in trying to comment—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Nowlan: —positively and constructively on this statement. I suggest through you, Mr. Speaker, to the members of the government that the people of this country will understand the relationship between the government of Canada and the people of this nation only when this government produces policies on matters such as social security so that we can get away from paper and get down to policies that the people understand.

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, the thought that came to my mind after listening to the minister's announcement about the simple colours involved is that the Minister of Finance must have had some hand in the decision which was made. Apparently the federal government has found a way to be in the red and the black at the same time.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mather: Actually, I think the announcement is one of the least harmful that the government has made for some time. The minister is in charge of Information Canada. I wish to take this opportunity to urge him to give us and the country as soon as possible more worthwhile and important information as to what Information Canada is actually doing for the benefit of the public. I believe there are 40 requests for the production of papers on the order paper, which would supply information to the members of the House and to their constituents. Instead of concerning itself so much with symbols, colours and other harmless trappings, Information Canada and the government as a whole ought to give the people the kind of information the people want and not the kind of information the government wishes them to have.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, the statement made by the minister this morning follows up, I believe, previous statements made by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand), in which he said, for instance, that if a province did not want to give recognition to the federal government's participation in some project, Ottawa would withhold its contribution.

According to the statement made this morning, the federal government wants its participation in any project to be recognized by the provinces, as, for example, the building of hospitals and technical schools and also the development of eastern or western Canada. Symbols will be used to show people that the federal government has really contributed to the establishment of hundreds of services, something people are often unaware of.

I think that people should be informed about provincial developments in which Ottawa is sharing. They should even be acquainted with municipal and school projects. They should be told what level of government is building roads.

But I wonder if this matter is so important at a time when many other things should be attended to and when legislation should be brought in to boost the Canadian economy.

Let us use symbols to inform people about the participation of the federal government and the provincial, municipal or school authorities in certain projects. Canadians will then know what the federal government is doing. As for the latter, it will do all it can to get the Canadian economy moving again.

* * *

[*English*]

• (11:20 a.m.)

ELECTION EXPENSES

ESTABLISHMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

On the order: Government notices of motions:

October 21, 1970—The President of the Privy Council: That a Special Committee be established to consider the question of the limitation and control of election expenses in Canada and to report from time to time its observations and opinions thereon;

That the Committee be empowered to send for persons, papers and records; to sit during sittings and adjournments of the House; to print from day to day such papers and evidence as may be ordered by the Committee; and to delegate to subcommittees any of its powers, except the power to report directly to the House;

That the evidence adduced by the Committee during the past Session in relation thereto be referred to the said Committee; and

That the Members of the Committee be designated at a later date.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Section 2 of Standing Order 21 this government notice of motion stands transferred to and ordered for consideration under government orders at the next sitting of the House.

* * *

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

AUTHORITY TO STANDING COMMITTEE TO REVIEW REPRESENTATION COMMISSIONER ACT

On the order: Government notices of motions:

October 21, 1970—The President of the Privy Council: That in relation to S. 22 of the Representation Commissioner Act, Statutes of Canada 1963, C. 40, the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be empowered to review the provisions of the Representation Commissioner Act and recommend to the House any amendments, alterations or modifications thereto that to the said Committee shall appear to be necessary or desirable, and the evidence adduced by the Committee during the past Session in relation thereto be referred to the said Committee.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Section 2 of Standing Order 21 this government notice of motion stands transferred to and ordered for consideration under government orders at the next sitting of the House.

* * *

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

REFERENCE OF QUESTION OF BROADCASTING OF PROCEEDINGS OF HOUSE AND COMMITTEES TO STANDING COMMITTEE

On the order: Government notices of motions:

October 21, 1970—The President of the Privy Council: That the question of radio and television broadcasting of the proceedings of the House and its Committees, including the legal, procedural, and technical aspects thereof, and the question of arrangements made for reporters for the electronic media in the Parliament Buildings, and the evidence adduced by the Committee during the past Session in relation thereto be referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Section 2 of Standing Order 21 this government notice of motion stands transferred to and ordered for consideration under government orders at the next sitting of the House.

REFERENCE OF QUESTION OF MEASURES TO ENSURE SECURITY OF GALLERIES TO STANDING COMMITTEE

On the order: Government notices of motions:

October 21, 1970—The President of the Privy Council: That the question of measures to be taken to ensure the security of the galleries of the House, and the evidence adduced by the Committee during the past Session in relation thereto be referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Section 2 of Standing Order 21 this government notice of motion stands transferred to and ordered for consideration under government orders at the next sitting of the House.

* * *

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

REFERENCE TO STANDING COMMITTEE

On the order: Government notices of motions:

October 21, 1970—The President of the Privy Council: That the Public Accounts for the year ended March 31, 1969, and the Auditor General's Report thereon, and the evidence adduced by the Committee during the past Session in relation thereto be referred to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Section 2 of Standing Order 21 this government notice of motion stands transferred to and ordered for consideration under government orders at the next sitting of the House.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL DEFENCE

REFERENCE TO STANDING COMMITTEE OF PAPERS, "FOREIGN POLICY FOR CANADIANS"

On the order: Government notices of motions:

October 21, 1970—The President of the Privy Council: That the papers entitled "Foreign Policy for Canadians", laid before the House June 25, 1970, be referred to the Standing Committtee on External Affairs and National Defence.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to Section 2 of Standing Order 21 this government notice of motion stands transferred to and ordered for consideration under government orders at the next sitting of the House.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

NATIONAL SECURITY

POLICE EFFORTS TO FIND MURDERERS AND KIDNAPPERS —OFFERING OF REWARD

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to direct a question to the Solicitor General. It is now nearly three weeks since the kidnapping of James Cross, one week since the invocation of the War Measures Act and almost a week since the foul murder of Pierre Laporte. Can the Solicitor General explain to the House the apparent lack of success of police efforts and the reports now being made that they are at a dead end and are relying upon tips? Can the Solicitor General give the country any assurance in this regard?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with three difficult criminal offences, and I am now speaking of that aspect of the whole situation. The two kidnappings and the murder and under investigation and it is not possible to give from time to time all the information I would like to give. I cannot accept the proposition that the police are at a dead end in this matter.

An hon. Member: That is what the police said.

Mr. McIlraith: If the hon. member wishes he can accept the words of those who said it, but I must speak as best I can in answering a responsible question by the Leader of the Opposition. The information I have received from our federal police sources does not support the statement that they are at a dead end. I am not able to give the bits and pieces of information that I might like to give in order to develop the subject. I regret that under the circum-

stances at the moment I am not in a position to give more complete information in that regard.

Mr. Stanfield: Can the Solicitor General explain why the government has not acted on the suggestion made some time ago by the right hon. member for Prince Albert that a reward be offered, especially since in the course of the last week the government has been relying upon all resources of pursuit and there are indications that tips are now quite important to the police, as presumably they always have been?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the matter of a reward has daily been receiving very close attention. The decision not to offer an award was made in circumstances that were relevant from day to day but it was considered and was made for very good reasons that I will be happy to explain to the House as soon as we can do so.

An hon. Member: When?

Mr. McIlraith: The hon. member asks when. I am sorry I cannot give that information at the moment. The fact that warrants have been issued for the arrest of two persons has been well publicized. One cannot give information in the House of Commons that might be helpful to these persons, much as it might be attractive and desirable to do so. I regret being in this awkward position. I do not like it, but I believe there is an element of responsibility that must be exercised in these cases, however regrettable it may be that we cannot satisfy the curiosity of some hon. members.

Mr. Stanfield: I must say it is not at all clear to any of us why the offer of a reward should create any difficulty, but may I ask the Solicitor General this question: In view of the time which has elapsed and the difficulties to which he has referred, and in view of the experience of police forces in other parts of the world in connection with the detection and tracing of terrorists and kidnappers, have the Solicitor General, the government and the authorities generally brought in experts from around the world to assist in the pursuit?

Mr. McIlraith: We have some experts on this subject quite outside the police forces concerned and we have been using their services on different aspects of the investigation.

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): I appreciate the minister's difficulty with regard to giving details of what has been going on in the last week or so, but can he tell this House what federal initiatives, if any, were taken by himself and his law officers after receiving the information presented by Mayor Drapeau and Mr. Saulnier last December when they appeared before the committee investigating the Company of Young Canadians?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member will appreciate that the supplementary question is very much broader than the question originally asked by the Leader of the Opposition. It might be acceptable later, but not as a supplementary.

Mr. Nowlan: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it was because of the long and laborious answer given by the minister that this subject was opened up. I can appreciate his difficulties in pursuing the horrible criminals. I am trying to pursue the minister.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nowlan: His laborious answer opened up this field, and I submit that my question is perfectly proper.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has an opinion and he is, of course, entitled to it. I do not think the question is a proper supplementary but I will return to the hon. member in due course.

Mr. Cliff Downey (Battle River): Would the Prime Minister explain to the House on motions why the government did not decide to use the sedition act months ago when the FLQ was known to be in possession of large quantities of explosives?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I will be glad to consider that point if the hon. member will tell me what the sedition act is. I have never heard of such an act.

INFORMATION LEADING TO INVOKING OF WAR MEASURES ACT

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Last Wednesday, Mr. Speaker, as reported at page 427 of *Hansard*, I directed a question to the Prime Minister and the right hon. gentleman promised he would take it under consideration. My question arose out of the fact that at least three ministers, both inside the House and outside, have referred to confidential intelligence reports and evidence upon which they based their conclusion that a state of apprehended insurrection obtained in this country. I asked the Prime Minister at that time whether he was prepared to give the House such information or such evidence, or whether he felt it would be better to postpone any public statement until later. Is the Prime Minister now prepared to give this information to the leaders of the various parties? I want to ask the Prime Minister whether he would make a statement in the course of the next few days as to the course the government intends to pursue, whether he will give the House, either publicly or privately, the basis of the information upon which they took the step they did in determining there was a state of apprehended insurrection?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): By now I would have thought this information was in the hands of everybody. We have at various times explained why the War Measures Act was brought in at the time it was. The first fact was that there had been kidnappings of two very important people in Canada and that they were being held for ransom under threat of death. The second was that the government of the province of Quebec and the authorities of the city of Montreal asked the federal government to permit the use of exceptional measures

because, in their own words, a state of apprehended insurrection existed. The third reason was our assessment of all the surrounding facts, which are known to the country by now—the state of confusion that existed in the province of Quebec in regard to these matters.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Prime Minister whether the government had any evidence of a conspiracy to bring about an insurrection, and of the statement made by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion that there were thousands of rifles, machine guns and bombs in the possession of the FLQ? Is the government prepared to tell the House whether or not that information was in its possession, and is the government prepared to produce the source of that information? Or is the government acting entirely on the basis of statements made to it by other authorities?

Mr. Trudeau: I repeat, Mr. Speaker, not entirely on the recommendations made by other authorities, though that was obviously an important element in our decision. When the authorities of the province of Quebec and the city of Montreal say that there is a state of apprehended insurrection existing, then we take that statement to be a serious one. They are elected by the people and are responsible governments. But that is not the only source of information; of course it is not. There are other facts which have been made known to the public—that a great quantity of dynamite has been stolen in Quebec during the last year and not recovered, that there is a great quantity—I do not know the exact number but at any rate it is substantial—of rifles and small arms that have disappeared.

I wish the leader of the New Democratic Party would ask himself how much information Kerensky had in the spring and summer of 1917 when he was pooh-poohing the possibility of an insurrection which in fact happened in October, 1917.

ALLEGATION BY MAYOR OF MONTREAL THAT FRAP IS HAVEN FOR TERRORISTS AND REVOLUTIONARIES

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question arising out of this matter to the Solicitor General. May I ask the minister about the statement made yesterday by the mayor of Montreal to the effect that the FRAP organization is a haven for terrorists, criminals and revolutionaries? Does the information that the Solicitor General has from the police authorities substantiate that charge and, if so, is he taking any action with respect thereto?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of entering the Montreal civic election campaign.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McIlraith: I do not think it is appropriate to ask me to comment on statements made outside the House by someone who is not a member of the House. I am quite prepared to answer such questions as I am able to answer relating to matters that are properly the concern of Parliament.

INFORMATION LEADING TO INVOKING OF WAR MEASURES ACT

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister, who as I understood him is now suggesting that the public had available to it the information upon which the government based its decision. May I ask the Prime Minister how he reconciles this statement with the statement made by the Minister of Justice that it might not ever be possible to disclose to the public the information upon which the government based its decision, since it might endanger the lives of innocent people?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, what I said was that the facts that I have recited and which are known to the House were sufficient for us to take the steps we did. I am not saying that beyond that there are not other facts which may or may not be known to the public. It is a matter that will be left to the police, as far as I am concerned. I say that the facts that are known to the House are the facts on which we acted, and it is on that that we stand.

[*Translation*]

WAR MEASURES ACT—OPINIONS EXPRESSED IN LETTERS TO PRIME MINISTER

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): While I have the floor, Mr. Speaker, I might reply to a question put yesterday by the leader of the Ralliement Créditiste as to whether I had received letters or telegrams approving implementation of the War Measures Act.

Mr. Speaker, I have received 2,500 telegrams and 2,600 letters, 97 per cent of them supporting government action.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*English*]

ALLEGATION BY MAYOR OF MONTREAL THAT FRAP IS HAVEN FOR TERRORISTS AND REVOLUTIONARIES

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Solicitor General a question put to him already, but may I put it in a different way. May I ask the Solicitor General whether the federal police or any other police force, to his knowledge, has information to the effect that FRAP is a haven for terrorists, criminals and revolutionaries? Does he have such information?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): To my knowledge at the moment, no, Mr. Speaker.

Inquiries of the Ministry

WAR MEASURES ACT—SUGGESTED INDEPENDENT COMMISSION TO SUPERVISE APPLICATION OF REGULATIONS

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the Solicitor General has been in touch with this matter, but last Wednesday I asked the Minister of Justice whether he or any other minister of the government or the Attorney General of Quebec was considering the appointment of an independent committee to be in contact with the people arrested, a suggestion that is now supported, I believe, by all the churches of Canada. May I ask the Solicitor General whether he knows if this is being considered and if there is any intention of appointing such a committee?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): I do not know, Mr. Speaker, that there is a great deal I can usefully add to what the Minister of Justice has said on this subject—

Mr. Lewis: The minister said that he would draw it to the attention of the Attorney General of Quebec.

Mr. McIlraith: I thank the hon. member for correcting his leader on that point. There is very little I can add to what the Minister of Justice said in explaining the situation to the House. It is my understanding that it is being considered by the justice minister of the province under whose immediate responsibility the matter falls.

[*Translation*]

ACTIVITIES OF PAUL CLICHE, PRESIDENT OF FRAP

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question.

If the minister to whom this question was put a moment ago by a representative of the New Democratic Party is aware that Mr. Paul Cliche is president of FRAP and that this movement is a cover for the terrorists in Montreal, does he know that Mr. Paul Cliche is also a strong supporter of the New Democratic Party in Quebec?

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond.

Mr. Lewis: A question of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member for York South rising on a question of privilege?

Mr. Lewis: I certainly am, Mr. Speaker. I suggest to hon. members and to Your Honour that when a charge is made by a minister of the crown smearing an entire group of people, and that charge is repeated by the mayor of Montreal, it is the worst kind of McCarthyism for the hon. member for Temiscamingue to do the kind of thing he did, smearing a named person, Paul Cliche—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member may resent it but that does not make it a question of privilege. I am sure he appreciates that.

[Mr. McIlraith.]

Mr. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Paul Cliche is not in this House and he ought not to be smeared by an irresponsible reactionary.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I suggest that we are entering the field of debate at the present time; I suggest to the hon. member that this is a point of debate, not a question of privilege in any event.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

I do not wish to contradict the member for York South, but I would like to point out to the House that I have been personally acquainted with Mr. Paul Cliche for many years and that he belongs to the New Democratic Party—

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. I think that the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond has a supplementary question which I am sure is not related to the exchange we have just had between hon. members. The hon. member for Joliette.

[*Translation*]

REQUEST BY QUEBEC GOVERNMENT AND MONTREAL MUNICIPAL AUTHORITIES FOR INVOKING OF WAR MEASURES ACT

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Prime Minister in order to define, I think, a matter that many Canadians are concerned about.

Is it really a fact that the Quebec and Montreal authorities asked the federal government for assistance concerning the problems of which we are all aware?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I can only repeat what I said a moment ago and last Friday morning when I announced that the government had taken those measures at the request of the authorities mentioned. I even tabled in the House the letters in which the government of the province of Quebec and Montreal municipal authorities expressed their fear of an insurrection. Besides, those letters have appeared in the official report of the House of Commons' debates.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair will allow a supplementary question to the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby. In view of the few minutes left during the question period, perhaps we might then try to cover a few other subjects.

ACTIVITIES OF FLQ—STATEMENT BY MINISTER OF REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. Because of the smearing effect on innocent people as

individuals and groups of the statement made by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion to the effect that the FLQ had infiltrated virtually all the major institutions in Quebec, including our political party among others, would the Prime Minister consider making a statement as soon as possible in the House providing documentary evidence of this statement?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I do not accept the premise, Mr. Speaker, so I have no intention of making such a statement.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

RECONSIDERATION OF CLOSING OF RIVERS AIR BASE

Mr. Craig Stewart (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Defence. Has the decision to close the Canadian Armed Forces base at Rivers, Manitoba, been reconsidered, since it is the only suitable airfield available for transporting troops in any emergency from Camp Shilo, as was shown by the extreme difficulties experienced last week in the enforced reactivating of Rivers in order to move troops to Montreal?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, these facts were very much taken into account when the earlier decisions were arrived at but there has been no reconsideration since the event the hon. member has referred to.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

ALLEGATION BY MAYOR OF MONTREAL THAT FRAP IS HAVEN FOR TERRORISTS AND REVOLUTIONARIES

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Solicitor General. Can he indicate whether the contentions of Mr. Drapeau concerning the FRAP organization in Montreal, which has been widely publicized during the last day, were communicated to the federal government or to the RCMP and, if so, were they communicated with supporting information and evidence?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, there is an election in Montreal this weekend and the question seems to be designed to bring out information with relation to that election. As I indicated earlier, I have no intention whatever of being drawn into this municipal election by any member of this House. It would not be a proper use of my role in the House to let myself be drawn into that situation. I will look at the hon. member's question very carefully and if there is any information sought in the question that can be provided on Monday I will try to do so.

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION ADVERTISEMENTS IN ALLEGED REVOLUTIONARY MAGAZINE

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the right hon. Prime Minister in connection with FLQ infiltration in all circles.

Is the Prime Minister aware that the Civil Service Commission is attempting to recruit civil servants through competitions advertised in *Le Quartier Latin*, a clearly revolutionary sheet supporting separatism and the FLQ?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member can find this information. He is asking if the right hon. Prime Minister is aware of this fact, and I do not believe that the question asked in this manner is acceptable.

* * *

[*English*]

POLLUTION

FURTHER REDUCTION OF PHOSPHATE CONTENT IN DETERGENTS—INVESTIGATION OF SUBSTITUTES

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Has any decision been made on the further reduction of the phosphate content in detergents under the provisions of the Canada Water Act?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, the government banned the content of phosphorous pentoxide in detergents to the extent of 20 per cent by weight as of August 1, and banned the use of phosphates altogether by January 1, 1972. At the time of the ban the industry said it was scientifically impossible to achieve these two objectives, either the 20 per cent by August 1 or the January 1, 1972, total ban. I note now that some of the industry has full page advertisements to the effect that they have already achieved 100 per cent removal of phosphates from detergents, and we are reviewing to see whether or not the January 1, 1972, date can be brought forward.

Mr. Aiken: Before asking my supplementary I would urge the minister first to proceed as quickly as possible. Is any intermediate order intended between now and the final ban?

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that a diminishing of quantities would be useful. It would be technically difficult and would not do a great deal of good. I think the thing to investigate, now that the industry has been able to make their scientific progress much more rapid than they had anticipated, and the most useful exercise to perform, is to find out how quickly we can push the January 1, 1972, date forward.

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister whether his department

has under review the substance or substances that manufacturers may be using instead of phosphates, and has he any information he can give the House on whether or not they may have any pollutant effect?

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, NTA, which is the major substitute, has been used in Sweden for some years and our scientists have investigated the effect there and have also consulted Swedish scientists in this regard. We are also continuing our own independent research in this area. To date, while we are satisfied that the banning of phosphates was the proper decision, there is no complete and comprehensive scientific conclusion which can be made as to NTA. We are satisfied to date that it is a substitute which is worth while.

PHOSPHATES—NEGOTIATIONS WITH UNITED STATES FOR CONTINENTAL BAN

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, since 80 per cent of phosphorous pollution emanates from the United States, has the minister negotiated with the United States government with a view to effecting a continental agreement banning phosphates, either through talks with the U.S. cabinet or through the International Joint Commission?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, on June 23, I believe it was, we had international meetings with the United States, the Canadian team being led by the Secretary of State for External Affairs and the United States team led by Russell Train, the president's environmental council director. That committee is continuing to sit. One of the recommendations at that time was a total ban on phosphates on both sides of the border. We are continuing our representations with the United States in this regard, but to date we have achieved no agreement.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

WAR MEASURES ACT—INFORMING BY POLICE OF FAMILIES OF THOSE DETAINED

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the right hon. Prime Minister. I tried to catch your attention a few minutes ago because it relates to an earlier topic. In light of a statement by the Minister of Justice yesterday, is it the position of the government that the police should inform the families of all those detained under the War Measures Act, and I underline the word "all"? If this has not yet been the case, would the Prime Minister explain on motions or otherwise what regulation or statute empowers the police to withhold such information?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that in the statement of the Minister of Justice of Quebec, which was tabled yesterday in the House by the Attorney General of Canada and I believe printed in *Hansard*, the Minister of Justice of Quebec said that all those who have been detained and have requested access either to their families or to counsel have received it. The hon. member can read the statement.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to the appendix in yesterday's *Hansard*. It might be well if my answer was given in the context of the following words which appeared in *Hansard* yesterday:

...the police have already contacted the families or individuals the detained persons have requested to have informed.

* * *

INDUSTRY

FINANCIAL SETTLEMENT WITH DOSCO SHAREHOLDERS—SUBMISSION TO HOUSE

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): I have a question for the Prime Minister. Prior to any government financial settlement with the shareholders of Dosco, will this matter be brought before the House for agreement?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice and refer it to the appropriate minister.

Mr. MacInnis: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In taking the question as notice, will the Prime Minister also inquire of the Minister of Justice whether the list of shareholders will be made available along with the dates when the shares were acquired by the individuals?

Mr. Trudeau: I will take that as notice also.

* * *

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

RETIRED EMPLOYEES' PENSIONS—ACTION TO IMPLEMENT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR INCREASE

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. It is supplementary to a question which I asked him two weeks ago today. Is the minister yet in a position to report to the House on his discussions with the CNR concerning the increases in pensions by the Canadian National as recommended by a standing committee of this House and concurred in by the House itself?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): No, Mr. Speaker. I am not at all certain whether it would be appropriate for me to report to the House regarding discussions between myself and officials of CNR. I can advise the hon. member that I have conveyed to the CNR officially the findings of the committee and the decision of the House. If there is anything subsequent to that which I can appropriately report I will, but I assume that this matter will emerge in the normal way through questioning before committees or in some other fashion.

HOUSING

REFUSAL OF CMHC FINANCING FOR DEVELOPMENTS NEAR AIRPORTS THAT VIOLATE COMPATIBLE LAND USE TABLE

Mr. P. M. Mahoney (Calgary South): My question is to the Minister without Portfolio charged with housing. Can the minister give an assurance that CMHC financing will be refused in developments near airports which violate the transport ministry's compatible land use table?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): It is my understanding that information has not yet been published regarding the compatible land use table, but I can assure the hon. member that consultations with the Department of Transport are proceeding with regard to revising CMHC requirements for residential developments to make sure they are compatible with their views.

Mr. Mahoney: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister consider deferring such financing for potential violations until the table is published?

Mr. Andras: We will give that consideration.

* * *

WELFARE

NUMBER RECEIVING ASSISTANCE—REQUEST FOR EMERGENCY RELIEF PAYMENTS

Mr. S. Perry Ryan (Spadina): My question is for the right hon. Prime Minister. As the number of people receiving welfare assistance in metropolitan Toronto rose to a record of 47,079 last month, an increase of approximately 50 per cent compared with the same time last year, and as that figure is predicted to rise by 50 per cent over the next five months, will the government give emergency relief payments to that city and to other cities in Canada with the same problem?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): As the hon. member knows, the federal government pays 50 per cent of every dollar through the Canada Assistance Plan. I would think this is a sufficient answer.

Mr. Ryan: In view of the fact that employables are now coming on the rolls in great numbers and that the 50 per cent payment is not sufficient to take care of the situation, would the government consider giving relief to the extent of 100 per cent in respect of employables in view of the fact that the city says this situation is due to the anti-inflationary policy of the government?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The last part of the hon. member's question put him out of order.

* * *

FINANCE

SUGGESTED REDUCTION OF BANK INTEREST RATES

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): I have a question for the Minister of Finance. I should like to ask him whether

it is in accordance with government policy that chartered banks should reduce their interest rates on money lent in line with the recent reductions by the Bank of Canada and, if so, will he consult these banks to determine why they are reluctant to give up their high interest rates which do nothing toward fighting unemployment?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): I think they should, and I will be glad to consult them.

Mr. Korchinski: Will he report back to the House on this?

Mr. Benson: Certainly.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

WAR MEASURES ACT DETENTIONS AND RELEASES

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I should like to direct a question to the Solicitor General. In view of the fact that there seems to be some discrepancy between the figure which the minister gave the House on Wednesday with respect to the number of persons who have been detained under the War Measures Act regulations and that issued by the Attorney General of the province of Quebec, may I ask the minister whether he can now give us the figures he has regarding the number of persons who have been detained and the number who have been released? Can the minister also tell us the number of persons who have been charged and whether or not all these individuals have had a chance to communicate with their families and to secure counsel?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): I am very glad of the opportunity to clear up that matter. The number of persons released following detention under the special powers was 102 as of last night. The number still held as of last night was 232. The hon. member will notice that when those figures are added together the total of 334 is smaller than the figure which had previously been given of the number of people detained. I am getting precise information on that, but it appears—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me that we are running out of time and there are a number of hon. members who appear to have questions.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise on a point of order. It seems to me extremely important that when the minister tells us that 379 people have been detained and now we have a figure of 334 we should know what has happened to these people. I will not press the point now at this late hour, but the minister should undertake to make a full statement on Monday regarding the number of people who have been detained, the number who have been released and other particulars.

Mr. Speaker: It is my suggestion that this can be done early next week, but we have about reached the end of

the question period and I was hoping I could recognize one or two hon. members before we call orders of the day.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS

REPORTING OF COMMITTEE EXPENSES

Mr. Mac T. McCutcheon (Lambton-Kent): I should like to direct my question to the Government House Leader. In order that the House may have better control of its activities and expenses, will the Government House Leader bring in a motion referring to the Committee on Procedure and Organization for report the need of all committees of the House to file a complete report of the expenses incurred during the previous session?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): This subject was touched upon in our debate on the establishment of the Constitutional Committee and I believe there was general agreement that we should look at this question. How we do it is a matter that I will be happy to consider.

Mr. McCutcheon: Would the minister also consider including in any motion when setting up a special committee the matter of the estimated cost? The figures of $300,000 to $500,000 are being bandied about regarding certain committees, and this is very nerveracking.

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. A moment ago, when I suggested that the Solicitor General might make a statement early next week giving the information for which I asked, the minister indicated he was willing to give it now. Would the House agree to revert to motions to allow the minister to make his statement because it is exceedingly important to the House to know what persons have been detained and what disposition has been made of these persons?

Mr. Speaker: Does the House agree to reverting to motions?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is no agreement. Orders of the day.

• (12:00 noon)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADA SHIPPING ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING DISCHARGE OF POLLUTANTS BY SHIPS

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport) moved that Bill C-2, to amend the Canada Shipping Act,

[Mr. Speaker.]

be read the second time and referred to the Special Committee on Environmental Pollution.

He said: Mr. Speaker, a few years ago if there were to be an amendment to the Canada Shipping Act the chances are that it would not even cause a ripple of excitement, except among the relatively small shipping community. However, over the last few years that situation clearly has changed, and as I speak to this proposed amending bill today I am very conscious of an incident which occurred several months ago, in fact in February of this year. At that time, I flew over a very attractive part of Nova Scotia known as Chedabucto Bay and saw the appalling damage that had already been caused as a result of the grounding of the tanker *Arrow* and the subsequent spill of many hundreds of thousands of gallons of crude oil on to the waters and shoreline of that particular area.

This incident was probably the most dramatic of many that have occured in recent months and years. It brought home to us all very clearly the necessity for significant changes in the powers that the government must have, that the people of Canada must have, to ensure first of all that such incidents are kept to an absolute minimum and, secondly, that when these do occur there is a means through which we can ensure that the responsible parties cover the costs involved in any clean-up operation.

It might be useful, Mr. Speaker, if on this occasion I took a moment or two to discuss the *Arrow* incident and its aftermath. In doing so my first responsibility, and indeed it is a pleasure, is to compliment Dr. McTaggart-Cowan and the members of his task force on the excellent job they did in cleaning up and controlling the aftermath and the effects of the *Arrow* oil spill.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Jamieson: It may be, Mr. Speaker, on this particular occasion and in the circumstances in which we find ourselves in Canada today, that it is also appropriate for me to call the attention of hon. members to the fact that the Canadian Armed Forces, particularly those stationed on the east coast of Canada, did a superb job under very difficult conditions. They illustrated in that case, as they have in the past and I have no doubt will again in the future, their ability to cope with an extreme situation of this sort whether it be in terms of the environment or in any other way. So, I do want as well to pay a well deserved tribute to Canada's Armed Forces and their leaders for the invaluable help they gave us in connection with the *Arrow* disaster.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, when I was in the broadcasting profession, I could not possibly imagine any field in which there were more instant experts. Almost invariably I discovered that the total population of Canada knew far more about broadcasting than I did, but I can now report to you with a great deal of accuracy that there is one other subject on which all Canadians appear to feel they are experts. I refer to the method of cleaning up oil spills and coping with these problems generally.

From the very first day that the *Arrow* disaster occurred, I received literally an avalanche of letters, phone calls and other forms of communication, all purporting to have the total answer to the problem. The fact of the matter, as of course we can see now in retrospect and in particular on the basis of the excellent report of the McTaggart-Cowan task force, is that there is no simple or unique solution that can be applied everywhere oil spills occur. The circumstances will vary from one part of our coastline to another. They will vary substantially depending on the time of year at which an oil spill occurs, and they will vary, too, depending on the kind of oil that happens to be involved.

Of course, the circumstances in the Chedabucto Bay area were amongst the worst we are likely to encounter in that the incident occurred in February, in the dead of winter. Water temperatures were extremely cold. The oil involved was a very thick type, commonly called bunker C type oil. This combination of circumstances created what, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, must be among the worst circumstances we could have encountered.

As a result of that difficulty, I believe we have now devised within Canada a competence with regard to dealing with oil spills that is superior to that known to authorities in almost any other part of the world. One of the examples I may give in support of that contention is the fact that for the first time in the case of the *Arrow* disaster means were devised, again with the co-operation of our Armed Forces, through which it was possible to attach valves to the vessel under water, and pump the oil through quite an involved system of heating coils so that it could be brought up to a point where it would flow.

The whole story of the operation is one that I believe would impress hon. members both with the ingenuity, and in some respects the courage, of Canada's Armed Forces whose divers went down in that very murky, cold and difficult water to carry out the exercise. But at the moment the important point to emphasize is that, although we have that known competence now in the circumstances surrounding the *Arrow* disaster, I would not want to mislead the House into thinking that we know everything there is to know about how to deal with an oil spillage of major magnitude.

The one that occurred more recently in the gulf near Prince Edward Island was of a completely different nature, and therefore we had to apply different techniques in that case. Mercifully, I may say, the bad effects of that particular spill were kept to a minimum. However, this was due as much to the fact that it occurred in the summer and that we were able to employ different techniques, rather than to the fact that we know everything there is to know about clean-up operations. I want to make that clear for a reason that will become apparent in a few moments in more detail.

The real objective of this legislation is not to so much, as has been emphasized, to ensure that somebody else pays for the clean-up operation. The real objective of this legislation is to guarantee to the maximum degree possible, to the extent that it is humanly possible, that oil spills will not occur at all. That must be our objective.

Now, Mr. Speaker, although I was born and lived all my life with the sea at my doorstep, I was not what might be called an expert on marine law until I became involved in these rather difficult problems during the current year. However, I have been fascinated during the past several months to study the evolution of marine law, and some of the rather strange and wonderful involvements that there have been of various groups in determining how shipping is controlled, not only in Canada and Canadian waters but throughout the world.

I do not propose to subject hon. members to a lengthy history lesson, but I do want to mention the fact that for centuries the great bulk of marine law was designed to do one of two things, either to protect the shipping community in one way or another or to protect life at sea. Indeed, when one looks at the quite massive amount of legislation within our own country on this subject, it is apparent that through all the years the main concern of our legislators has been to ensure that seamen were given the maximum amount of protection. We have commendable success in that regard, particularly when one sees the conditions that exist on most vessels today and compares them with the circumstances that existed on vessels even 20 or 25 years ago. But the truth is that until comparatively recent times no thought was given to pollution and its effects in terms of ocean shipping.

I suppose that is only natural, when one considers that up until fairly recent times the size of vessels was somewhat limited and we did not have what constitutes the greatest menace of our day, these massive tankers which now ply the sea routes and, in many cases, move into and out of Canadian waters. So, this bill we are now proposing and commending to hon. members, is designed to give to the Canada Shipping Act what might be described as a new look. We are hoping that through this measure we will add this new dimension to marine law, and will ensure that the shipping community assumes a greater measure of responsibility for the potential hazards that are inherent in the movement of large quantities of various items, but particularly oil, which can be a potential threat to the environment.

• (12:10 p.m.)

Let me now return to what I mentioned a few moments ago as the main objective of this legislation. Hon. members, I hope, will feel free in the committee stage on the bill to examine it thoroughly. For that reason I shall not burden the House today with the specifics of what we intend to do. Rather I shall try, with a rather broad brush, to outline the general principles involved and then permit members during the committee stage on this bill to question not only expert witnesses but myself, if they so desire, concerning what the specifics are.

Essentially, in terms of the insurance, I can point out specifically that one of the things the commission investigating the *Arrow* disaster discovered was that this was, in every sense of the word, a tramp. This was a very badly constructed ancient vessel which had not been kept

up to standard. The record, as now publicized in the report of the committee, indicates that two navigation items were not operative and that in a whole series of ways this was not a vessel which could be classed as being suitable for the transportation of oil. May I point out to hon. members that in terms of today's standards of transport this was literally a toy ship in size. It was only a comparatively small ship in terms of the 250,000, 300,000, 400,000 and even 500,000 ton vessels now being constructed or designed. Yet, we have seen the appalling effects of this spill. This legislation will give us the right, in a sense as Canadian citizens, to legislate to establish standards for vessels carrying major pollutants which we will permit into our waters.

In other words, we will say, as we did in the case of the voyage of the *Manhattan*, that there are standards we as the Canadian government will lay down. If these standards are not followed, the ship cannot be used in the transportation trade of Canada. In addition, there are considerations in respect of hull design, such as the number of compartments that ought to be in the vessel and other things having to do with the structure itself. We will have the authority to ensure that navigation aids of various kinds are up to scratch, and that the vessel is properly equipped in every respect as well as adequately and skillfully manned to the point where the hazards can be reduced to the minimum.

But we will not simply leave it at this because it is also possible, as particularly those of us from the coastal parts of our country know, for even the best constructed vessel to run into trouble for reasons beyond the control of the captain. I believe there are phrases in Marine law such as, "acts of God" and "beyond the control of the captain and crew". So, we must do something to ensure that the vessels are sound and that they operate in our waters only under conditions which ensure that there is the minimum amount of risk.

There is, therefore, provision in these amendments in respect of the establishment of pollution control to give those who will be designated from time to time by the government the right to go on board vessels in our waters and issue instructions to those vessels not to come into a port or, conversely, not to leave port because of weather conditions and so on in order, again, to minimize the hazards. The work, particularly in respect of the *Arrow*, has indicated the necessity for this kind of legislation. The *Arrow* incident occurred on an extremely bad and foggy day, so we had the worst possible combination of conditions. The crew may or may not have been in some measure familiar with the area and may or may not have been totally competent but, in addition, there were bad weather conditions. So, in this legislation we are moving to ensure that such a situation cannot occur again. In other words, the legislation provides us with more power than we have had up until now to designate traffic patterns.

One comment Dr. McTaggart-Cowan made was that, in terms of international air transport, corridors are established and rights of way are declared. This also is our ideal. We propose the same kind of measures in terms of water transport within Canada's territorial waters. We will designate routes and will have the opportunity to control traffic so that there are not two or more vessels in the same region at the same time, if there should be a potential for collision or anything of that nature. We hope that through this combination of measures we will reduce very drastically the prospects of any major disaster of this nature occurring again. In this connection I might say we have also in this legislation proposed that not only the cargo of the vessels, that is the oil cargo, but that also the bunkering be included as part of the total package subject to control measures.

In many cases large vessels, such as I referred to earlier, actually carry for bunkering purposes, even though they may carry all manner of cargo aboard, more oil than was carried by the *Arrow*. So there would be a gap in our control if we said that a small ship carrying a cargo of oil would be liable but that another ship carrying a larger quantity of oil for its own fuel requirements would be outside the law. Therefore, we have embraced in this legislation the bunkering of vessels.

What is important in our experience is that, so far as I am aware, up to the present time there has been no law of the sea which applies to unmanned vessels. This again is because of the historic impetus of marine law which was originally for the protection of individuals. If no persons were on board vessels, there was no law governing those vessels. We saw evidence of this in the case of the sinking of the *Irving Whale* a few months ago near my hon. friend's delightful province of Prince Edward Island. This vessel carried something in the order of 11 million gallons of oil but because it was being towed it was not a vessel and therefore, inferentially at least, there was no risk to human life involved. This indicates a wide open gap in the legislation. So we do, indeed, include unmanned barges of any type used for the transfer of oil.

Without minimizing the problem, let me tell you what we propose to do about it. I have already told you of the establishment of the task force at the time of the *Arrow* incident and the additional competence we obtained at the time of the incident near Prince Edward Island. We are now moving ahead on the basis of Dr. McTaggart-Cowan's excellent report with a view to establishing certain depots throughout Canada where various materials which we now know are useful for the control of pollution can be stored, and where there can be a qualified team that can move to wherever an incident occurs.

I believe hon. members will appreciate the scope of the problem here. Canada has, I assume, the longest coastline in the world. Possibly the Soviet Union may have a little more, but my friends, for example, from Newfoundland and Labrador know that the coastline of the province of Newfoundland and Labrador is longer than the entire eastern seaboard of the United States. Canada has, as I say, a fantastic amount of coast to protect.

Mr. Lundrigan: I have most of it in my area.

Mr. Jamieson: The hon. member says that he has most of it in his area, and what he does not have I have. I

represent the only constituency in Canada, Mr. Speaker, that is 700 miles long and half a mile wide. This actually is the case. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, there are parts of it that are so narrow I have difficulty in getting all of me within it.

• (12:20 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Jamieson: Be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is, as I have already said, we cannot exercise pollution control over the whole coastline at any one time so, we are proposing to establish depots for mobile teams at various points.

I have not touched on what is perhaps the most important part of the legislation. I will do that quickly. It is that part of the legislation which is designed to reinforce and enhance our contention that where there is pollution the polluter must pay. As hon. members will see when the legislation goes to committee, we have provided for several ways in which this can be achieved. In the first place, we have provided that various ship owners must give evidence that they have covered their liability through insurance, bonds and various other ways; that the insurance is in force and their liability is covered before they can move in to or out of Canadian waters. Secondly, we are proposing to level up to 15 cents per ton, not only on oil shipments entering Canada but on all movements of oil by water within Canada. In other words, we wish to cover the kind of situation which we encountered in the Gulf of St. Lawrence.

The provisions of the legislation will extend to such situations. We do not really know exactly how much this toll is likely to generate, although on the basis of 15 cents per ton it should be in the neighbourhood of $300,000 annually. And, just to show that that is not an excessive amount may I say—and I believe hon. members already know this—that the cost of cleaning up the oil spill by the *Arrow* alone exceeded $300,000 by a very wide margin. Therefore, we have proposed the establishment of this fund.

One of the things about the fund which I think hon. members will appreciate and which I am very pleased about—I am very proud to be able to introduce this because I think hon. members opposite representing the Maritimes will also be pleased about it—is this: the fund will be and can be used to cover loss of income by fishermen as a result of pollution. Up to now there has been no means through which fishermen could be compensated. Individuals have found it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to take action in the courts and the like. There has been no means, other than government largess of one type or another, for making up the loss of income. Under this plan, the pollution fund will be used to clean up a pollution incident. From it payments can also be made to fishermen in order to cover their loss of income.

There are two ways actually in which the fishermen will be protected. On the one hand, the fund will cover income losses and, on the other hand, the liability provisions which I have outlined and which involve insurance and the like will be applied to any damage that may occur to the gear of fishermen, to their wharves, to their boats or anything of that kind. So, there is a clearcut distinction here which I think will work very satisfactorily. In other words, there is a clear insurance provision covering situations in which boats are damaged, nets are soiled or anything like that. On the other hand, the fund can take care of the loss of income and, through this means, we shall be able to make payments to fishermen much more quickly than otherwise would be the case in order to bridge them over any difficult period which they inevitably face under these circumstances.

A number of questions have been asked about this legislation. I have not attempted today to cover all of them by any means. I can only say that there is unanimity, I believe, within the shipping community that we have gone further, much further, than any other country in using this type of legislation in order to protect ourselves. I make absolutely no apologies for that, Mr. Speaker, so far as I am concerned. We have seen that historically, as I tried to document earlier in my remarks, the law of the sea generally has been weighted for centuries in favour of the shipping community. I believe it is high time that we reversed the circumstances and attempted at least to correct the balance somewhat on our own account and in our own interest.

I therefore believe that what we have proposed will do two things—perhaps it will do many other things, too. It will do two things at least. First, it will make the shipping community much more conscious of what I contend is its fundamental and basic responsibility in this regard. There will no longer be any inducement for those who want to exploit the shipments of oil and the like to the maximum degree to use rotten or rusty tubs in which to carry this highly dangerous and highly polluting substance. Second, I think it will help us to achieve what we ultimately wish to see: international agreement on the whole question of the control of pollution, not only within coastal or territorial waters but on the high seas as well. Third, and this is incidental to the other two points I have made, we want to make ship operators, those being the crews and captains of vessels, more conscious of their responsibilities when they are in our waters, not merely in terms of navigating carefully but also in terms of what they do with such things as oil bilge, the flushings from their tanks, garbage, and such other things which, unfortunately, crews and captains at the present do not seem to feel are important.

To cover this kind of situation, we have increased what was essentially a token fine of $5,000 for this kind of pollution to $100,000. Furthermore, as the legal gentlemen in the House will know and will see when the legislation is considered in committee, we have broadened the base on which we can take action against a ship operating in this way. We have tried, during the past several months of intensive examination and study of this matter, to determine just exactly what kinds of package measures were needed. I believe we have come up with what is at the moment the maximum that we can achieve unilaterally.

I am aware that there are those who feel we should go even farther. Indeed I, as the head of the Canadian delegation at Brussels last November, advocated that there be unlimited liability with regard to oil spills of this sort. Unfortunately, the world community was not prepared to accept anything like this. I can say to them through you, Mr. Speaker, that the instant the world community comes around to agreeing on the magnitude of this problem and on the potential threat it poses to us all, Canada will not wish to act unilaterally but will be quite prepared to fall in line with whatever is achieved through international agreements.

We cannot wait around for another *Arrow* to sail its wobbly way up Chedabucto Bay; we cannot wait around while perhaps the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the St. Lawrence Seaway are polluted and find ourselves helpless and powerless as we were in many respects when the two major incidents as well as some smaller ones occurred this year. That is why, on an urgent basis, I have brought this legislation before the House. I believe it will commend itself to hon. members. I shall be more than pleased, as I said earlier, to deal with it in detail in committee. I have not the slightest doubt that it will be approved unanimously. When this legislation is coupled with the improvements in the Fisheries Act, which my colleague the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) helped to bring forward, and when it is coupled with the Arctic bill which hon. members approved unanimously earlier this year and with other measures which will be taken within this area, we shall have devised within the short space of less than one year a comprehensive package which will ensure that our coastline and coastal waters are protected to the maximum degree that is humanly possible.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Is the hon. member for Comox-Alberni seeking the floor for the purpose of asking a question?

Mr. Barnett: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My question has to do with the fund. The minister did not clarify this in his remarks, and I ask my question because the matter is not clear from my reading of the bill. Perhaps I should put my question this way. If there were two or three major disasters close together, is it possible that the fund could operate on an overdraft basis, since the amount in the fund would be insufficient to cover all charges against it, in order that the people who needed to be helped may be compensated?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to answer the question. I can only hope that we will not, in a sense, enter the committee stage at this point because, the answers to any of the questions with regard to this measure will need to be fairly lengthy. To be specific about the question asked by the hon. member, I see no problem with regard to having the fund operate in an overdraft state or something of that nature. Indeed, we anticipate that from the outset there might perhaps be some government advance into the fund on a loan basis to ensure that it becomes operative. I will be glad to discuss this with the hon. member in committee.

[Mr. Jamieson.]

• (12:30 p.m.)

Mr. Barnett: That covers the situation.

Mr. Aiken: Before beginning my remarks, may I be permitted to ask the minister a question which I feel is important? In view of the fact that the legislation is being sent to the Special Committee on Environmental Pollution, does the government eventually intend to transfer the responsibility for this section of the Canada Shipping Act to the new department of environmental affairs?

Mr. Jamieson: No, Mr. Speaker. There is no such intention in the legal sense, but my colleague the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) and I recognize the necessity of co-ordinated effort in this regard. The Canada Shipping Act has so many ramifications it is generally felt, and I think all hon. members will agree, that the Department of Transport has the greatest competence in this area. It involves the coastguard and this sort of thing. These provisions will remain the responsibility of the Department of Transport.

Mr. Lundrigan: A supplementary question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. It seems we are getting into the committee aspect of the discussion. The Chair will permit one further question.

Mr. Lundrigan: Can the minister indicate under whose purview will fall the matter of oil drilling and any spills that might occur?

Mr. Jamieson: Here again, Mr. Speaker, there is no short answer. In so far as this legislation is concerned, it does not concern itself with anything other than shipping. Because we have to use the Canada Shipping Act to establish where the liability lies, that question is not resolved in this measure. The Department of Energy, Mines and Resources licenses oil drills, etc., and something in their regulations covers this field. I plead with the hon. member to give me time so that when we get to committee I can then give the answers.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for his brief explanation of the objectives of this bill. I assure him that we in the Progressive Conservative Party support the objectives of this bill absolutely.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Aiken: This bill is intended to reduce the dangers of pollution of our waters by ships and their cargoes. To this particular objective we are absolutely committed. I am sure the minister understands that any comments, criticisms or suggestions that may be made by my colleagues or myself will be directed solely toward strengthening the bill, making it workable and effective, and clearing up some of the obvious administrative difficulties with which the minister is faced.

I join the minister in congratulating the task force "Operation Oil" which had the job of cleaning up the mess at Chedabucto Bay earlier this year. I was one of several hon. members who had the privilege of visiting this area. We saw the exact location of the disaster and the terrible results along the coastline, around the ship and for many miles in all directions. It was obvious that immediate measures were required to eliminate further spills. Even more important, and I place this first although the minister may have placed it second, when spills occur a group should be ready to deal with them.

The minister has expressed the extent of the bill. As far as marine regulations are concerned, there has been an effort to strengthen these in order to prevent spills. The minister referred to establishing groups throughout the country which might deal effectively with spills that occur. My main criticism of the bill is that it is not specific in setting up crews which could act immediately on situations such as occurred at Chedabucto Bay. I will deal with that later. Although this bill may not have intended to deal with that, I think it should. One of our most urgent concerns should be that we are prepared for disasters of this kind.

In a recent report prepared for the Progressive Conservative Party, of which I was a co-author, certain recommendations were made along these lines in very brief terms. I wish to quote paragraph 4 of this report:

> Contingency plans for oil or other spills from ships in Canadian waters need to be set down more specifically. We will set up, train and equip mobile crews to deal immediately with the actual or imminent spill of hazardous substances into water, drawing from the experience gained at Chedabucto Bay and elsewhere. To eliminate delays and arguments in emergency situations, we will embark on legislative procedures to give a Canadian government agency authority to immediately take control of any vessel carrying a hazardous substance which is in imminent danger of losing its contents into the water.

That is a brief, general description of our objective. The greatest concern I have at the moment is the ability of the government to enforce the provisions outlined by the minister. As he stated, they are not based on any international agreement or understanding. I agree that we cannot wait for years for such an agreement to be established.

There are other problems. We do not have a coastguard service sufficient to aid an inspector who may seek to board a foreign vessel for the purpose of inspection. The subject of a coastguard has been raised in this House quite often. We are now beginning to see the need. It would be a brave man indeed who would attempt to board certain foreign vessels and demand to inspect their facilities without sufficient backing. He requires the full force of the Canadian Parliament and a naval force to back him up when making such an inspection. Otherwise, the whole bill will be useless.

With regard to jurisdiction, we are concerned about the fact that fishing zones prescribed under the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act have not yet been defined. It is going to be very difficult to enforce this bill under present conditions. The definition of the application of this bill is in sub-section (2)(c). It applies:

> to any fishing zones of Canada prescribed pursuant to the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act:—

I hope the government will act quickly to establish these zones so that the bill now under consideration will be effective. If they are not, jurisdiction is gone and so are the prescribed areas. In certain parts of eastern Canada, these zones have not yet been prescribed.

• (12:40 p.m.)

I have not been able to discover in the bill any provision for the setting up and training of mobile crews to deal with emergency situations. The minister has said this is a desirable objective and that a beginning has been made in several locations. I had hoped to see the relevant provision written into the bill itself, bearing in mind the message we got from the special task force, "Operation Oil", on page 41 of its report:

> We carry no brief for the ratio of successes and failures in our own operations but we do hope that if there is another major spill in Canadian waters those responsible for the clean-up will be able to do a better job because of our experience and our recommendations.
>
> We are of the firm opinion that the only way that oil spills are going to be cleaned up effectively, when the responsibility rests at the federal level, is to have a small task force such as ours given the full responsibility and the authority to deal with it. This task force must, as it was in our case, be responsible to a single minister.

Further on, at page 42, the recommendation reads as follows:

> On the basis of these experiences we recommend that the Minister of Transport have the responsibility for dealing with pollution arising from oil spilled in water when the extent and nature of the spill makes it a federal responsibility.
>
> We recommend that this responsibility of the Minister of Transport be focussed in a small team at the headquarters level and comprise a minimum of one physical scientist, one biological scientist and one operations expert, the physical scientist being the leader.

This is somewhat similar to the operation which was set up at Chedabucto Bay. The minister did refer during the course of his remarks to such a force or forces but the bill itself gives no authority for setting them up in specific terms. I hope he is proceeding promptly to get these forces into operation.

With regard to taking charge of vessels in danger of allowing pollutants to enter the water, an existing section of the Canada Shipping Act, section 495(c), has been quoted. I am pleased to see that the section has been redrafted in clause 738 of the new bill. Correction, Mr. Speaker. On first reading, at least, the new clause does not seem to be much different from the old one certainly not so different as to give us cause for confidence that enforcement will be carried out more effectively. As I say, the provision exists already in the Canada Shipping Act. Yet we have found twice in the past year that ships in distress, foundering, with their cargoes likely to spill, have become involved in arguments between owners, charterers, masters and insurers as to just who would take charge and where responsibility lay. Delays in this connection could have serious consequences. Immediate action must be taken when spillage begins and sufficient

authority must be secured from Parliament to enable the Department of Transport to take any necessary steps. I do not see that the new drafting brings about any improvement in the situation, and this subject will certainly have to be fully reviewed when the bill goes before the committee.

The report of the special task force on the oil clean-up at Chedabucto Bay recommends certain areas of action which, it says, should be specifically dealt with in the present bill. For example, it recommends provision for the setting up of a series of laboratories to identify oil products and, in particular, to conduct research into the effects of pollution on marine life. The minister told us that this was not really the idea of the bill he was presenting, but to the extent that there are no such provisions in the measure it falls short of what is required to give effect to the recommendations of the task force.

The task force also recommended that tugboats should be properly equipped and, again, there appears to be nothing in the bill in this regard. The special committee was particularly concerned about the need to instal dykes surrounding land installations and pipelines carrying oil products which might get into the sea. Here again, the minister may have decided that this is someone else's responsibility and would not come within the purview of the Shipping Act but we would certainly like to be assured that if it does not appear in this bill it will appear elsewhere. Again, I point out that these are recommendations which stem from experience and concern, not just from theory.

As I mentioned previously, the bill could easily have contained provision for the organizational framework for the setting up of emergency crews to deal with oil spills. As we all know, the time factor in these situations is of vital importance; remedial procedures ought to be spelled out beforehand and carried out quickly. The minister did make some reference to the matter but, again, he was not specific as to how the arrangements would be carried out or, indeed, whether they would be carried out at all.

There is one other subject I should like to mention and it has to do with the co-ordination of these efforts. Co-ordination between not only the various federal departments concerned but with provincial and other agencies is a most important factor in making anti-pollution measures work effectively. Here again, though the minister said he was prepared to co-operate, we do not see in the bill any provision for the establishment of anti-pollution forces in the event of an emergency. An ad hoc organization was certainly build up during the Chedabucto Bay emergency but arrangements to deal with such situations might have been spelt out more specifically in the present bill, stating who should be in charge and what departments should be involved. We raised this question before in connection with the Canada Water Act.

• (12:50 p.m.)

This bill provides for inspectors, and there is no question that pollution inspectors is what they are. The Canada Water Act also made provision for inspectors. The Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) has his departmental inspectors. Undoubtedly, the provincial authorities have their inspectors in jurisdictions close to the shore. I am wondering, as I have wondered once before, how the activities of all these inspectors will be co-ordinated if a situation arises where all of them have some interest or authority to exercise. Our minds are directed, of course, to Chedabucto Bay on the east coast of Canada, but a similar situation to that could easily arise on the Great Lakes.

The situation right now is terribly complicated. If there were a spill into the Great Lakes within the provincial jurisdiction of the province of Ontario, in addition to their own inspectors the inspectors of the Water Resources Commission as well as the International Joint Commission would become involved, as would any administration set up by that body on the recommendation made at the Great Lakes conference fairly recently. I hope that co-operation between all these bodies will be made effective; and I think that it could be made effective if the bill provided for the nucleus of an emergency team which would have overriding authority in such cases.

It may be the intention of the minister to consult with other government departments and with the provincial authorities with regard to making this very desirable addition to the bill. If that is the case it would meet this particular objection. Although at the moment arguments as to responsibility for pollution may exist between shipowners, charterers, insurers and the masters of ships, I hope we will not also end up with arguments between inspectors appointed under the Canada Shipping Act, inspectors appointed under the Fisheries Act and inspectors appointed under the Canada Water Act. I suggest to the minister that this might very well be made a subject for the consideration of the committee, and I hope if my criticism is valid—and I believe it is—the minister will move an amendment in this regard at the appropriate time.

As a member of the Special Committee on Environmental Pollution, I am a little perturbed and perplexed at the fact that this bill is being sent to that committee. I think the committee is competent to deal with it, but at its last meeting last session and its first meeting in this new session, the committee decided that it would like to undertake a general, broad study of environmental pollution in Canada rather than be tied down with legislation that would distract it from its original purposes.

I had thought that since the bill was being referred to that committee this might mean that a special responsibility would be placed on the new department. Certainly, I would like someone to explain to me what is going to happen about the desire of the Special Committee on Environmental Pollution to undertake a broad survey of the picture. Nevertheless, as a member of the committee may I assure the minister that we will be happy to give full and complete consideration to the bill if it is the wish of the House that this committee deal with the bill.

In conclusion, as I said at the beginning, we support the aims and objectives of the bill and we wish the

minister and his special committee well in their considerations. In particular, I hope the committee will hear the members of the "Operation Oil" task force, and that it will also hear legal witnesses on the question of jurisdiction as well as representatives of shipping interests. It is quite obvious that the implementation of the bill will prove inconvenient and perhaps unpleasant to certain shipping interests, but I think they ought to be heard and given the opportunity to set their position forth so that we can deal with it.

I mention this point in particular because it was always a matter of regret when we were considering the Canada Water Act that representatives from the detergent industry were not called before the committee to speak to the special section of the bill relating to detergent phosphates. I hope this mistake will not be repeated, that those people against whom in large part this legislation is directed will come before the committee to give the committee their story, and that they receive a full hearing.

With those remarks I conclude. We will to the best of our ability make this bill an effective part of the pollution control efforts of Canada.

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to share the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) and to say that our party too supports the objectives of the measure. I should like also to say how much I enjoyed listening to the minister. I find him articulate, persuasive, and extremely adept at pouring oil on troubled waters.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, since we are very close to our adjournment time for lunch, I wonder whether I may be permitted to call it one o'clock.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Does the House agree to call it one o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): It being one o'clock I do now leave the Chair. The House will meet again at two p.m.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2.10 p.m.

Mr. Rose: I realize the difficulties we have had finding a quorum this afternoon but I would like to observe that members of my party are here in proportionately much larger strength than members of some other parties.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Is this quantitative or qualitative?

Mr. Rose: Before the lunch break, I said that the NDP supported the aims and objectives of this bill. We do not regard this piece of legislation as a particularly contentious one. I think I also thanked the minister for his excellent introductory and explanatory remarks.

I should like to start by saying that my remarks will be quite general this afternoon and will emphasize two very important concerns related to this measure. First, I wish to say that an otherwise perfectly good piece of legislation is being made ineffective, or not as effective as it might be, by the government's timidity in its jurisdictional approach to this matter. The government has designed this bill to apply only 12 miles off our shores. We think it should apply at least 100 miles, as it does in the government's own Arctic Pollution Prevention Act of last year.

Second, although this bill seeks to prevent—and I emphasize the word "prevent" because I think the minister made a great deal of this—further oil spills, it is unlikely that any bill can ever prevent such disasters. Therefore, we in this party believe we should press for very specific provisions to enable immediate clean-up operations on both our coasts in the event of some future spill which is almost certain to come. Fines levied after the event are not sufficient, and that is what this bill envisages.

Before I develop these two main points, let me review some of the recent history of Canadian oil spills legislation. We heard some of the history from the minister this morning and we were fascinated by his remarks. But I should like to add my own rather brief notes. Prompted by the ecological tragedies, such as the one that happened in the case of the famed *Torrey Canyon* off the coast of England, on December 8 of 1968, Bill S-23 was introduced to the other place for consideration. The bill included a very tough provision which was contained in clause 495(d) defining very effective measures known as unlimited liability to be charged to any carrier, shipowner or master of the ship. This provision made such persons responsible for not only the cost equal to that of the cargo and the value of the ship but also provided that the responsibility for the total damage, even though it exceeded the cost of the ship and its cargo, would be borne by the carrier, in this case the ship.

This was a tough but nevertheless thoughtful provision. During the committee hearings in the other place on Bill S-23 much concern was expressed by various interested people about this very tough provision. Shipowners, insurance companies and various oil interest representatives who were called as witnesses objected to this tough provision on the grounds that it would make the ship and its cargo uninsurable, and that that would effectively prevent any tanker from ever again calling at Canadian ports. The western oilmen would have probably applauded such a measure. The concern expressed by the insurance companies and the shipowners, although it was not meant to, gives the people some idea of the size of the risks involved. If the cost of the total damage of any spill and the consequent cost of clean-up is so immense that huge insurance and shipping companies cannot bear it, consider the immensity of the cost of any major oil disaster to be borne by the general public.

In any event, Bill S-23 emerged from the Senate committee hearings with clause 495(d) missing. In effect, the protection of the public was seriously threatened by its deletion. During the hearings of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications, attempts were made by some of us, including the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett) and myself, to have the provision for unlimited liability re-introduced into the bill. We failed, and later when the bill returned to the Commons an amendment was filed under the name of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni restating this concept on third reading or at the report stage, I am not quite certain exactly when. We wanted the protection of unlimited liability.

Of course, if the amendment had been allowed, the debate would have been very time consuming. Since we were close to the end of the session, the minister asked that the amendment be withdrawn on several grounds which I will enumerate. He suggested that the other parts of the bill were essential and should be passed before Parliament recessed for the summer. He went on to say that an extensive revision of the whole shipping act was forthcoming after this housekeeping measure—which was deemed very necessary at the time—had been allowed to pass. I may mention as an aside that this extensive revision will certainly come as news to various towboat workers in British Columbia who had so little faith in the Department of Transport safety regulations that they engaged in a long and bitter strike last spring in order to have the safety regulations made part, not of DOT regulations but of their collective agreement. Finally, the minister assured the mover and seconder that he would take the concept of unlimited liability to IMCO, the maritime convention in Brussels, in the summer of 1969 and would lend his great weight toward getting other maritime nations to see his point of view.

• (2:20 p.m.)

To the minister's everlasting credit he did just that, but in spite of the minister's great weight he failed to get agreement from the other maritime nations. When he returned home he was very bitter about this and, as reported in the press, stated that although Canada sought to get an international agreement on this very dangerous problem had failed to get such an agreement so Canada was prepared, therefore, to go it alone. But, Mr. Speaker, we did not go it alone. That was one year ago.

Mr. McGrath: What are we doing now?

Mr. Rose: At that time nothing was done. No legislation was introduced, and then we had the terrible tragedy known as the *Arrow* disaster. We know how involved the minister was; how worried he was, and how hard he worked during that disaster. We do not take anything away from him on that score, but the point is that Canada was going to go it alone, and only now are we going it alone, exactly one year later.

That brings the story up to date, Mr. Speaker. Today now we are considering a piece of legislation that falls somewhat short of the concept of unlimited liability. The liability is limited. It is limited to $14 million if negligence can be shown, and the remainder of the damage costs will be met from a fund. This is far short of unlimited liability, but still this bill is much stronger and has far more teeth than any legislation presently on the books.

I return now to my No. 1 objection, which I raised earlier, about the jurisdictional aspects of the bill. We are considering a bill the provisions of which are to apply only south of the sixtieth parallel north latitude, or in any area not covered by the Arctic Pollution Bill. Further, this jurisdiction extends only 12 miles from Canada's shoreline. I think we are entitled to ask a number of questions about this 12 mile limit. How can anyone justify the suggestion that the ecology south of the sixtieth parallel north latitude is less sensitive to pollution than that north of it? Certainly, there is greater population south of the sixtieth; certainly there is greater marine traffic, and certainly any oil spill could cause greater immediate damage in our main traffic areas, greater than is likely to occur when a spill takes place away from population centres.

Since the International Oil Pollution Convention has established an area 100 miles off shore—the minister reiterated this in his remarks—for the dumping of bilge, why has he not sought to make his jurisdiction congruent with that? Canada's jurisdiction is congruent in terms of the dumping of bilge, but here we are talking about how this legislation will apply to oil tankers close to our shores or moving about in inter-coastal traffic. In the case of the *Arrow*, the oil pollutants travelled 100 miles from Chedabucto Bay and substantial damage was done to Sable Island. How would this legislation apply in relation to damage of that kind?

Since the task force dealing with the *Arrow* spill recommended the establishment of pollution control zones extending 100 miles out, why has that recommendation been ignored, particularly when this bill is a direct government response not only to its failure to get international agreement but to the *Arrow* disaster? I think hon. members of the House should make it quite clear that this limited jurisdiction ruins the whole bill. It severely limits its effectiveness as a preventer of oil spills beyond the 12 mile limit. I think we should insist that an amendment be brought forward to overcome this limitation. I hope the minister will do this.

After World War II, the United States of America extended its jurisdiction to cover the whole of its continental shelf. South American states, such as Peru and other nations, have claimed exclusive fishing rights as far out as 200 miles off shore. Last year our own government, with much tub-thumping, extended pollution control zones in the Arctic to 100 miles off shore. Should not the same apply in this case? The minister shakes his head. Perhaps he knows something that I don't.

Mr. Jamieson: Never.

Mr. Rose: This is not the first time members of the government have known something that I don't, and it

probably won't be the last since they are privy to all kinds of secret information.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Rose: Leaving aside the catcalls from the very smug government benches, Mr. Speaker, I point out that we are no longer in the days of the sailing ship. Big spills have caused and will continue to cause extensive damage. The minister recognizes this. That is why we are here. That is why we are discussing this bill. We are dealing with ships not weighing 18,000 tons as was the *Arrow* but with ships of up to 400,000 tons. Let us see what the task force has to say when comparing shipping with aviation:

> The sailing of ships is inherently easier and should be safer than the operation of commercial aircraft. They are substantially slower and it is a two dimensional rather than a three-dimensional problem. It is our judgment that until the nations of the world get together and sign a shipping convention, embodying the principles that have existed since the end of World War II in the civil aviation convention, of positive control and discipline, of proper standards of adequacy of equipment...the world is paying lip service to a problem of growing dimensions.

I am sure the minister will agree with that. International agreement has been sought on that point, and will continue to be sought.

If the example of the Arctic Pollution Prevention Act is to be a precedent for us, may I point out that international law is often made by recognizing existing national laws. We can take a lead in this area as well.

Mr. Jamieson: We are.

Mr. Rose: I turn now to my second major criticism of the bill, concerning the lack of preparedness in Canada to deal with oil disasters both before the *Arrow* incident and also today.

On October 1, in an issue of *The 4th Estate*, an article appeared dealing with the *Irving Whale*, the oil barge which sunk off Prince Edward Island, and to which the minister referred today. I quote the following excerpts from it:

> The federal government still has no contingency plan to deal with major oil spills that occur in Canadian waters.
>
> Had deep sea divers been summoned in the initial hours (of the sinking of the *Irving Whale*) they would have been able to plug the vent pipes. Naval divers were available for this purpose. Instead, civilian divers were hired eight days after the barge sank and the oil, chilled in 30 degree water 240 feet down, had congealed and practically stopped of its own accord.
>
> To be fair it should be pointed out that two coastguard vessels dumped several tons of peat moss on the fringes of part of the slick to absorb the oil and make it easier to clean up if it went ashore. This action had more propaganda value than real effect.
>
> The real problem is that Canada has no properly equipped and experienced salvage firm capable of dealing with the special problems posed by stricken vessels carrying petroleum products. Super tankers are now calling regularly at maritime ports. It is only a matter of time until the next serious oil spill occurs in this area.

We were just lucky, observes the writer of the article, Norman Pascoe.

• (2:30 p.m.)

I do not see anywhere in this bill any reference to protective plans and equipment facilities to look after the next disaster. The minister alluded to them in his opening remarks. Why aren't they in the bill? Without them we can expect further oil to be poured upon troubled waters. Let us have a look at some of the things the *Arrow* task force had to say in an effort to see whether consideration has been given to its recommendations in Bill C-2. The following appears at page 43 of the task force recommendations:

> We recommend that the federal government should have the operational responsibility and authority for all major spills at sea and should reach agreement urgently with the provincial governments concerning the responsibility for all other major spills.

Then, on page 42 we find this:

> We recommend that this responsibility of the Minister of Transport be focused in a small team at the headquarters level and comprising a minimum of one physical scientist, one biological scientist and one operations expert, with the physical scientist being the leader.

The following appears on page 55:

> We recommend that stockpiles of material be located at strategic ports. These would include peat moss or other absorbents, booms and boom components, and a variety of equipment not readily available, which will vary with each location.

Then the task force recommends that at least one slick-licker be placed at each major port on the Canadian coast and that at least two others be held in a central contingency packet. Then, there is a recommendation that the Canadian coast guard should have primary responsibility for the recovery of oil floating on the water, which will include slick-lickers, containment booming and all other ramifications. And finally, the task force recommends that the Canadian coast guard be responsible for steam-cleaning operations. Lack of specific clean-up provisions is the type of oversight which concerns our party. I am not suggesting that the minister is not concerned about these things. These are matters we will be discussing when the bill is before us. It is very easy for one who does not have the responsibility of the minister to adopt a position of, "I told you so". I think we should be fair about acknowledging this. The point, however, is that the bill is silent in this regard. A quotation I just read from *The 4th Estate* suggested that preparedness is sadly lacking. What does the minister intend to do about this?

Earlier I spoke about unlimited liability and the difficulties surrounding that idea. This bill attempts a compromise through limited liability insurance, with the remainder of any damage to be paid from the consolidated revenue fund financed by a maximum of 15 cents a ton being levied on the shippers. If we take the figures for last year's imports and exports, which represented some 61 million tons, we find that our total revenue would amount to about $9 million. Earlier, the minister said $3 million. Obviously he is dealing with different figures. The total costs for the *Arrow* clean-up were approximately $3 million.

According to the minister's figures the fund would have been completely used up in the first year had there been a fund during the *Arrow* tragedy. The total does not include any compensation and, in addition, all the damage was not repaired. The clean-up extended to only about 30 of the 190 miles contaminated. The *Arrow* contained 18,000 tons and would have paid only $2,700 into the fund. The amount of damage done can be much greater than might appear from the tonnage of the ship, depending on water currents, weather conditions and so on. When we consider the damage caused by an 18,000 ton *Arrow*, we have an idea of the damage that might have been caused by a larger vessel, say of up to 400,000 tons.

There are many more points with which I could deal at this time, but I am certain other speakers will touch on them. I am certain also that members of our party and other parties will be extremely alert during the committee hearings and during further stages of the bill. I shall touch, however, on one or two further items of concern before I resume my seat. Although it cost the people of Canada over $3 million to clean up the *Arrow* mess, not one dime to my knowledge was recovered from the owners of the *Arrow*.

Mr. Jamieson: Yes.

Mr. Rose: Not one dime?

Mr. Jamieson: Does the hon. member wish me to clarify this?

Mr. Rose: Certainly.

Mr. Jamieson: There is an international fund to which the owners of vessels contribute. While the hon. member is correct in saying that we have not received anything, there is an amount of about $1,300,000 which should be available.

Mr. Rose: That is very reassuring. I do agree that $1,300,000 is essentially a much larger sum than one dime. However, this still leaves about $2 million which the people of Canada will have to pay. Although the owner of the cargo, Imperial Oil, assisted in the clean-up operation no one, according to my information—and again the minister may care to interject—can legally establish the ownership of the vessel. This is a particular problem when dealing with foreign registry, flags of convenience and remote interlocking directorships. We do not know who owns the *Arrow*. We have our suspicions but nobody really knows. This will make the future collection of any damages somewhat of a problem because the *Arrow*, like most American and other national vessels really was flying the Jolly Roger. That is what it was doing; it was flying a flag of convenience in order to escape the responsibility for wages, working conditions, benefits and improvements in respect of its seamen, about whom the minister spoke so glowingly before lunch. Seamen aboard these ships do not enjoy modern living conditions, nor are they paid decent wages, nor are these vessels properly maintained. How will this bill assist in establishing true ownership, so that a claim against the owner has validity? I believe ownership should be declared before any ship enters our waters. Dr. McTaggart-Cowan, who was the chairman of the task force, had this to say about this situation:

> In my opinion, the flag of convenience is merely a device to enable shipowners to do an end run in avoiding proper regulation of their vessels. In the case of the *Arrow* almost none of the navigational equipment was found to be in proper working order. Shipwrecks of this nature are increasing at an alarming rate and severe steps must be taken to stop these idiotic losses.

Again the minister agrees with me. That is the reason the bill is before us. I understand that. Another point is that assessment at the rate of 15 cents per ton bears no relationship to the damage a wreck could cause. It is quite conceivable that a relatively small vessel, depending on the population density near the wreck location, could cause $1 billion in damage while a larger vessel could cause a smaller amount of damage, depending upon the situation. In other words, the assessment based on ship tonnage bears little relationships to the amount of damage its wreckage could cause.

We are pleased about the protective provisions in respect of fishermen relating to their boats and gear. However, I note that they have but a period of two years in which to make up their minds concerning whether or not there has been damage. The results of an ecological disaster may or may not show in a period of two years. Therefore, future claims of fishermen are limited for a period of two years when this period might not cover the situation. I have no suggestion in respect of a way around this situation although it would seem to me it should be covered in the legislation which is before us. I think we should also take a very careful look at this. Many of the areas in which wrecks could occur are the wetlands or tidelands. These are precisely the areas in which fish breed, and where an oil spill can cause the greatest ecological havoc. How does one compensate for birds and fish; how does one compensate in respect of such things? We should take a look in order to determine what kind of system might be devised.

I share the feelings of the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) about this bill being brought before the committee on environmental pollution. I realize that at first glance that is the obvious committee to which the bill should be directed.

• (2:40 p.m.)

An hon. Member: What else?

Mr. Rose: That is the difficulty. In the past, amendments to the Shipping Act were considered by the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications. I should like to voice my misgivings about this bill going to the Environmental committee mentioned on two grounds. They are; first, that the committee is too small. It is representative, but it is too small, only one member of our party being on its membership; and second, as mentioned by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka

the committee has other things to do. Perhaps it might be worth enlarging this committee so that the various things that committee must do may be covered.

An hon. Member: This bill will not go to the Transport Committee.

Mr. Rose: I know it will not; that is what I am complaining about.

In conclusion, may I say that we shall watch this bill as it goes through its various stages and try to change its direction here and there. I compliment the minister on the legislation. I reiterate my main objections to it: the bill encompasses too limited a geographical jurisdiction. I think it should go farther. We feel that the kind of mobile clean-up operational methods the Task Force envisaged should be clearly outlined and instituted, either in the provisions of this legislation or in the regulations resulting therefrom.

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, may I just clarify a matter for the hon. member? I have no particular insistence on taking this bill to this particular committee. I wish to advise the House that it seemed to us that that committee was the most logical place for a consideration of the bill under all the circumstances. However, if the House is disposed to change that, there is certainly no objection on my part.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, first may I be permitted to take this opportunity of extending my congratulations to the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) who has had conferred upon him an honorary doctorate by the Memorial University of Newfoundland.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

An hon. Member: He is now Dr. Jamieson.

Mr. McGrath: I have no hesitation in saying that I welcome the fact that the minister has been honoured by our university. I think he truly deserves that honour.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. McGrath: It may be a coincidence that the minister's first action after having had conferred on him an honorary laws degree was to delve into the rather hazy and mixed up field of admiralty law.

The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) put forward the principal views of my party and some of our reservations about the bill we are debating. He pointed out some of the shortcomings of the bill, although indicating to the House, as I am pleased to reiterate, our support of the principle of the bill.

There are one or two points I should like to put forward which are of particular interest to that part of the country I represent. Certainly, I know they are of special interest to the minister. Perhaps he will have a chance to deal with these points when the bill goes to committee. I notice that a number of the major recommendations of the McTaggart-Cowan Task Force have largely been ignored in the drafting of this bill. I should point out also that, to my knowledge, this report was never tabled in the House. I find it difficult to understand why it was not tabled and why a ministerial statement was not made.

While on the subject of statements, sir, may I say this. When the minister participated in the Brussels conference on pollution of the high seas last year he also promised, after being prompted by members of the opposition who were questioning him, to make a statement on the outcome of that conference in respect of the position that Canada took there and the course that Canada intends to pursue in subsequent international conferences. We were denied the opportunity of hearing that statement in the House and the opportunity of commenting on it. The minister can certainly correct me if I am wrong in that respect.

My reference to the Brussels conference reminds me of what I consider to be the major weakness of the legislation now before us: the fact that Canada has found it necessary to take unilateral action in a field where effective action can only be taken on a multilateral basis. All we shall be doing by passing this legislation is attempting to enforce the regulations set out in the bill within our limited territorial fishing zones. It is well known that some of the larger super tankers in the world today, tankers of the size of the *Manhattan*, require at least nine miles in order to get a full stop from full ahead. One can readily appreciate the difficulty connected with our jurisdiction being so limited, as well as the difficulty of enforcing any meaningful control over this very serious form of pollution.

Even though we may go along with the idea of enforcing this legislation within the territorial fishing zones of Canada, we shall immediately get into trouble when we come to the minister's own constituency or when we get to the province of Newfoundland and certain areas of the east coast. The one area of the country with respect to which the government has not been able to enforce effectively the fishing zone regulations is that area off the south and east coasts of Newfoundland. There is a very good reason for that. The reason is that the government has found its hands tied by international treaties which Canada, as a country, inherited from Great Britain and to which the government maintains we must live up. Those treaties involve the fishing rights of other countries, in addition to traditional rights of other countries the fishermen of which have fished off the coasts of Newfoundland for centuries.

The difficulty has been made even more serious by the fact that Newfoundland recently signed an agreement with an international consortium to build a 100,000 barrel oil refinery at Come-By-Chance on Placentia Bay, on the southeast coast of Newfoundland, that being the one area where the bill as it now stands would be ineffective and inoperative. The largest oil refinery in eastern Canada today is a 50,000 barrel refinery, which is either in New Brunswick or Nova Scotia. So, one can see the importance of the new refinery to the east coast and the serious pollution hazard it poses to that one area of Newfoundland where this bill will not have jurisdiction.

That is something, Sir—and I say this with all sincerity—that concerns me very much. We should not have needed to put up with such limitations in a bill of this kind if we had been able to reach some sort of meaningful international agreement. Indeed, the task force refers to this matter. I quote from page 3 of the report:

> We see no reason why the countries which have signed and lived up to the civil aviation convention for the past many years should find it impossible to adopt a similar convention to bring order out of chaos in marine navigation and particularly in tanker operation.

As Dr. McTaggart-Cowan points out, the precedent is there. It is a very good example. I refer to the International Civil Aviation Organization which, as hon. members know, is headquartered in Montreal.

• (2:50 p.m.)

Another well known expert in the field of pollution is from the minister's own honorary alma mater, the Memorial University of Newfoundland. Dr. Richard E. Warner, in a very useful and learned paper entitled "Environmental Effects of Oil Pollution in Canada", dated August 14, 1969, refers to the complication which we have in terms of the lack of a meaningful international agreement. I quote:

> Communication between interested scientists and organisations has also been hampered by the lack of a suitable international forum for reporting research results, proposed projects, and circulating other information which could materially improve research coordination and reduce duplication of effort.

I think that the bill, commendable as its objectives are, will not protect us from the very serious consequences of pollution from oil. The only meaningful protection we can hope for, and for which there is any hope of enforcement, would be to have some internation convention similar to the civil aviation agreement which operates under the aegis of the United Nations.

The increase in the tanker fleets of the world is a cause for very serious concern. Another very interesting shortcoming in the bill, which is of particular interest to the part of the country I represent, is that it will only tax carriers of oil. As hon. members know, other pollutants probably have even more serious consequences. I need only refer to the phosphorous pollution which occurred recently in Placentia Bay, where the consequences were so serious the whole fishing industry of Eastern Canada was affected.

Freighters from the southern United States daily carry phosphorous to the Erco plant at Long Harbour in Placentia Bay where it is refined into various by-products. This pollutant is not included in the tax which will be levied by this legislation only on the carriers of oil and oil products. These are some of the major shortcomings of this bill.

This bill points out the importance of continuing our international pursuits in the area of those treaties we have inherited from Great Britain which in my opinion should be revoked. One treaty which is causing great difficulties in enforcing our territorial fishing zones in Newfoundland is the Treaty of Utrecht. This not only gives France permission to operate within the 12-mile limit, but to operate within the three-mile limit, right up to our beaches. I repeat that we have not been able to enforce our territorial fishing zones area where enforcement is needed most, the fishing grounds off the south coast of Newfoundland. This legislation creates no jurisdiction in that area.

I also have reservations about having this bill referred to the special committee on environmental pollution. The same case that the minister made for this bill being under the administration of his department could be made for referring the bill to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications. I was happy to hear the minister indicate that he has no strong views on this aspect of our proceedings. I am speaking personally, and not on behalf of my party, when I say that I hope the minister will agree to referring the bill to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications. In my view, this committee is much better equipped to handle this bill.

Regardless of which committee examines the bill, I am sure hon. members will press for the hearing of witnesses. I am sure hon. members of the committee will want to hear from members of the McTaggart-Cowan task force. The committee should also hear Dr. Richard E. Warner who is internationally renowned in the field of oil pollution and environmental consequences stemming from oil pollution. I am certain there are other interested and interesting witnesses who may be able to throw some light on this very serious and complex matter.

I feel a mistake has been made by proceeding unilaterally in this field without having first obtained some form of international agreement. At the same time I believe it is a mistake to incorporate the principle of limited liability. If there is to be liability, it should be unlimited because we are now only beginning to realize how drastic the consequences are from oil pollution.

Not enough attention has been given to jurisdiction over the possibility of accidental spills as a result of tapping the potential oil resources on the continental shelf on our east or west coasts. We know of the unfortunate experience in Santa Barbara off the coast of California. We also know of the more recent experience off the coast of Florida in the Gulf of Mexico. I repeat my concern over the fact that this bill will have no application in enforcing the regulations in an area where enforcement is badly needed. I refer to the south and southeast coast of Newfoundland where there is a prospect of a 100,000 barrels per day refinery being put into production at Come-By-Chance.

I will be directing further questions to the minister. I look forward to hearing witnesses who can shed some light on this very complex matter. Working together with the minister, hopefully we will come up with some meaningful amendments to the bill so that when it is presented to this House for third reading it will be a better bill.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order please. Pursuant to special order made Thursday, October 22nd, 1970,

it is my duty to interrupt proceedings on this bill in order that the House may resume debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne.

* * *

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

CONTINUATION OF DEBATE ON ADDRESS IN REPLY

The House resumed from Thursday, October 22, consideration of the motion of Mr. Jacques-L. Trudel for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session.

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): I wish to continue the remarks I started last night, Mr. Speaker. When the proceedings were interrupted at ten o'clock, I was intending to speak about the importance of marine resources to the Atlantic area. I intend to be a bit parochial in the few minutes remaining to me because this is one of the few opportunities a member has to speak about matters which affect his constituency.

• (3:00 p.m.)

I want to talk particularly about wharves and harbours in my area. Last year the estimates of the Department of Public Works never came before the House for consideration; they never came before the committee, either. The Committee on National Resources and Public Works, which normally studies these estimates, was bogged down by legislation having to do with the pollution of our waters and no questions could be asked on the estimates of the Department of Public Works. As I said last night, my area is heavily dependent upon fisheries and marine resources. Perhaps I should say it used to be dependent, Mr. Speaker, because right now the situation is very serious. This applies to the whole of Nova Scotia—in fact, to all the Atlantic provinces.

I represent a most beautiful part of Canada. The people down there are intelligent, they are tough, they are strong, they are industrious. Moreover, they are independent; they do not ask for much from the government. They do not care about all these highfalutin' buildings.

Mr. McBride: Is that why they sent you here?

Mr. Comeau: They sent me here because I care about their problems. I might add that they do not care much for partisan interruptions, either. They ask only for what is due to them. But they know what is going on. They see, they hear, they listen and they read about money which is being spent on different government projects, money they sometimes consider is being wasted though they cannot get a nickel from the government to repair a wharf so that they can tie up their boats. There is hardly a fishing village I have visited where people did not complain about the condition of their harbour or their wharf.

In the past two years I have received hundreds of letters asking for repairs, dredging or new construction to be undertaken. In some cases I have been successful and there have been improvements. But not enough has been done. Remember, the people in my riding depend heavily upon harbour facilities without which they cannot berth their boats or carry on their fishing enterprises. Every time I make an inquiry, the engineers in the Department of Public Works go to my riding, investigate and make a report. The reports are always favourable, Mr. Speaker. I feel the engineers do a good job. Then the report reaches Ottawa, the minister takes out his big axe, and goodbye, wharf; goodbye, dredging!

Coming from British Columbia, the minister does not understand the need. He does not understand that we experience high tides and seas varying up to 30 feet. He does not understand that we need sturdy facilities unlike those little floating docks they have on the British Columbia coast. He does not understand that good harbours are the basis of the economy of my riding and, for that matter, the economy of all the Atlantic provinces.

Two years ago I made it clear to the minister that I have in my riding 25 per cent of the harbours and wharves in the whole province of Nova Scotia. This is why my file on public works is growing bigger and bigger all the time. I do not know how many wharves I have inquired about: it is becoming ridiculous—Yarmouth Bar, Stoney Island, Camp Cove, Cape St. Mary, Church Point, Comeauville, Delap's Cove, Digby, Freeport, Ingomar, Lower East Pubnico Meteghan, New Edinburgh, Newellton, Pinkney's Point, Sandy Cove and Whale Cove, Saulnierville—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Boulanger: Change cars; all aboard!

Mr. Comeau: I could go on and name them all. I make no apology for referring to these matters because this is one of the few opportunities we have to do so. Last year the government took away from Parliament the right to study the estimates of this department. There are many other areas in which there is urgent need for wharf maintenance and harbour repair: West Head, Wood's Harbour, Yarmouth Harbour, Abbott's Harbour, Shag Harbour, Annapolis—

Mr. McBride: There are too many.

Mr. Comeau: Yes, there are probably too many. In response to my requests I was told that the government intended to concentrate its efforts in building two or three extremely good harbours. I said: Fine; you come up with the good harbours and then I will listen. Yarmouth was supposed to have one of these good harbours, yet only the other day the papers came out with the headline: "Critical Yarmouth Wharfage Situation". What has the department been doing in the past three years? If it had built these harbours I would not be inquiring into all these things today. This situation makes one mad.

In Yarmouth we have two ferries, one going to Bar Harbour, a daily run, and the other, the *Prince of Fundy*, going to Portland, Maine, bringing in between 1,000 and 1,200 tourists a day in the summer season. The situation

which faces us is that one of these boats, the *Bluenose*, which has been operating in my riding for quite a while, has to leave the wharf in order that the other vessel can come in. What a situation! The captain of the *Bluenose* needs to remain at the wharf. He needs telephone and water services; he cannot just put out to sea at any time. Nevertheless, he has to get out simply because the other ferry is coming in.

This summer all kinds of foreign vessels docked at Yarmouth. People from Digby, who are faced with a similar situation, were making use of the harbour. They were told, as I was two years ago, that Digby harbour was to be developed as a fantastic harbour serving the needs of Dibgy county as a whole. Nothing happened. This summer, Mr. Speaker, part of the wharf collapsed and a fellow almost got killed before tenders were put out for the repair of the structure.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Comeau: It is a terrible situation when you have to wait for structures to collapse before action is taken. The engineers in Halifax, in the regional offices, have been recommending that work be done for years. But the minister in Ottawa cannot understand the situation. With regard to another place in my riding Annapolis Royal, the minister told me, as an excuse for not building a wharf, that the export trade was slackening off. What kind of nonsense is that? Where did he get his statistics? I have not found such statistics anywhere. Certainly the government of Nova Scotia did not give him those figures. What bothers me is that the Speech from the Throne refers to the need for anticipating and planning. The government waits for the walls to collapse around it before taking any action. I suggest the government does not know the meaning of the word "planning".

• (3:10 p.m.)

I return to my main topic. The Department of Fisheries issued a statement two days ago stating that the ICNAF nations have agreed not to fish for haddock on the Grand Banks, effective as of today, October 23, until the end of the year. This is really quite amusing because in fact there is now no haddock on the Grand Banks. The government should have taken action a few years ago in this regard. It should have called a Law of the Sea Conference for the purpose of planning proper conservation methods. Had that been done, there would be no need for the present restrictions. The situation, Mr. Speaker, is becoming very serious. The minister has made some fantastic speeches on the subject of the fisheries, but either he does not have the influence he should have with his colleagues or he is unable to convince them that action should be taken. Many times he seems to be talking in the right vein, but it seems he cannot get their co-operation.

I have before me a bulletin issued by the Fisheries Council of Canada in September last. I shall read one paragraph from the bulletin as follows:

> It is now generally agreed that stocks of haddock and red fish are virtually extinct on the Grand Banks and flounder is in the process of being depleted. Furthermore, it is unmistakably clear that inshore cod stocks are less and less dependable due to continuing fishing efforts by foreign fleets.

Five years ago no one talked about the fisheries being depleted. Everybody thought there was a great deal of fish in the sea. Today there is evidence that haddock, herring, halibut, flounder and cod have almost become a rarity. Because of the shortage of these fish they are becoming expensive to buy. The inshore fishery is having a hard time.

Mr. McGrath: Soon there will be no Department of Fisheries.

Mr. Comeau: And soon there will be no Department of Fisheries. Where has the government been for the last couple of years? Why did it take an accident on the west coast before Canada and Russia got together? Two ships had to collide to get both countries together to talk about the depletion of the fisheries on the west coast. No mention was made of the east coast, so I suppose it will need an accident on the east coast to bring these two countries together to talk about the problems of the fishery on the east coast. When you have foreign fishing fleets consisting of 70 vessels, 50 vessels, 35 vessels fishing off the east coast, believe me, Mr. Speaker, the problems are very serious.

The Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) has an interest in the fisheries and know that fishing is vital to the Atlantic provinces. Yet Canada has taken no initiative in the calling of a Law of the Sea Conference. Although the subject has been talked about for many years, Canada has taken no initiative in this regard. According to the Fisheries Council of Canada, it may already be too late. It may be that we cannot afford to wait for a Law of the Sea Conference. We must take the initiative to bring the fishing countries together, because Canada is heavily dependent upon the fisheries.

The department must convince Canadians that there is a livelihood to be derived from fishing and that that means of livelihood should be maintained. I am not saying that our fishermen are starving, but I am saying that we must do much more planning to conserve the fisheries than has been the case in the past. We must take proper conservation measures so that we put an end to the depletion of our fishing stocks.

Some Canadians think that the programs under the Department of Regional Economic Expansion benefit Atlantic Canada only. That sort of thing makes me mad. Grants are given to all regions of Canada under this program, not only to Atlantic Canada. Let us not try to create the impression that the central government is pouring too much money into the Atlantic provinces. If the government had carried out proper planning in the past, it would not be necessary to spend this money today. The Atlantic provinces are not getting any more than they need and deserve.

As I have said, the fisheries are vital to the Atlantic provinces. Another vital issue is the establishment of a 12-mile limit. Although we have been since 1964 talking of doing this, there are still eight nations which can come

to within three miles of our shores to fish without let or hindrance. This is because the government says these nations have historical treaty rights. Let me remind the government that last year it had no worries about breaking the treaty with Washington.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alexandre Cyr (Gaspé): Mr. Speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Is the hon. member for Gaspé rising to ask a question? If so, he will have to ask for the unanimous consent of the House, as the time alloted to the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) has completely expired.

[*English*]

Does the House agree to allow the hon. member for Gaspé (Mr. Cyr) to ask the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) a question?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Cyr: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for South Western Nova is apparently saying that there are far too many small fishing harbours in his constituency and I would like to ask him whether he has suggested to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Laing) or to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) which ones were to be closed and where operations should be centralized?

Mr. Comeau: Mr. Speaker, I see no purpose in offering suggestions since the minister himself already has suggested his own solutions which I have agreed to but which were not followed-up. I was somewhat disappointed, and when I went to Gaspé about three weeks ago, I saw all those harbours along the Gaspé coast where there was not a single boat to be seen.

[*English*]

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I am sure we have all enjoyed listening to the eloquent argument of the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau). I did not find too much to quarrel with in what he said, except that I thought he went a little far when he suggested that he represented the most beautiful part of Canada. If he said "one of the most beautiful", I might go along with him.

• (3:20 p.m.)

I suppose at this stage of the debate we should not participate in a general discussion as to which of our constituencies is the most beautiful. We are at the point where we will shortly be asked to thank His Excellency for the gracious words of his speech. As is usually the case, not too much of the discussion has centred on those gracious words. Like other hon. members, perhaps particularly those on the opposition side, I am much more concerned about seeking-out those elusive advisers to His Excellency. It is one of the facts of life that during this debate, as a rule the particular adviser to whom one wants to speak is not to be found in the chamber at any given moment.

I could say some words to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Laing), for example, who despite what the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) says comes from the province of British Columbia. I suggest he also has displayed a fairly wide lack of knowledge about some of the improvements required on the Pacific coast of Canada. I shall not go into detail on that question this afternoon because if I did I would find myself talking to the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) or the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson), who impose harsh restrictions upon the amount of money their colleague the Minister of Public Works has to spend.

A short while ago I was going to say that the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) was the only person to come to the defence of the government, but I see that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) is here.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Barnett: He is being vigorously applauded by his supporters on that side of the House. He can listen to the words that may be addressed to one of the advisers to His Excellency, as I have described them. Earlier today, under another order, we listened to quite an eloquent speech by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) on a very important subject. This indicates that he is moving to take action in a direction which obviously will meet with the general approval of the House. I should like this afternoon to mention one or two areas of his responsibility in respect of which there has been singular lack of action, not only during his tenure of office but going back to when the portfolio was held by two or three of his predecessors.

This lack of action certainly goes back to a former Minister of Transport, the then hon. member for Bonavista-Twillingate, now president of the Canadian Transport Commission. As a matter of fact, when the hon. member for South Western Nova took us on a geographic tour of his constituency and mentioned all those places along the coast, I began to think he had been reading a speech of the former member for Bonavista-Twillingate. In the speech to which I refer, the then hon. member took us on an even more extensive tour around the coves and outports of Bonavista-Twillingate. That was when he sat on the opposition side of the House. Some hon. members may remember that geographic excursion.

The point I want to emphasize is the complete lack of action on the part of the minister and the Department of Transport to do anything to cope with the mess in the administration of small harbours in the province of British Columbia. I have raised this question many times and it was the subject of a previous debate. This mess reached the point, as some hon. members may recall, where the fishermen on our Pacific coast were prepared to allow themselves to be charged, and even sent to jail, before they would continue tolerating the unfair and inequitable arrangement which existed in respect of

levying side wharfage fees. It reached the point where the minister who is now president of the Canadian Transport Commission appointed an officer of the Department of Transport, Dr. Tom How, to inquire into the situation. He filed an extensive report, with recommendations on this subject, in the fall of 1967.

As I travelled through my constituency during the concerned, a review of the situation on the coast of British Columbia shows that nothing has been done. The situation has steadily deteriorated and the administrative people in the area have an impossible and frustrating task upon their hands. I raised this question with the Minister of Transport when he assumed the portfolio. I raised it in a way which would indicate that I was prepared to give him some time to look into the situation, as indeed I did when the hon. member for Trinity (Mr. Hellyer) held that portfolio. I suggest that the time has long passed when one can allow the government to hide behind the excuse of frequent changes in ministers of transport.

There have been recent announcements about a new national harbours arrangement and authority. I am not decrying the importance of that move or the need for restructuring the management of our major harbours, but I suggest it is not good enough to have the whole question of a proper administrative arrangement for smaller harbours, which are important to the local commercial traffic up and down our coasts, left on ice. The Minister of Transport months ago said he would ask his colleagues the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis) to look into possible changes in the administrative arrangement. From that time until now, neither the Minister of Transport, the Minister of Fisheries nor the Minister of Public Works has said one word in this House about what they intend to do, if anything.

As I travelled through my constituency during the summer recess I saw that the situation had become a festering sore. It is creating much doubt about the administrative capability of this government. I think the time has come when we should have from the Minister of Transport, on whose shoulders the responsibility rests, a statement regarding a definite plan or proposal to be put before this House for our assessment and examination. We should know whether the government is going to accept any or all of the recommendations made in the How report. We should know, after the review of this report—which presumably has been studied by the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Fisheries—whether the government has any useful idea as to how small harbours could be better administered. Let us not play around with this subject any longer.

In my area the commercial fishermen, the towboat operators, the commercial users and all those interested in having facilities for mooring pleasure craft are concerned. This is not only a very important matter because of the industrial and commercial activity that is going on, but it involves thousands of pleasure craft which are using the coastal waters of British Columbia.

When we had before us the new transport act, the government announced a general policy that the users of facilities should pay at least part of the cost of providing those facilities. I refer to transportation terminals for travellers by air and by water. That policy was adopted and settled in this House. At that time I believed, and still do, that it was the logical approach to take.

• (3:30 p.m.)

The commercial fishermen of B.C. have now, almost to a man, come to accept the concept of paying a reasonable annual fee for the use of public harbour and other facilities along the coast of British Columbia. But they want to know what the situation is. On the surface, I think the proposal of the Minister of Transport to unload some harbours on the Minister of Public Works and some on the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry can only bring about confusion, lack of co-ordination, overduplication in the case of some harbour facilities and unnecessary restriction in the use of others.

If any one of those ministers can put forward a logical argument as to why this kind of arrangement might be suitable, I for one would like to hear them in order to assess and consider the arrangement on its merits. My constituents and I are no longer content—indeed, for a long time we have not been content—with a situation about which month after month, year after year nothing is done.

I wish one other adviser to His Excellency were here at the moment. I refer to the man who recently accepted responsibility for the administration of postal affairs. I want him to reconsider the position taken by the erstwhile Postmaster General and the discriminatory policy of not extending postal services to communities which are entitled by law and under the regulations to have them. There is at least one such community in my constituency, namely, the city of Courtenay, which should have had these services over two years ago. The last time I raised this question there were, I think, at least 30 other communities in Canada in exactly the same boat.

The Postmaster General was hiding behind the excuse that this policy was instituted as a result of the government's restrictions on spending. When are these unfair restrictions on spending to be lifted? When will this government cease to discriminate against the citizens of some communities in Canada because its policies have resulted in a lack of adequate funds with which to administer the necessary services of departments of government?

I know that the genial Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, if he were to answer me, would probably off-the-cuff and in the pleasant way he has put forward a plausible argument as to why his colleagues the President of the Treasury Board and the Minister of Finance were justified in imposing this kind of restriction. This situation has existed for quite a long time. The government has had a chance to adjust the policies which it considered necessary and brought about with the meat-axe technique, as I have described it, in slashing expenditures.

Now is the time when at least we should know how much longer this kind of restriction on the extension of normal and essential services to communities will be

continued. I hope that the minister, who has had previous experience with the Post Office Department, will very shortly rise in the House and make a statement of new government policy on this subject. I hope he will indicate that this discriminatory treatment in respect of some communities in Canada, including the city of Courtenay in my constituency, will be lifted so that they will have the same rights and privileges in the area of government services as their fellow Canadians in other communities.

Mr. John M. Reid (Kenora-Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech was a rather interesting document because, to my knowledge, it is the first time that a government has attempted to outline its philosophic approach to government problem-solving. Among the subjects with which the government dealt quite extensively was the matter of the environment in the 1970s, the matter of pollution. These are very important questions and I thought I would bring to the attention of the House a specific example of the impact of pollution on certain segments of the country, an impact which can be out of all proportion.

I want to deal with the mercury pollution situation which has been particularly prevalent in northwestern and other parts of Ontario, and Manitoba. It has hit those industries which are dependent upon fish. It is said in my constituency, which depends on the tourist industry, that the local fishermen may get 35 cents per pound of fish but that the tourist who comes up to fish pays as much as $10 per pound of fish; yet the tourist industry provides about 10 per cent of the employment in my constituency.

Another group affected by mercury pollution is commercial fishermen. But perhaps the most important group and those who are most significantly affected by mercury pollution are the Indian people who live in areas in which mercury has destroyed their livelihood and, more important, has destroyed their way of life. No amount of compensation can provide adequate payment for what they have lost.

When we deal with pollution let me point out that there are all sorts of interpretations as to who is to blame. To some it is the company which pollutes, and to others it is the consumer who pollutes because he has been unwilling to pay the cost of the waste disposal of the process that brings to him a particular product. But let us look at the whole situation and find out who really is responsible for pollution. There are Crown corporations, as in Saskatchewan, and the private enterprise corporations; their shareholders, the management of the local mill, the workers who make the process work; and there are the service industries which are built around a particular centre of production, people such as small businessmen, school teachers and lawyers.

Another group is the consumers who, as I mentioned before, have had the benefit of low prices because they have not had to pay the cost of disposing the waste or the by-product of the products they purchase. Lastly, of course, and perhaps the greatest culprit of all, is government which represents the people, which taxes these industries, which regulates these industries and prescribes anti-pollution measures for them. I think hon. members will see, therefore, that the people who are basically responsible for pollution are not a particular group, such as a company, its shareholders or the workers: society as a whole has utilized this method of increasing its gross national product, thereby creating an effluent society.

When mercury was discovered in my constituency it had an immediate effect on the tourist industry and on the commercial fishermen. With all respect to the federal government and the province of Ontario, one must say that they moved in very quickly to look after the commercial fishermen, a small industry which in the province of Ontario has an income of about $6 million per year. But they ignored the tourist industry which has perhaps an annual income of around $200 million and was dependent upon the same product as the commercial fishermen, that is, fish.

• (3:40 p.m.)

The areas most affected by mercury were the English River system, the Winnipeg River and Lake of the Woods. In the first two areas the government moved swiftly to provide compensation to the commercial fishermen affected. But at Lake of the Woods we have had another problem because the mercury levels were not considered high enough to close down the lake. The federal and provincial governments, along with their chosen instrument the Fresh Water Fish Marketing Corporation, devised an arrangement whereby that corporation would buy all the fish produced from this lake and other lakes, test it for mercury, and that portion which was polluted would be destroyed.

The two governments agreed to compensate the board for the expense; the fishermen were not to take a loss. However, during the summer we had a great deal of difficulty because all the fish coming out of Lake of the Woods had to be frozen and later tested. At the end of the summer I went to Winnipeg to discuss the matter with the officials of the Department of Fisheries and Forestry. We came to an agreement whereby they would send a sampler to Kenora to take samples of fish, rush them to Winnipeg, make a test, and if the fish passed the test the catch could be sold as fresh fish. If there were some doubt, the fish would be frozen and tested again. The consequence of this was hopefully to put another $25,000 in the pockets of the fishermen.

What did the provincial and federal governments do then, Mr. Speaker? It would be only reasonable to suggest that they would allow a system that had been in effect for the spring and summer to continue into the fall. But halfway through the fall fishing season the Fresh Water Fish Marketing Corporation sent out a new price schedule, the effect of which was to penalize the fishermen on Lake of the Woods for mercury pollution, because instead of the government bearing the cost of the fish which were infected, the fishermen would have to bear the cost.

The result is that production of fish from Lake of the Woods has dropped by half, the fishermen's income has

dropped by 25 per cent and a great many of them have ceased to fish. I would have had no objection to the government taking a step like this in the fall after the fishing season was over, but why in the name of sanity would the government do this in the middle of the fishing season? That is beyond my knowledge and I suspect it is probably beyond the knowledge of the ministers concerned, because while they speak pretty-sounding words about environmental pollution, the fact is that the government is not yet prepared to move. Therefore, society as a whole does not have to pay the penalty at this time, but only a few fishermen who are already living at the bottom of the economic margin. The government apparently is willing to see them pick up the full cost. Mr. Speaker, this is unjust as well as being stupid and unreasonable.

It is all right to speak of the dangers to the environment but there is another problem which has to be faced. That is the problem of these people who have been hurt by pollution through no fault of their own; in other words, the innocent bystanders must pay. It was not the fishermen who polluted the waterways, it was not the tourist industry which polluted the waterways, and it certainly was not the Indians who depend upon fishing for their living and income.

What are the alternatives? We have ministers from both the Ontario government and the federal government going around saying to these people, "You can sue the polluters." These are supposed to be intelligent men. I am not a lawyer, Mr. Speaker, but lawyers tell me that anybody who is stupid enough to think that a small fisherman or tourist camp operator could sue a polluter, that he would have the resources to go that far, is ignorant of the law and especially of law practice.

It seems to me there is a definite role for society to play, acting through governments, to compensate people who are affected by pollution. I do not refer only to mercury pollution, because as we examine our environment I am sure we will find there are other substances which are polluting it. Other people, equally as innocent as fishermen and tourist camp operators, will be affected. I believe the government should be working on a policy to provide some form of compensation to them. It is unjust to allow the whole burden of pollution to fall upon marginal producers of various items when the responsibility clearly is not theirs, when they did not cause the pollution but are being asked to pay the whole price.

I would now like to say a few words about the way in which Indians living along polluted waterways were affected. First of all, Mr. Speaker, they were wiped out of commercial fishing. This was not so important to them as a cash crop, but it was important as a means of supporting themselves, as a means of combating lack of jobs and lack of other income. Now they have been told they can no longer fish commercially. Their traditional fishing grounds have been eliminated from their use. Furthermore, they have been informed by officials of the provincial department of lands and forests that on no account are their women to touch mercury-polluted fish because mercury tends to concentrate in the foetus.

We have eliminated their traditional source of food. We have increased their cost of living. We have eliminated a certain amount of their cash income from fishing. We have also destroyed another source of income which they had, outside some logging and lumbering. That income was from the tourist industry. Work in the tourist camps may not seem important to many people, but in northwestern Ontario it accounts for 10 per cent of the available jobs. You cannot eliminate these big employers of men in one step and not produce a detrimental effect.

What should the federal government be doing in these cases? The Indians do not understand the concept of compensation for something they have lost. To them it is just another form of government welfare. Those who wish to improve themselves, who wish to go out and work in the tourist camps, now have this opportunity denied them; and there is no evidence that the government is prepared to move in some way and provide assistance for these people. Ministers of government are still sitting on the bottom of their big, round, stuffed chairs waiting for the problem to disappear.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot provide what we have taken away from the Indian people, which is a way of life and a way of adjustment into the society which has grown up around them. We have destroyed that, and nothing we do can compensate for it. The Indians know this. We can go to other people and buy them out, compensate them, and they will understand. But the Indians do not understand it. When we consider what we have taken away from the Indian we, too, know we cannot compensate him and we know the Indian is quite right.

I would like to say a few words in more detail about the plight of the tourist camp operators and of the people who normally sought employment from them. As I said before, Mr. Speaker, fishing is the basis of the tourist industry in northwestern Ontario. Now that we have taken away the use of fish from a great part of the region, in effect we have destroyed these people's capital investment and the legitimate return through profits that they might have expected—and this all in one blow. We have provided no compensation for them.

I am prepared to admit that the regulation of the tourist industry is probably a provincial affair. Certainly the province issues tourist camp licences. But this is an industry that lives off fish, which is a federal responsibility. It is something the federal government cannot ignore, particularly when one notices that in this case pollution flows from my constituency into the province of Manitoba. The mercury also flows into the province of Manitoba from the Assiniboine River through Saskatchewan. It is quite apparent that no federal government can hide behind the pretext that this is a matter of provincial responsibility, because it just won't wash.

What happened to the tourist camp industry in my area, Mr. Speaker? I can give two examples. Perhaps the largest and most expensive camp, after a careful survey to decide whether its guests would come as normal,

decided to close down. It so believed that tourists would not come to it because of the mercury-infected fish. Another camp, which competes directly with the first one, stayed open and the results have been disastrous for it. At the beginning of the year it had reservations for 95 per cent of its available cabins, etc., but it ended up with less than 10 per cent filled. For the smaller camps along that waterway, the English River waterway, this year's results have not been as good as anticipated. Where they expected a good year, for most of them it has been disaster; and in the coming year obviously they will be put out of business if they are not helped.

• (3:50 p.m.)

The question is one of compensation, not only for the camp owners who saw their investment wiped out in one blow when the announcement in respect of mercury was made but for those who normally sought employment in the tourist camps. We cannot ignore these people, either. This is an area to which the federal government should be turning its attention, together with the provinces. It might well be that this matter should be on the agenda of a Federal-Provincial Conference to discuss the third party effects of environmental pollution, because I do not believe the innocent should suffer and the guilty get off scot-free. I include the government in the latter category.

What is the solution? Let me outline a proposal. About 15 years ago in the Sein River System, including Rainy Lake, Rainy River, Lake of the Woods and Lake Winnipeg, there was a great deal of pollution caused by the development of a new mine at Steep Rock Lake, Ontario. The mine experts went out there, examined the damage to the commercial fishermen and the tourist camp operators, agreed on a price, bought the property, and the next day sold all the property back to these people for the sum of $1.

That is an example of compensation. Perhaps we should be looking at the position of the commercial fishermen in areas in which we feel there will be no possibility of cleaning up the water in the future, with the idea of compensating them in this way. I do not believe it is a healthy situation when people are compensated on a year by year or a month by month basis. They are not encouraged to take advantage of other training so long as they receive compensation from the government. This might be an opportunity for the government to begin making another form of compensation, such as I described before.

Also, I believe we should look at the position of tourist camp operators who are in the same position and provide a formula whereby the government would assist those affected, on the basis of a system of paying them the capital value of their asset. Furthermore, the government should consider the situation of the people who normally sought employment in these areas in an effort to find a way to adequately compensate them for the employment opportunities they have lost.

I realize there are limits to how far we can go. However, another matter at which I think the government should look is that which pertains to gas station operators and others in the tertiary areas. I realize it is difficult to provide adequate compensation, but perhaps it might be provided on a community basis, such as changing the designation of the area to assist resource-based industries. It seems to me the government should address itself to this situation particularly as we examine our environment, determine what substances we are discharging into the air, water and life and their effect upon other innocent bystanders.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, at a time when this nation needs a most positive form of government and government direction, it is regrettable that this government should produce for the House a Throne Speech such as this, which has been referred to by the preceding Liberal speaker, the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River (Mr. Reid), as a philosophical outline. One would think that at a time such as this the government would be more interested in providing the House with an economic policy and an economic outline of its intentions.

It is also regrettable that this government has underlined its incompetence by producing such a document at this time. I say this keeping in mind that before I left Cape Breton I made it quite clear that I stood behind the implementation of the War Measures Act to cure the regrettable situation which has developed in the province of Quebec. I consider the proper implementation of that act to be the duty of this government. At this time of the death of an outstanding Canadian and when we continue day by day to hope that we will see the safe return of Mr. Cross, it is very regrettable that the government has not taken the proper action.

It is further regrettable that the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) passed up the opportunity to put the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) in his place when he objected to the fact that our forces in the province of Quebec are English-speaking. Our armed forces have gone to Quebec in order to protect its people, yet when a member of the House raises a question such as he did, the Minister of National Defence fails to come to the support of these men.

Are we to believe that the Canadian forces in Cyprus or the Canadian forces in Germany would be withdrawn because the members of the forces are English-speaking? I believe the Minister of National Defence owed it to his troops to stand up and defend them in that situation. When the integration of the armed forces was before us there was no complaint about their being English-speaking. In this country, which from the early hours of Sunday has seemed finally to be showing a united front, it is regrettable that a member of this House should seek to divide the country by complaining about English-speaking soldiers being in the province of Quebec. It is also very regrettable that the Minister of National Defence did not defend his troops. When I rose to speak I did not think, and I still do not think, I could surpass the criticism directed at the government by the last speaker, the hon. member for Kenora-Rainy River. He questioned the sanity of his own government. He said it is unjust and

stupid. He also said that it is unreasonable, and that no action is being taken.

An hon. Member: That is not what he said.

Mr. MacInnis: I thought somebody would pick me up on that. I would ask the hon. member to refer to the remarks in *Hansard,* because these words will appear in *Hansard* unless the hon. member goes up and fools around with the "blues", as quite often is done. The hon. member also referred to federal responsibility. It is very regrettable that we have had so much lack of action on the part of the government.

It is further regrettable that the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) interfered with the civic election in Montreal. I am not concerned about it one way or the other, but it would seem to me that he has attacked his own party and that his resignation has been called for because of the statement he made about the election in Montreal. I could not care less who is elected in Montreal. No matter who is elected there, Canadians will be faced with another big bill from that city. That city has had write-offs before and we must be prepared again to write off the expense of the Olympics which are to be held there. I recall the statement made earlier that there would be no cost to the Canadian taxpayer. Anyone who would believe this is experiencing a pipe-dream. The Minister of Regional Eonomic Expansion has been criticized for the statement he made. He has been asked to withdraw the statement and resign his seat because of it.

I should now like to speak about the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), who at the eleventh hour of the election in Nova Scotia appeared before an audience in Cape Breton and told the people what cannot be classed as other than a lie. The proof that this minister lied can be found in the bill which was placed before this House by the government, Bill C-5, dealing with the situation in respect of Deuterium of Canada Limited, in Cape Breton. The minister gave blanket approval. The Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) questioned the status of the provincial government in Nova Scotia, because he could not have been talking about Prince Edward Island.

• (4:00 p.m.)

According to the President of the Privy Council, everything is sunshine. He gave blanket approval for Liberal candidates in the Nova Scotia election to say—I have the tapes to prove this—that if elected they would improve the situation with regard to old age security. That is fine. The President of the Privy Council went before a Cape Breton audience and gave his blanket approval to this. That was done on behalf of Liberal candidates because the minister wished to hide from the people what little confidence those candidates had in their federal cabinet member. Almost everybody in this House has made representations to the government to increase old age security, yet the President of the Privy Council said, "If you elect the Liberals in Nova Scotia we will take care of old age security."

An hon. Member: Shame!

Mr. MacInnis: The President of the Privy Council gave his blanket approval to this.

Mr. Pepin: Let us hear the tapes.

An hon. Member: Which party was elected?

Mr. Pepin: Let us hear the tapes.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. MacInnis: If the minister wants to hear the tapes, I will provide them to him later. In the meantime I suggest that he will obtain his answer most quickly if he asks his colleague, the President of the Privy Council, to come into this House and deny that he lied to the people of Cape Breton.

An hon. Member: Shame!

Mr. MacInnis: The tapes will back me up. Further proof that the minister was wrong in his actions is contained in Bill C-5. In addition to promising to look after the matter of old age security, if elected to the legislature in Halifax, these people made claims with respect to the Nova Scotia government and the coal division of Devco. That was another lie—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the hon. member would allow me to intervene at this moment. There must be some reason, I suggest, for the approach taken in speeches made in the House of Commons. I think certain words are most unbecoming. The hon. member will have a chance to speak in a moment; the Chair also has rights in this House.

I suggest to the hon. member that it is against the long-established practice of the House of Commons to ascribe lies to another hon. member. There are other ways of conveying the impression that one thinks the facts have not been stated correctly by another hon. member. I realize, of course, that there is a different aspect in this situation in that the hon. member referred to events which did not take place in the House. The hon. member is referring to the participation of another hon. member in a provincial election and says that the statements made during that election were untrue or did not accord with reality.

Whether the hon. member is correct or not—and he may very well be correct—I suggest to him that the language used is not in accordance with the customs, traditions and usages of the House of Commons. I am sure the hon. member would wish to keep that in the back of his mind as he proceeds with his remarks. I apologize for interrupting him. He has every right to say what he thinks in this House.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I wondered whether on October 20, three days ago, when the word "lie" was used in the House, a few of the rules and customs of the House went through the window. I thought that the rules and procedures of this House applied to all backbenchers as well as to prime ministers and members of the cabinet. I draw Your Honour's attention to page 392 of *Hansard* for October 20. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is reported to have used the following phrase: "or is he just interested in telling lies to the House?" He was replying to the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker). He then went on to say, "Is it a lie or not?". Strangely enough, in that case, sir, no one was in a position to know whether or not a lie was involved.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The point made by the hon. member is very well taken. I assure him that I am in full agreement with him. No matter whether such language is used by senior members of the House or by less senior members such as the hon. member, it still is not correct. I certainly would not condone the use of such words by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) or by the most senior or the most junior member.

May I say that if the hon. member had been in the Chair at that time he would have heard quite a bit of noise. Certainly, the exchange which took place between the two right hon. gentlemen was not audible to the Chair. It was picked up by the *Hansard* reporters; they obviously have better ears than the Speaker. That is how those unfortunate words got on the record. I noticed them the next day and felt badly about them. I certainly would not want the use of such words, even by the Prime Minister, to set a precedent.

The hon. member is quite right to bring his point forward. We cannot allow even right hon. members of the House to use words that are prohibited in the language of other hon. members. I tell the hon. member that I am sorry I was not on my feet at the time, to mention or bring home a point of order to the right hon. gentleman in the sense that I am now doing in the case of the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond (Mr. MacInnis). Again I must apologize for interrupting him. I am sure his speech is much more interesting than mine.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, in the language of the House of Commons, the statement made in the press with regard to the blanket approval on the part of the President of the Privy Council to the approach to be used by Liberals seeking office in Nova Scotia was far removed from the truth.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May I commend the hon. member for his choice of language.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacInnis: The matter I am talking about touches on the responsibilities of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand), the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) and all members of this House. During the past two years I have been fighting on behalf of the miners who were retired before retirement age by the Cape Breton Development Corporation which is a Crown company. Certain officers there enjoying executive positions, expensive cars and expense accounts, have been given the protection of the civil service, while others more deserving of that protection are without it.

There are men there who ought to be given the protection that has been extended to certain Englishmen who have come over here and taken our jobs. The men who are employed by the Crown corporation are entitled to the same protection afforded by the Civil Service Act as has been extended to Englishmen who have come over here and bumped out of their jobs men in the coal industry in Cape Breton who are more qualified than them. I say without fear of contradiction that the men who were brought in, replaced men who are far superior in the coal mining industry. They were brought over to this country and given these jobs. They were extended the protection of the civil service. That protection ought to have been extended to other employees of this Crown corporation.

While I am on the subject of mining in Cape Breton, I appeal to the government, as I have appealed to it in the past, to take a good look at the legislation that was passed to set up the Cape Breton Development Corporation. The minister at times has been a little annoyed at remarks I have made. I say that Messrs. Ord and Blackmore have misinformed the minister on a number of occasions and told him things that do not accord with the facts. I ask all members of this House, including the Minister of Labour, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion and the minister who represents Cape Breton in this House, to examine the involvement of UIC funds in the subsidization of the pre-retirement plan of the Cape Breton miners. We should look at that legislation. As I do not have a copy of the legislation here, I will paraphrase it. Section 18 specifically states that the funds to be used to pay the men on pre-retirement are to be from the coal division fund. That is spelled out in black and white in the legislation. The Cape Breton Development Corporation has nothing to do with the UIC fund. Although they have absolutely no administrative responsibility, they are using the money the miners have paid into the fund, some for as long as 45 years.

• (4:10 p.m.)

When Mr. Blackmore arrived from England he walked into a cushy job. He is the man who set this up. Nowhere in the legislation passed by this House has Devco been given authority to touch UIC funds. Many men receive their UIC cheque every second week and Devco makes up the balance to $2,500 or $3,000. It is not possible for a man in his first year of retirement to receive more than $300 or $400 from Devco, yet the legislation states that the least he shall receive is $2,500, with a maximum of $3,000. That is an abuse of the privilege of the members of this House who voted in support of that legislation.

Mr. Blackmore is making a fool of everyone in the House. Where in the legislation is authority given to Mr. Blackmore to take the UIC fund from the miners? There are distinct instructions in the legislation that the pre-retirement leave fund is to be put into coal division moneys, yet the Minister of Labour states there are hundreds of similar situations throughout the country.

I could make some remarks about the competence of Mr. Ord as well as many other statements about Mr. Blackmore. If it were not for the fact that a capable Nova Scotian has proven himself, this situation would still be running wild. These men spent the money of Cape Bretoners as if it were going out of style. They failed to realize that even with this government there is a bottom to the barrel. Why are these men receiving protection under the Civil Service Act, when it is being denied to the rank and file members of that Crown corporation? The legislation dealing with the situation was passed by this House.

Mr. Blackmore came to Canada and set himself up as a Caesar in Cape Breton Island. In defiance of legislation passed in this House he dictates to the government and to Cape Bretoners. When he appeared before our committee he made statements which are not in accord with the facts. If anyone questions this statement, I can show him the many contradictions of Mr. Blackmore which appear in the reports of the Standing Committee on Regional Development. If Mr. Blackmore appears before this committee again, I hope it is as a sworn witness. This man cannot be depended upon for anything unless he is under oath. I ask you gentlemen to examine the worth while legislation you passed.

Mr. Speaker: Order please. I apologize to the hon. member, but I must remind him that he should not address himself to gentlemen but to the Chair.

Mr. MacInnis: I keep going wrong, Mr. Speaker. However, this matter has been bothering me for some time. It has been very difficult for me to get the point across to the minister responsible, despite the fact that we see eye-to-eye on many drawbacks and pitfalls these men place before the government through the incompetent handling of many situations in this area.

Mr. R. B. Cameron has now taken over this task. He has saved this government many millions of dollars. If Mr. Cameron had not taken over this task there would be no money left to provide for what the legislation originally intended. Hon. members should examine this legislation to see what they supported. Are they going to allow this man to continue to affect in a detrimental way, not only the miners but the communities involved? Can we allow him to deny the good legislation passed in this House and allow suffering in the communities affected?

If any member questions the accuracy of these statements, I can verify them by correspondence I have received from the minister and by the reports of the Standing Committee in which there are pages of contradictions. This is a very serious situation. The legislation was supposed to be beneficial, yet there are detrimental effects in the mining communities in and around Cape Breton. Because of this situation the legislation was passed. These communities have not received the benefits that were promised through the establishment of the Cape Breton Development Corporation.

I ask that the protection being given to the executives of the Cape Breton Development Corporation be extended to the working man so that any future lay-offs will come under the Civil Service Commission. I appeal to hon. members to examine the legislation with respect to the use of the UIC fund. Devco had no business touching this fund. In fact, they are instructed where the moneys for the pre-retirement leave will come from.

It is ironic, but I have witnessed Devco, with their bleeding hearts and pronouncements, "taking care" of the Cape Breton miners. I have seen a cheque in the amount of two cents which was paid to a retired miner for a two-week period. Unfortunately, the cheque is no longer available. It would have been a worth while document to table in this House. However, Mr. Speaker, there would be no problem in obtaining many cheques with a value under $10 which are paid every second week, cheques to the Cape Breton miners on pre-retirement leave.

• (4:20 p.m.)

This is not what our legislation intended, and I hope gentlemen, that among you, along with Liberals elected to Halifax who were given blanket approval by the President of the Privy Council, means can be found to impress upon this government the need to do the right thing by the miners of Cape Breton who are suffering because of this import who is pushing his weight around.

Mr. Speaker: Order. It being the end of the debate, pursuant to the Special Order made on Thursday, October 22, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings forthwith and to put any question necessary to dispose of the main motion. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Motion (Mr. Trudel) agreed to.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence) moved:

That an Address be engrossed and presented to His Excellency the Governor General by Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, in accordance with Standing Order 58 I move, seconded by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin):

That this House at its next sitting consider the business of supply.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, would the minister tell us whether the business on Monday will be the same as was announced last night?

Business of the House

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I know of no change in the business as announced last evening by my colleague.

On motion of Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale) the House adjourned at 4.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, October 26, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I should like to advise the House that I will call item No. 17 as the first order of government business today because I understand an agreement has been reached that this reference to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence can be approved by the House without debate. Therefore I shall call it as the first item.

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): That is correct, Mr. Speaker; as the result of discussion among those especially concerned, this has been agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

FISHERIES

AGREEMENTS WITH RUSSIA RESPECTING NORTHEASTERN PACIFIC OCEAN—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43 relating to the acceptance of motions by unanimous consent I would like to ask for consent, seconded by the hon. member for New Westminster but in conjunction with the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry who said that he would be glad to do so but has not done it yet, to move the following motion:

That the two draft agreements negotiated between fisheries experts of Canada and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for resolving problems associated with Canadian and Soviet fishing operations in the northeastern Pacific Ocean, as referred to in a communiqué from the Department of Fisheries and Forestry dated October 21, 1970, be referred to the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has indicated the nature of his motion which, under Standing Order 43, requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there such unanimity?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

23226—35

Mr. Speaker: There are a few nays which indicate there is not unanimous agreement. Therefore the motion cannot be put.

* * *

TAX REVIEW BOARD BILL

ESTABLISHMENT, DUTIES, APPEALS, ORGANIZATION, ETC.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-174, to establish the Tax Review Board and to make certain amendments to other Acts in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

CANADA GRAIN BILL

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION, PROVISIONS RESPECTING GRADING LICENCES, ELEVATORS, ETC.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (for the Minister of Agriculture) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-175, respecting grain.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING AGENCIES BILL

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL MARKETING COUNCIL AND AGENCIES

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (for the Minister of Agriculture) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-176, to establish the National Farm Products Marketing Council and to authorize the establishment of national marketing agencies for farm products.

Motion agreed, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

CANADA CO-OPERATIVE ASSOCIATIONS BILL

INCORPORATION, ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION, SHARE STRUCTURE, GENERAL POWERS AND DUTIES, ETC.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-177, respecting co-operative associations.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

Questions

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

NUMBER OF RESIDENTS OF CANADA WHO HAVE NOT BECOME CANADIAN CITIZENS

Question No. 1—**Mr. Nowlan:**

What is the estimated number of individuals, by country of citizenship, normally resident in Canada who had not by January 1, 1970, become Canadian citizens?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Information not available.

LIST OF ACTING MINISTERS

Question No. 19—**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):**

Who are the Ministers, Acting Ministers and Second Acting Ministers of each department of the federal government?

Mr. Barney Danson (Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister):

Office	Name	Acting Minister	Second Acting Minister
Agriculture	Mr. Olson	Mr. Greene	Mr. Laing
Communications	Mr. Kierans	Mr. Côté	Mr. Jamieson
Consumer and Corporate Affairs	Mr. Basford	Mr. McIlraith	Mr. Jamieson
Energy, Mines and Resources	Mr. Greene	Mr. Lang	Mr. Pépin
External Affairs	Mr. Sharp	Mr. Martin	Mr. Drury
Finance	Mr. Benson	Mr. Gray	Mr. Sharp
Fisheries and Forestry	Mr. Davis	Mr. Dubé	Mr. Côté
Indian Affairs and Northern Development	Mr. Chrétien	Mr. Andras	Mr. Davis
Industry, Trade and Commerce	Mr. Pépin	Mr. Lang	Mr. Drury
Justice and Attorney General	Mr. Turner	Mr. McIlraith	Mr. Macdonald
Labour	Mr. Mackasey	Mr. MacEachen	Mr. Basford
Manpower and Immigration	Mr. Lang	Mr. Marchand	Mr. Mackasey
National Defence	Mr. Macdonald	Mr. Drury	Mr. Laing
National Health and Welfare	Mr. Munro	Mr. Martin	Mr. Pelletier
National Revenue	Mr. Gray	Mr. Kierans	Mr. Chrétien
Privy Council	Mr. MacEachen	Mr. Macdonald	Mr. Olson
Public Works	Mr. Laing	Mr. Côté	Mr. Dubé
Regional Economic Expansion	Mr. Marchand	Mr. Munro	Mr. Mackasey
Secretary of State	Mr. Pelletier	Mr. Stanbury	Mr. Munro
Solicitor General	Mr. McIlraith	Mr. Turner	Mr. Lang
Supply and Services	Mr. Richardson	Mr. Olson	Mr. Côté
Transport	Mr. Jamieson	Mr. Richardson	Mr. Turner
Treasury Board	Mr. Drury	Mr. Kierans	Mr. Laing
Veterans Affairs	Mr. Dubé	Mr. Andras	Mr. Basford

RAID ON MAGAZINE DISTRIBUTOR IN THE TORONTO AREA

Question No. 35—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Did the RCMP, in co-operation with Metro Toronto Police during 1969, make a raid on a magazine distributor in the Toronto area armed with a Writ of Assistance and, if so (a) on what date did this take place (b) under provision of which Act was the Writ of Assistance used?

2. Were charges under the Act for which the Writ of Assistance was used laid against the magazine distributor and, if not, were charges laid under any other Act?

3. Was a large quantity of magazines seized on the occasion of the raid, and, if so, what was the wholesale or retail value of the seized magazines?

4. (a) How long were the magazines, seized through the use of the Writ of Assistance, kept by the police (b) were they held by the RCMP or the Toronto police?

5. Were representations made by the magazine distributor or his legal counsel for return of the magazines and, if so (a) when and how long before they were actually returned (b) for what reasons were the magazines held for the length of time they were held?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): 1. On information received that a magazine distributor located in Toronto, Ontario, was in possession of unlawfully imported obscene magazines and films, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police in conjunction with the Metropolitan

Toronto Police Department, conducted a search on July 5, 1969 under authority of a Writ of Assistance issued pursuant to the Customs Act.

2. Charges were not laid under the Customs Act. Subsequently charges were preferred by the Metropolitan Toronto Police Department under Section 150 of the Criminal Code of Canada.

3. A total of 4,255 magazines, bearing 13 different titles, and 544—100 feet 8 m.m. films, bearing 20 different titles, were placed under Customs detention pursuant to the Customs Act. The value of the magazines and films was not determined as they were not appraised by Customs.

4. The magazines and films placed under Customs detention were retained by the RCMP from July 5, 1969 until December 10, 1969. The Metropolitan Toronto Police Department was permitted, for a short time, to take possession of the magazines and films for examination concerning the proposed Criminal Code prosecution.

5. Representation was made for return of the magazines and films by Legal Counsel on behalf of the magazine distributor on December 1, 1969. The magazines and films were returned to the magazine distributor by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police on December 10, 1969. Samples of the magazines and films placed under Customs detention by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police were forwarded on August 26, 1969, to the Department of National Revenue, Ottawa, for a ruling under Tariff Item 99201-1. A ruling was not given by the Department in view of the prosecution under Section 150 of the Criminal Code of Canada by the Metropolitan Toronto Police Department.

R.C.M.P. SUPERANNUATION ACCOUNT

Question No. 70—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

1. What was the total amount of money in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Superannuation Account as at (a) March 31, 1968 (b) March 31, 1969 (c) March 31, 1970?

2. What rate of interest does the Government pay for the use of this money?

3. What amount of interest was credited to the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Superannuation Account during the fiscal years ending (a) March 31, 1968, (b) March 31, 1969 (c) March 31, 1970?

4. What was the total amount paid out of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Superannuation Account during the fiscal years ending (a) March 31, 1968 (b) March 31, 1969 (c) March 31, 1970?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): 1. (a) March 31, 1968, $104,724,111.76; (b) March 31, 1969, $130,811,-253.12; (c) March 31, 1970, $165,764,567.44.

2. Interest was paid on this account at the rate of 4 per cent per annum up until the quarter ending June 30, 1969. T.B. Minute 692055-2 dated September 25, 1969 amended Section 23(3) of the R.C.M.P. Superannuation Regulations, and effective with the quarter ending September 30, 1969 the interest factor changed in accordance with the schedule outlined in T.B. Minute 692055-2.

3. (a) March 31, 1968, $3,534,722.02; (b) March 31, 1969, $4,494,764.86; (c) March 31, 1970, $5,454,750.61.

4. (a) March 31, 1968, $988,991.22; (b) March 31, 1969, $1,101,036.09; (c) March 31, 1970, $1,315,474.24.

PENSIONS—RETIRED ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL

Question No. 71—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

1. How many retired Armed Forces personnel are receiving pensions including their basic pensions and any supplement or supplements added thereto, of amounts within each of the following brackets: (a) less than $20.00 per month (b) $20.00 to $29.99 per month (c) $30.00 to $39.99 per month (d) $40.00 to $49.99 per month (e) $50.00 to $59.99 per month (f) $60.00 to $69.99 per month (g) $70.00 to $79.99 per month (h) $80.00 to $89.99 per month (i) $90.00 to $99.99 per month (j) $100.00 to $149.99 per month (k) $150.00 to $199.99 per month (l) $200.00 to $249.99 per month (m) $250.00 to $299.99 per month; (n) 300.00 per month and over?

2. How many widows of Armed Forces personnel or of retired armed forces personnel are receiving pensions including their basic pensions and any supplement or supplements added thereto, of amounts within each of the brackets indicated in the above question?

3. What is the total number of retired Armed Forces personnel and also the number of widows of armed forces personnel or of retired armed forces personnel presently residing in each province?

4. In respect of how many orphans of Armed Forces personnel are pensions being paid and what is the average amount thereof?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): 1. (a) 6, (b) 37, (c) 308, (d) 276, (e) 341, (f) 379, (g) 603, (h) 926, (i) 1297, (j) 4873, (k) 6007, (l) 5025, (m) 3896, (n) 6127.

2. (a) o, (b) 8, (c) 23, (d) 171, (e) 259, (f) 282, (g) 227, (h) 272, (i) 253, (j) 743, (k) 311, (l) 202, (m) 99, (n) 68.

3.

	Retired Personnel	Widows
Newfoundland	67	11
Prince Edward Island	153	13
Nova Scotia	2,793	184
New Brunswick	731	93
Quebec	3,992	316
Ontario	12,008	1,289
Manitoba	909	133
Saskatchewan	315	53
Alberta	2,098	159
British Columbia	6,054	503
Yukon and N.W.T.	314	3
Outside Canada	667	161

4. Seventy Seven; $34.18.

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES SUPERANNUATION ACCOUNT

Question No. 72—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

1. What was the total amount of money in the Canadian Forces Superannuation Account as at (a) March 31, 1968 (b) March 31, 1969 (c) March 31, 1970?

2. What rate of interest does the government pay for the use of this money?

3. What amount of interest was credited to the Canadian Forces Superannuation Account during the fiscal years ending (a) March 31, 1968 (b) March 31, 1969 (c) March 31, 1970?

4. What was the total amount paid out of the Canadian Forces Superannuation Account during the fiscal years ending (a) March 31, 1968 (b) March 31, 1969 (c) March 31, 1970?

Questions

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): 1, 3 and 4. This information is tabled in the House annually in accordance with Revised Statutes 1966-67, c.44, s.53, and also appears in the Public Accounts, as Appendix 1, to the National Defence Expenditures.

2. Section 21 of the Canadian Forces Superannuation Regulations were amended by TB/CT 692055-1, dated September 25, 1969. The actual interest rates for the four quarters subsequent to this date, were as follows: Quarter ending September 1969, 1.2416 per cent; December 1969, 1.2575 per cent; March 1970, 1.2868 per cent; June 1970, 1.3174 per cent.

PUBLIC RELATIONS FIRMS HIRED BY GOVERNMENT TO PRODUCE INFORMATION ON GOVERNMENT POLICIES

Question No. 81—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. What public relations firms or economic or social research organizations have (a) been commissioned by government departments, agencies or Crown corporations (b) been hired or given contracts to produce pamphlets, brochures, economic surveys, etc., for educating or explaining government policies to the public?

2. By what government department or agency were they hired?

3. What specific task were they given to do?

4. How much money were they paid?

5. Was the choice of the firm concerned arrived at by asking for tenders and, if not, how was the choice made?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See return to question No. 1,427 deposited with the Clerk of the House of Commons on June 22, 1970.

INCOME TAX ACT AMENDMENTS FOR CLAIMS OF CAPITAL COSTS FOR AIRCRAFT

Question No. 84—**Mr. Forrestall:**

Will the government give consideration to amending that section of the Income Tax Act which provides claims of capital costs for automobiles used in the course of employment with a view to including aircraft?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): This is a matter of Government policy. If the Government should decide to propose an amendment to the Income Tax Act to make the suggested change it will be announced at the appropriate time.

D.D.H. CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Question No. 123—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. What was the original cost estimate, including all components, of the present DDH construction program?

2. What is the present cost estimate including all components and sea trials?

3. Is the construction program on time and, if not, what is the nature of the delay?

4. Have there been any substantial cutbacks in the components of this program in order to maintain the original cost estimate?

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): 1. See *Hansard* dated April 28, 1969, page 8035.

2. The program, including costs, is presently under review.

3. No, there is a delay of approximately one year. Until the review has been completed, it is impossible to be more specific.

4. See 2 above.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—REDUCTION OF FORCES

Question No. 125—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. Has the Department of National Defence been instructed to prepare contingency plans for the reduction of the Canadian Armed Forces to a level below 60,000 members?

2. Is the government considering a further phased reduction of the strength of the Canadian Armed Forces beyond that already publicly announced and, if so, from what elements will such reduction be made?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): 1. No, present plans call for a regular force strength of approximately 82,000 by April 1, 1973.

2. No.

MARITIME COMMAND PERSONNEL

Question No. 130—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. In the nine months ended September 30, 1970, how many officers or men of the Maritime Command (a) have been released (b) transferred to other commands including Headquarters?

2. What was the strength of the Maritime Command as of January 1 and September 30, 1970?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): 1. (a) One hundred and thirty-eight officers, 1,327 men, have been released through normal attrition, e.g. reaching age for retirement, medical grounds, voluntary, etc. (b) Records are not maintained in a manner which would make this information readily available without a costly manual search of individual files.

2.	January 1, 70	September 30, 70
Officers	2,011	2,172
Men	13,120	13,486

APPOINTMENT OF WOMEN TO CERTAIN POSITIONS

Question No. 133—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. In the period commencing April 23, 1968 and ending July 25, 1969, how many women were appointed to a position or otherwise employed, other than under the provisions of sections 8 and 9 of the *Public Service Employment Act*, by the government under conditions or remuneration equitable to a salary of $10,000 or more per year?

2. Who are they?

3. By whom were they employed and what was the rank of their position?

4. How many men were appointed or otherwise employed under the same conditions during the same period of time?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See return to question No.

317 deposited with the Clerk of the House of Commons on February 25, 1970.

NATIONAL DEFENCE RESERVE, BROKEN GROUP ISLANDS, BARKLEY SOUND

Question No. 137—**Mr. Barnett:**

1. Were Effingham and other Islands in the Broken Group in Barkley Sound, Vancouver Island, ever held by the government through the Department of National Defence, either by transfer of title, or through an agreement with the Government of British Columbia held in a National Defence reserve and thus removed from alienation from the Crown and, if so, when did the government assume such control of these lands?

2. Were these lands subsequently released to the Province and, if so, on what date?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): 1. Yes, according to Federal Order-in-Council P.C. 6777, August 26, 1943, these islands were reserved by the Province of British Columbia for use by the Dominion of Canada by Provincial Order-in-Council 874, June 21, 1943.

2. Yes, as the islands were no longer needed for defence purposes, the reservation was cancelled by the Province of British Columbia in 1967.

BEAUCE CONSTITUENCY—FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION BY GOVERNMENT

Question No. 139—**Mr. Rodrigue:**

For each project in which the government has participated financially since 1965 in the constituency of Beauce (a) what was the nature of the project (b) what is the amount of money invested by the government in each of these projects (c) what was the amount of money invested by the provincial government in each of these projects (d) were any other contributions made and, if so, what was the amount of money involved and by whom were they made?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): It is not feasible to provide aggregate information on expenditure disbursements or revenue collections for constituencies, counties or other comparable units. Government estimates are not prepared on this basis nor are records of expenditures kept in this way.

Information concerning expenditures could be supplied about specific projects or programs which are identified in a question. These, of course, would in some cases relate to a particular constituency or locality.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION—SELECTION STANDARDS

Question No. 140—**Mr. Osler:**

Has Treasury Board any plans to call for consultation with the Public Service Commission concerning (a) selection standards (b) the apparent lapses from government policy admitted by the Chairman?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): (a) Yes. Treasury Board consults with the Commission on selection standards on a regular basis. (b) No.

Inquiries of the Ministry

PERSONNEL OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

Question No. 197—**Mr. Saltsman:**

1. Who are the persons recently appointed to the Advisory Committee on Taxation for the Department of National Revenue, and in each case, what is their present occupation?

2. What remuneration do the above persons receive from the Department of National Revenue?

3. What criteria were used in the selection of these persons?

4. Does any earn less than $8,000 a year?

5. What percentage of Canadian taxpayers, according to the most recently available statistics, earn less than $8,000 a year?

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister of National Revenue): 1. The members of the Taxation Advisory Committee and their occupations are set out below: Raymond G. Décary, Lawyer; Sydney E. Ewens, Tax Manager; Edwin C. Harris, Professor; W. R. Latimer, Lawyer; Charles McLaughlin, Tax Manager; Charles Pelletier, Accountant; C. Albert Poissant, Accountant; Donald C. Selman, Accountant; Alan Sweatman, Lawyer; David Y. Timbrell, Accountant.

2. The members of the Committee are serving without remuneration.

3. The criteria used were a wide knowledge of taxation systems in general and a thorough knowledge of the Canadian system in particular by persons who would be representative of the various regions of the country and of its two official language groups.

4. The provisions of Section 133 of the Income Tax Act prohibit the communication of such information.

5. The most recently available statistics, which are in respect of the 1968 taxation year, show that 82 per cent of Canadian individual taxpayers earned less than $8,000 a year.

• (2:10 p.m.)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

NATIONAL SECURITY

WAR MEASURES ACT—ESTABLISHMENT OF AUTHORITY TO REVIEW ARRESTS AND DETENTIONS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. He has indicated that he made suggestions to the province of Quebec with regard to a review of actions being taken under the War Measures Act. Can the minister tell the House whether he has received any assurance from the Minister of Justice of Quebec or from the government of Quebec that some authority is being established by that province for the review of arrests and detentions under the War Measures Act?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I cannot add anything to what I have said already except that I know from a personal conversation with the

Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Quebec that he is actively considering that proposition.

Mr. Stanfield: Since the government of Canada invoked the War Measures Act and suspended, to the extent that it has, the due process of law and since no assurance has yet been given by the province of Quebec, is the government of Canada itself prepared to establish an independent authority for the purpose of reviewing all arrests and detentions made under the Act in any part of the country?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, within the terms of those regulations the administration of law enforcement under those regulations is the same as the administration of the criminal law under the Criminal Code and is properly, in this case, left to the Attorney General of Quebec.

Mr. Stanfield: I notice the care with which the minister answered my question. I ask him now whether his position is that the Governor General in Council does not have jurisdiction under the War Measures Act to establish such an authority for the review of actions taken under that Act or, rather, that it is not expedient to exercise that jurisdiction?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Certainly, in so far as the first part of the supplementary question is concerned, the Leader of the Opposition is inviting the Minister of Justice to express an opinion as to the legal position. I appreciate that this is a serious situation and a serious matter. Perhaps in view of the importance of the matter the minister might like to reply to both aspects of the question.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, with respect, I was not asking the minister to express a legal opinion. I was asking him to tell the House what the position of the government is.

Mr. Speaker: In any event, I suggest that the minister might reply to the question.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, the position of the government is that the matter is properly within the jurisdiction of the Attorney General of Quebec. We have expressed our concern that the regulations be administered in a way appropriate to meet the very serious situation in Quebec while at the same time paying due regard to the civil rights of the people concerned.

SUBSTITUTE LEGISLATION FOR WAR MEASURES ACT REGULATIONS

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Can the Minister of Justice tell the House how soon he expects to be able to introduce into the House the specific legislation to be substituted for the regulations under the War Measures Act?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, it will be either at the end of this week or the beginning of next week.

[*Translation*]

WAR MEASURES ACT—SEARCHES BY ARMED FORCES—ALLEGED DESTRUCTION OF FURNITURE

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question I would like to ask the Minister of Justice.

Has he received any complaints to the effect that during searching operations some members of the Armed Forces might have misused their powers and caused unnecessary damage to furniture in some homes?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Personally, I have received no complaints yet, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

WAR MEASURES ACT ARRESTS—SUGGESTED ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMITTEE TO PREVENT ABUSES

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I am anxious to broaden the scope of these questions in view of the answer the minister has given to the question by my leader. I therefore ask the Prime Minister whether he has had an opportunity in the last few days to consider what some of us feel is a helpful suggestion by the Archbishop of Montreal to establish a committee of persons of outstanding integrity who would hopefully be able to avoid—I make no charge here—abuses or negligence in those aspects of the War Measures Act dealing with arrests of Canadians?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not know to whom the Archbishop was addressing himself.

An hon. Member: You.

Mr. Trudeau: If he was addressing himself to the government of Quebec, I take it they will have heard his representations. I am as willing as the hon. member to broaden the scope of this, as he says, but on this point I support the Minister of Justice entirely. The regulations adopted under the Act provide that the administration of justice under that Act will be the proper affair of the provincial Attorney General. This was not because the government did not think it could not do it, but because the federal government did not think it should be involved, but because we have confidence in the government of Quebec and we believe they can handle the situation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Fairweather: Leaving aside whether we have confidence in the government of Quebec, I wonder whether the Prime Minister has had an opportunity to discuss this proposal which I suspect was directed to him and other people in Quebec? If he has not had an opportunity, will he discuss what is surely a useful idea with Quebec officials?

Mr. Trudeau: I think the hon. member in the opening part of his question underlined very well the difference between his party and ours. They want to leave aside the government of Quebec; we do not.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

INFORMATION LEADING TO INVOKING OF WAR MEASURES ACT

Mr. David Lewis (York South): In view of the Prime Minister's statement last Friday that Parliament and the country already have the information on the basis of which the War Measures Act was invoked, will the Prime Minister inform the House whether the government had the intelligence referred to in these words by the Minister of Justice on Friday, October 16, as recorded at page 215 of *Hansard*:

> It is my hope that some day the full details of the intelligence upon which the government acted can be made public, because until that day comes the people of Canada will not be able full to appraise the course of action which has been taken by the government.

Did the government have such intelligence on which the invocation of the War Measures Act was based? If the government did have such a report, did the Prime Minister's statement last Friday express his final decision not to make it public?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, no, yes, no, Mr. Speaker. It was not a final decision. When I answered this question on Friday I added that it may be that we will have further facts to communicate to the House, but I impressed on the House then and I impress on the House now that the facts on which we did act are known to the people of Canada and indeed to this House. They are very clear facts. First, we had from the authorities of the province of Quebec and of the city of Montreal a clear statement that they apprehended insurrection. Second, there had been the abduction of two very important citizens in the province of Quebec, with an intention to murder them if the government did not give in to ransom. The third fact was circumstantial, if you wish, that approximately two tons of dynamite had been stolen in the province of Quebec this year, as well as a sizeable number of small arms and other ammunition. Also, there was a state of confusion and threats of violence in the province of Quebec. We decided to act on these facts as we interpreted them, and on this the government will stand or fall.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: I ask the Prime Minister whether the Minister of Justice was speaking for the government when he said to the House:

> —until that day comes the people of Canada will not be able fully to appraise the course of action which has been taken by the government.

What the Minister of Justice informed this House and the people of Canada is obviously contradicted by the Prime Minister. Was he speaking for the government—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will appreciate that he is now asking his question in the form of an argument. At this point it is no longer an acceptable question.

Mr. Lewis: I simply ask the Prime Minister whether the Minister of Justice was speaking for the government when he made the statement I just read.

Mr. Trudeau: The hon. member might read my own statement and draw his own conclusion.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

SUGGESTED ADMINISTRATION UNDER GUARDIANSHIP

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

Does he intend to introduce a resolution providing for the placing of the CBC under trusteeship in order to clean up as it should be this haven for rebels who are well-fed at public expense?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, and I do not see that the hon. member has himself asked to introduce a bill to this effect.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL SECURITY

ALLEGATION BY MAYOR OF MONTREAL THAT FRAP IS HAVEN FOR TERRORISTS AND REVOLUTIONARIES

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Solicitor General supplementary to that asked by my hon. friend from York South. On Friday I asked the Solicitor General whether the contentions of Mayor Drapeau concerning the FRAP organization in Montreal were communicated to the federal government or to the RCMP, and, if so, whether they were accompanied by supporting information and evidence. The Solicitor General indicated he would try to provide whatever information he could today. I wonder whether he is in a position to do so now?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): No, Mr. Speaker. On Friday the Solicitor General made it perfectly clear that he had no intention of entering the Montreal municipal election.

Mr. Lewis: It took place yesterday.

Mr. McIlraith: The hon. member for York South seems to be very knowledgeable on that subject. In any event, after making this clear I said I would look at the hon. member's question and if I saw anything in it which could be answered I would do so. I found nothing which required an answer.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Inquiries of the Ministry

WAR MEASURES ACT—REPRESENTATIONS BY OSGOODE LAW SCHOOL FACULTY MEMBERS ON PROTECTION OF CIVIL LIBERTIES

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): On a more serious note, I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister. May I ask whether the right hon. gentleman has received a telegram from 20 faculty members of the Osgoode Law School, York University, Toronto, requesting him to take action to protect the civil liberties of people arrested under the War Measures Act and specifically requesting that no one should be prosecuted for past acts which were not criminal prior to the proclamation of the War Measures Act?

An hon. Member: You represent the one per cent.

Mr. Broadbent: May we have order, Mr. Speaker? If the Prime Minister has received such a telegram, has he replied to these distinguished professors of law giving them the assurance for which they asked?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I do not have any knowledge of having received such a telegram from my distinguished confrères. I will look into the matter and see whether I can find some appropriate platform for arguing it out with them.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Chair will recognize the hon. member for Yukon for a supplementary and then pass on to another subject.

* * *

AIRPORTS

MONTREAL—ROBBERY—INCREASE IN SECURITY MEASURES

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): In the absence of the Minister of Transport I should like to ask the Solicitor General whether, in view of the recent theft of $120,000 from Montreal airport despite the high degree of security already in existence, it is the intention of the government to increase the security measures in force at this airport?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): I would be glad to take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

BRITISH COLUMBIA—ORDER IN COUNCIL PLACING TEACHERS IN DOUBLE JEOPARDY

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Justice. Was the federal government or the minister consulted by the government of British Columbia before that government passed an Order in Council placing teachers and university professors in that province in double jeopardy?

[Mr. McIlraith.]

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): I was not consulted, Mr. Speaker.

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Would the minister inform the House under what law or authority the British Columbia government passed the Order in Council, and would the government consider using its powers under the War Measures Act to annul this undemocratic order?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway will recognize, I am sure, that she is asking the minister to express a legal opinion.

Mrs. MacInnis: Then, Mr. Speaker, may I repeat the second half of my question. Would the government consider using its powers under the War Measures Act to annul this undemocratic order which places teachers in British Columbia in double jeopardy?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I would not want to abuse the War Measures Act beyond its purpose.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Justice.

Would the province of Quebec have the right under the Constitution to adopt a legislation similar to the one passed by British Columbia?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is once more inviting the minister to express a legal opinion.

* * *

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

MEASURES TO STIMULATE ECONOMY AND REDUCE UNEMPLOYMENT

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address my question to the Prime Minister. Is the government planning in the near future to introduce new measures to stimulate the economy and reduce the unemployment, poverty and misery on which terrorism feeds as an important first step in a long-range plan to remove this menace from our country?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the hon. member is at least catching up with the importance of this and is calling it a first step. Of course we took this first step a long while ago.

Mr. Hees: Does not the Prime Minister consider that the seriousness of this situation and the seriousness of the question I asked merit a more positive and constructive answer, rather than just the meaningless parroting of the same answer—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Hees: —that he has been giving us for the past three years while the economic situation has got steadily worse?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

SHOWING OF DOCUMENTARY FILM, "THE LEGACY OF LENIN"

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation has announced that it is presenting over its network on Tuesday, October 27, a documentary for revolution entitled "The Legacy of Lenin". In view of the fact that the government believes that the situation in Canada is serious enough to implement the War Measures Act, has the Secretary of State seen the film and, if so, does he believe that to show it would be appropriate at this time?

Mr. Speaker: Order. While the hon. member might ask the question in a different way, in its present form he is asking two questions, first, whether the Secretary of State has seen the picture, which I do not think is a question that can be put at this time and, second, whether the minister believes the film should be shown, again a question asking for an expression of opinion. The hon. member should ask his question in a different way.

Mr. Crouse: Then, Mr. Speaker, I will put it more directly. Since we as Canadians are experiencing the agony of a wave of revolution against our democratic government, will the Secretary of State consider the cancelling of the program "The Legacy of Lenin" to be projected by the CBC tomorrow evening?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I will be very happy to convey these remarks to the CBC authorities with the request that they be taken into consideration.

SUSPENSION OF PROGRAMS CONCERNING PREMEDITATED POLITICAL CRIMES

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Secretary of State.

Does he intend to follow the example of the CTV television network and instruct the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to discontinue any program more or less connected with a premeditated political crime?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I do not understand, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is asking whether we intend—

Mr. Beaudoin: —to follow the same policy as CTV and instruct the CBC to discontinue any program more or less related with a premeditated political crime?

Mr. Pelletier: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would be very surprised if the policy outlined by the hon. member had been adopted by any network, particularly in the area of information. In fact, radio and television networks are information media and I would be surprised that they could eliminate a part of the information in which they are duty bound to be interested.

As for comments, I would be very happy to consider the policy mentioned by the hon. member. I must say I have not yet seen it implemented. But I would like to find out whether it would be best for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation to follow it, in which case I would surely recommend it.

[*English*]

[*Later:*]

INTERVIEWING ABROAD OF PEOPLE BARRED FROM CANADA

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Secretary of State. Will he seek an assurance from the CBC that they will desist from sending teams abroad to interview people who are persona non grata as far as their being legally allowed into Canada is concerned, as the CBC has done in the past? I ask this question in light of the fact that some of their favourite commentators, such as Timothy Leary and others, are now fugitives from justice.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): I don't know just what case the hon. member is referring to, Mr. Speaker. His question is very general and I could not give it a reply, particularly as his definition of persona non grata seems a little vague to warrant a specific reply.

[*English*]

Mr. MacLean: I have a supplementary question. If persons are not allowed to come into Canada because of criminal records or other reasons and therefore are not acceptable as temporary visitors to Canada, will the minister seek the assurance that the CBC will not send teams abroad to interview these same people so that what they have to say can be broadcast over the national network without their being in the country?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pelletier: I shall gladly pass that suggestion on to the CBC, Mr. Speaker. However, an interview which was recently filmed abroad clearly revealed the intentions of some subversive characters and could make the opposition aware of dangers which, so far, they seemed to deny.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*English*]

NATIONAL SECURITY

VANCOUVER—PROPOSED UTILIZATION OF WAR MEASURES ACT TO BAN SUBVERSIVE GATHERINGS

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Minister of Justice or the Solicitor General. Are they aware of reports from Vancouver today to the effect that the city council there is to consider a motion which would ban all "subversive gatherings" under the powers that they consider to be contained in the war measures legislation and, if so, do they think that such action would be in conformity with Parliament's intention?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the minister might want to reply to the question. I have some doubts whether it is in order but the minister may want to answer in any event.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the particular resolution before the Vancouver city council. I have been in touch with the Attorney General of the province of British Columbia and my officials have been in touch with his office underlining the purpose of the implementation of the War Measures Act, which is to meet a present emergency arising out of the particular subversive activities of the FLQ, and suggesting that any extension of the use of the War Measures Act beyond that purpose might very well be harmful.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

TIGHTENING OF LAW TO PREVENT ADMISSION OF PERSONS WITH SAME AIMS AS FLQ

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, in light of the implementation of the War Measures Act I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether there has been any tightening up of immigration laws in reference to those people coming into Canada who appear to have the same aims and objectives as the FLQ, even though they may not have membership cards?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I take it that the hon. gentleman is asking the question as a lawyer. There has been no tightening up in the sense that there has been no further extension of the powers applied under the War Measures Act by the adoption of any Order in Council further to those published on the first day in this House. There was nothing in them, to my recollection, that referred to immigration; therefore there has been no tightening up in the sense the hon. member asks.

Mr. Woolliams: Perhaps I might ask a supplementary question. I take it then that the law applies to Canadians and anyone who wishes to come in and do the same thing as the FLQ is still permitted to come in under the immigration laws?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think the supplementary question as asked is an argument in support of the question asked in the first instance.

[Mr. Pelletier.]

Mr. Woolliams: With the greatest respect, Mr. Speaker, it was not meant as an argument. I am seeking information on this important matter.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

JUSTIFICATION FOR RERUN OF PANEL DISCUSSION ON WAR MEASURES ACT

Mr. E. B. Osler (Winnipeg South): Mr. Speaker, my question has reference to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and I tried to get in a supplementary earlier. Last evening the CBC included on its television show, "Weekend", an old panel discussion of doubtful taste and merit on the invocation of the War Measures Act. I should like to ask the Secretary of State whether he has requested or will request the corporation for figures that would justify its claim on the air that they did this only in response to substantial viewer pressure, giving the impression that all sorts of people were dying to hear this week-old homily?

* * *

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES

METRIC SYSTEM INTRODUCTION—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT TO CLEAR UP CONFUSION

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Will he clear up the confusion that exists in the minds of the business community and the country arising out of the government timetable in regard to the metric system and the confusion that has been created by the introduction of a bill in the other place?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, Bill S-5 in the other place, the new Weights and Measures Act, is designed, among other things, simply to provide that the yard and other units of Canadian measurement will be measured against the international meter rather than against previous standards which at one time included the right arm of King Henry I. This is simply to improve the standard of measuring and measuring devices in Canada.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REPRESENTATIONS FOR INCREASED GRANT TO UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN'S FUND

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the strong representations made by the Canadian UNICEF committee, is the government giving favourable consideration to increasing Canada's grant to the United Nations Children's Fund to $2,400,000?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I have received representations from UNICEF and I have promised them consideration. I do not want to compromise the position of the treasury by saying "favourable consideration," but certainly this request is receiving consideration.

* * *

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL SECURITY

KIDNAPPING OF JAMES CROSS—REPRESENTATIONS BY BRITISH GOVERNMENT

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Could the minister tell the House if the Government of London has made representations or brought pressure to bear concerning the eventual release of British diplomat James Cross?

[*English*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, we have received many messages from the British government with regard to Mr. Cross. I have exchanged messages, of course, with my counterpart, the British Foreign Secretary, and in all of them the British government have expressed their appreciation for the great efforts being made on behalf of Mr. Cross.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has the British government offered the services of Scotland Yard and has the government of Canada accepted?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I have not had any such offers.

KIDNAPPING OF JAMES CROSS—OFFERING OF REWARD

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question to the Solicitor General. As it is now three weeks since Mr. Cross was kidnapped, is there any reassurance the minister can give the House today? In particular, as he has had the weekend to think and reflect further upon the wisdom of offering a reward, is there anything more the Solicitor General can say in that regard?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): No, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

PENALIZING OF NURSING MOTHERS—RESTORATION OF RIGHTS

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Labour as the doughty champion of women's rights. Will he cause to be examined and remedied the recent ruling of the

Unemployment Insurance Commission in Ontario which penalized nursing mothers?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. gentleman's question is irrelevant. In the interval not only has an apology been extended to the lady in question but her full rights under the Unemployment Insurance Act have been extended to her.

* * *

LABOUR CONDITIONS

QUEBEC—PROGRAMS TO DEAL WITH LACK OF EMPLOYMENT

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister about Quebec but not about the War Measures Act. In view of the information contained in the report of the Economic Council of Canada issued last month that out of 77,000 new jobs created in Canada this year only 3,000 were in Quebec and in view of the fact that about 40 per cent of the unemployed in Canada are in Quebec, can the Prime Minister inform the House whether the government is planning some special programs to deal with this serious situation in that province? I hope it is and we would be glad to hear a statement on that matter.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The statement, if this is what the hon. member is asking for, should not be made now but on motions.

Mr. Lewis: I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker. I should have asked whether we might have the assurance that there will be a statement on this matter.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there will, either in the form of statements in the House, answers to questions or announcements in the House, from time to time be announcements of measures which have been and will be taken in order to meet this unemployment situation. I remind the hon. member that not too many weeks ago, out of I believe an amount of $100 million which was set aside for the problem of public housing in Canada, a very sizeable percentage of that amount, I think nearly 50 per cent, went to the province of Quebec because we have this kind of problem in mind. I am glad to see we have the support of the House in this regard.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I am sure hon. members would be interested to know whether there is a committee of cabinet, a task force, or some other body studying the particular problem of jobs in Quebec with a view to developing a program to meet the situation at least in part.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings.

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. As the only economic statement made in the House since the beginning of the session was that made by the Minister of Finance some days ago, has the government nothing

more to offer the House by way of hope that a worthwhile program will be introduced?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Simcoe North.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

IDENTIFICATION OF OWNER OF CAR IN WHICH BODY OF PIERRE LAPORTE WAS FOUND

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Minister of Justice, one that I have been asked about a great many times. Has the green car that was used in the kidnapping of Mr. Laporte been identified and the owner of the licence number established? Is this information in the hands of the provincial and federal governments, or was the licence number changed on the green car in which the body of Mr. Laporte was unfortunately found?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): I will take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

ALLEGED DEMOTION OF K. A. STEAD BECAUSE OF INABILITY TO SPEAK SECOND LANGUAGE

Mr. Cliff Downey (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State. In view of the fact that there are several questions concerning the affair involving Keith Stead of the Museums Branch that are still unanswered, would the minister give the House the answer in three areas? Would he say whether Miss Monique Plamondon has returned from her extended tour of Europe, why it was necessary for Miss Plamondon to be in Europe for the past three months while the Stead case was being discussed and—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. This obviously is a question which should be placed on the order paper.

* * *

GRAIN

RAPESEED—RECEIPT OF TRUCKLOAD DELIVERIES BY SASKATOON TERMINAL

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture I should like to direct my question to his Parliamentary Secretary. In view of the recent press release by the minister in connection with the handling of rapeseed at inland terminals, can the minister inform the House if the inland terminal at Saskatoon has been instructed to receive rapeseed on a truckload basis and, if so, when will this facility be in operation?

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I shall take the hon. member's question as notice and advise him later.

[Mr. Hees.]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH CENTRE—APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT TO BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Mr. Ralph Stewart (Cochrane): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. As a result of the press release regarding the appointment of a Board of Governors of the International Development Research Centre and in view of the fact that the House on February 20 of this year passed the bill concerning the International Development Research Centre in which it recommended that one of the governors be a Member of Parliament, would the Secretary of State for External Affairs advise the House why he decided not to appoint a Member of Parliament and if in the future he intends to appoint one to that board?

Mr. Speaker: I am not sure there is urgency in the question. If there is, the hon. member could well give notice to the Chair for the purpose of having it discussed at the time of adjournment.

Mr. Stewart (Cochrane): Ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION

INVESTIGATION OF FISH PRICES

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Is his department, through the Prices and Incomes Commission, carrying out an investigation into "exorbitant fish prices" and can he indicate the basis for the investigation?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure whether the commission is investigating the subject the hon. member mentioned. I will make an inquiry and check. In the meantime, if the hon. member wishes to give me information concerning the specific prices with which he is concerned I will be happy to pass it on to the commission.

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Speaker, in the event that the minister does discover a reservoir of excessive profits, would he recycle them to the pockets of the fishermen who have in no way contributed to inflationary prices in the fisheries?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has made a representation and can assume it will be taken into consideration.

* * *

INDIAN AFFAIRS

REFUSAL OF ENTRY TO BANFF SPRINGS HOTEL TO GROUP FROM MORLEY RESERVE

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern

Development in respect of which, hopefully, he may be able to help us. Would the minister look into the allegation that about a week or so ago the Banff Springs Hotel refused entry into the hotel to a group of people from the Morley Indian Reserve who had been invited to participate in meetings of the Alberta Architects Association at the hotel, and that the Banff Springs Hotel, after refusing entry, subsequently rescinded their refusal on the threat of the Alberta Architects Association that they would walk out of the hotel.

Mr. Judd Buchanan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to take that question as notice.

* * *

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

DEPARTMENTAL STUDY OF IMPLICATIONS OF NATIONAL DEFENCE BASE CLOSURES

Mr. Doug. Rowland (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, this question is addressed to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. In light of the effect upon a number of Canadian communities of Canadian base closures I should like to ask the minister whether his department has made a study of the regional economic implications of base closures? If so, does he intend to make that report available to the House and to the public in general?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, there is no question of making a public report. Nevertheless, this question is under consideration since the cabinet decided to close the two bases and, by the way, I shall be going to Manitoba very soon to review with the Manitoba government the best means of correcting the unfortunate consequences of these two base closures.

* * *

[*English*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Norman A. Cafik (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to direct to the Prime Minister. Last week the leader of the New Democratic Party expressed his views on a television interview program regarding the inplications of the War Measures Act. I gather he was chosen for this task because no federal minister—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member should ask a question rather than make a speech.

Mr. Cafik: I shall put the question very simply, Mr. Speaker. Is it government policy to refrain from allowing cabinet ministers to make public statements to the press or on television regarding the implementation of the regulations because otherwise we leave the public as ill-informed as the leader of the New Democratic Party?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I had the impression that the hon. member wanted to make a speech.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

INQUIRY AS TO INTRODUCTION OF INCOME SECURITY AND VETERANS PENSIONS LEGISLATION

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the President of the Privy Council. Can he tell us when the legislation relating to income security and veterans pensions will be coming before the House?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): No, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. Now that the election in Montreal is over, in light of the difficulties that the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion has encountered and before the minister goes to Manitoba and before he makes any further statements, would the Prime Minister see that he applies for English instruction under the civil service's new B and B facilities?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

WAR MEASURES ACT—NON-PROSECUTION FOR ACTS COMMITTED PRIOR TO PROCLAMATION

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice and I am hoping to receive a less flippant and more direct answer. Would he assure the House that no one will be prosecuted for past acts that were not criminal prior to the proclamation of the War Measures Act?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add further to what I have said, that prosecutions under the War Measures Act regulations lie within the jurisdiction of the Attorney General of the province of Quebec, and undoubtedly the Attorney General will want to interpret those regulations as they read.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS AND NATIONAL DEFENCE

REFERENCE TO STANDING COMMITTEE OF PAPERS, "FOREIGN POLICY FOR CANADIANS"

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council) moved:

That the papers entitled "Foreign Policy for Canadians", laid before the House June 25, 1970, be referred to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

CANADA SHIPPING ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING DISCHARGE OF POLLUTANTS BY SHIPS

The House resumed, from Friday, October 23, consideration of the motion of Mr. Jamieson that Bill C-2, to amend the Canada Shipping Act, be read the second time and referred to the Special Committee on Environmental Pollution.

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to speak on Bill C-2, an act to amend the Canada Shipping Act. The bill deals primarily with one of the most pressing problems in our society today, namely, the pollution of our environment. Quite frankly the first question that comes to my mind is, why didn't the government put this bill under the authority of the new ministry of environmental affairs which is to be under the control of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Davis)? When raising this point, I do not question the ability of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) to deal with the problems arising from the pollution of our waters by oil tankers or merchant shipping, for I give him full marks for the efforts he and his department made in cleaning up the *Arrow* oil spill in Chedabucto Bay.

I regret it is not possible for the Minister of Transport to be here today but I believe he is well aware that the pollution of our water, air and soil, by oil and other hazardous substances is of direct interest not only to his department but also to the Department of Fisheries and Forestry, the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, the Department of National Health and Welfare, the Department of National Defence and the Department of Public Works.

It was my understanding from the words in the Throne Speech dealing with pollution control, coupled with the explanation given by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), that something definite would be done in this session to solve our pollution problems, and that the authority to do this would be vested in the Minister of Fisheries. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, in all frankness what other interpretation can we, as members of this House, place upon the words of our Prime Minister when he said on October 9, as reported at page 35 of *Hansard:*

A bill relating to the organization of the government will also be introduced shortly, proposing the establishment of a department concerned with renewable resources and environmental affairs which would have as its core the Department of Fisheries and Forestry, whose functions will be expanded to bring under the direction of a single minister the principal governmental activities relating to environmental quality in general, and pollution in particular.

By transferring to the Department of Fisheries and Forestry elements of the meteorological branch of the Department of Transport and the general responsibilities related to air pollution of the Department of National Health and Welfare, the principal governmental activities relating to the fight against atmospheric pollution will be brought together within one department.

The transfer of the bulk of the water sector of the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources, and the transfer of the responsibility for the Canada Water Act from the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, (Mr. Greene) to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry will combine under the direction of one minister and his department general responsibility for the development of our water resources and the more particular responsibility of the protection of the water habitat of our marine life.

Finally, the transfer of the Canadian Wildlife Service from the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development to the Department of Fisheries and Forestry will bring together in one department responsibility for our renewable resources including, notably, the related research activities required for the effective discharge of these responsibilities.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the words of our Prime Minister, and yet the second bill brought into this House in this session is entirely contradictory to the outline he gave us of the government's plans for pollution control in Canada. Naturally, we cannot help but wonder why the Prime Minister has changed his mind. His original proposal made some sense to us, as the Minister of Fisheries has far-reaching authority under the Fisheries Act which, if implemented, would go a long way towards cleaning up the poisons presently destroying our oceans, our rivers and our lakes. However, in retrospect it is better to have this bill amending the Canada Shipping Act under the Minister of Transport than no act at all, since our pollution problems have reached gigantic proportions in Canada. We, therefore, support the bill in principle.

At present we have no way of knowing the amount of pollutants that cloud our air, foul our water, and destroy our soil, since science has not yet devised uniform and accurate standards for carrying out this type of measurement. In like vein, we have no way of knowing the cost of cleaning up our pollution problems. Everyone knows it is going to be expensive, but how do you measure the cost when a polluted stream loses its fish, or a breeding ground can no longer support its water fowl?

Canada is blessed with one quarter of the world's known fresh water volume, with 117,000 miles of ocean shoreline, and with one of the world's best concentrations of game, birds and fish. We are now belatedly aware that all are threatened by the creeping inroads of pollution, and while our problem is immense we are still not suffering as much as the people residing in the United States. It now appears that water pollution has probably killed more people than all the wars in history. Millions die

every year from water borne diseases. Each year in Canada water pollution costs us more than all the fires, floods, accidents and other disasters that occur across the country.

The bill before us describes a pollutant as any substance which, if added to any waters, would degrade or alter or form part of a process of degradation or alteration of the quality of those waters to an extent that is detrimental to their use by man or by any animal, fish or plant that is useful to man. All these words seem unnecessary to me for, in my opinion, a general description of a pollutant would be the addition of any foreign matter to the natural environment to a degree unsupportable by nature.

What do we mean by our natural environment? It is generally accepted that there are three distinct areas, soil, water and air. Soil pollutants are any substances added to the soil which impair the yield or quality of farm produce, affect the health of animals or humans, or which may contribute to subsequent air or water pollution. Water pollution is understood to include any substances which render the water unfit for the purpose for which it is intended.

Obviously pollution of the air started away back in the fourteenth century when coal first became a source of heat. It became intensified during the industrial revolution, and has worsened ever since. There is some degree of natural pollution, but most pollution is of man's own making. Our affluent society produces more waste per person than ever before, and unfortunately the situation is getting worse. In fact, this bill was brought into being because of polluted rivers and lakes and pollution in our ocean which menaces our health. Fish are dying in streams and bays; scum and algae and oil drive those who go on holiday from our beaches, while tourist resorts fail, property values fall and taxes rise with the cost of water treatment. It is now a realized fact that if water pollution is allowed to continue unheeded, the necessity for the purification of water before it is fit to be used will impose an intolerable burden on all sections of our society. No province in Canada is free from pollution problems. My colleague, the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath), when speaking on this measure, referred to the problems faced by the fishermen in Placentia Bay when the bay was closed to fishing and a phosphorous plant closed for a month because toxic waste from the company caused widespread water pollution.

• (3:00 p.m.)

In my native province of Nova Scotia, water pollution is also one of our major problems. There are no treatment plants, for example, for the raw sewage dumped into the ocean in the Halifax-Dartmouth area with its 250,000 population. The same can be said of many of our small cities and towns situated up and down the coast. This situation exists as a result of the fantastic cost of pollution control measures.

Just what does this bill propose to do to improve the situation? Primarily, through amendments to the Canada Shipping Act, it hopes to correct through regulations the massive pollution of our environment by tankers and other ships. These amendments are aimed at establishing a maritime pollution claims fund under an administrator who will have very broad powers. In fact, as I read the duties of the administrator as listed on page 18 of the bill, section 750, he will be empowered to act as judge, defendant and claimant, depending on the stage of the claim. The man who holds this position will be required to have the wisdom of Solomon and the patience of Job, attributes which are hard to find among Liberal party supporters these days. Fifteen cents a ton is to be paid on each ton of oil shipped in and out of Canada by the shipping companies. I cannot help but wonder if this charge will increase the price of oil and gas in Atlantic Canada, an area which is presently suffering from economic disparity. Obviously, there is need for a fund. Why should the charge be placed on those in Atlantic Canada who are the least capable of paying additional taxes?

When reading the sections of the Canada Shipping Act that are being repealed, namely part VIIA, I cannot help but question the government's obvious inability to enforce this section of the International Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil as set out in the convention schedule approved in 1954. I realize that the fines for polluting Canadian waters with oil were not heavy enough to pose a threat to ship owners or even to act as a deterrent, but I cannot help but question the number of times this act was enforced. In my opinion, legislation that is not enforced or is not enforceable is bad legislation.

In the bill, we read that the new regulations will apply to any fishing zones in Canada prescribed pursuant to the Territorial Sea and Fishing Zones Act. I question the value of using fishing zones as control areas when they are in some cases inoperative. As the House is well aware, we have a Territorial Seas and Fishing Zones Act which was passed unilaterally with great fanfare in 1964. If the terms of that legislation had been implemented and had been enforced that year or even in 1965, our fishermen on the east and west coasts would not today be facing a serious decline in their fishery resource due to over fishing by other countries, as was so well depicted last evening on television.

However, the legislation was not enforced in 1964, nor was it enforced in 1965, in 1966, in 1967, in 1968, in 1969 or in 1970, and as a result of this government's vacillating and procrastinating attitude on this important matter we see our supplies of haddock today almost extinct, while stocks of redfish, flounder and cod have declined to dangerous levels.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Crouse: I also say, "Shame" along with my colleagues on this side.

This pollution control bill applies to any fishing zones of Canada. I would like the minister to describe those fishing zones. In fact, since the minister is not here, I would like any minister to describe those fishing zones.

Does this bill apply to Canadians operating within 12 miles off our shore, and does it apply equally, for example, to the fleets of France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Norway, Denmark, the United Kingdom and the United States, or does it apply only to fleets of those countries when they are operating within three miles of our shores, which is at present their fishing zone? The huge fishing fleets are capable of polluting with oil large sections of our inshore bank if the law does not apply to them when they are operating more than three miles from shore. In the absence of clearly defined fishing zones, it seems to me that longitude and latitude lines would be more descriptive and more acceptable if international agreement could be obtained.

Another regulation in the bill which disturbs me is to be found on page 4, section 737. Under this section, the governor in council may make regulations prohibiting the discharge from ships of any one or more pollutants specified in the regulations, except as thereby authorized, in any waters to which this part applies and with respect to which those regulations are made applicable. I cannot help but ask: Why the exceptions, why the special treatment for anyone, in view of the seriousness of the situation?

According to these regulations it is still possible to get a licence to pollute. There was a similar clause in the Canada Water Act to which we took exception when that act was under debate. Theoretically, oil tankers—the only ones paying tax under this bill—could be carrying a cargo, namely oil, that is not a pollutant because it has not been specified as a pollutant. If proper pollution control is the aim of this bill, why not define all pollutants in the bill rather than leave such an important matter to be done by regulation? Not only can someone legally pollute our seas under this bill, but section 744 (3) permits the escape from payment of claims if the "owner establishes to the satisfaction of the Minister that the pollutant of which he is the owner is of such a nature and quantity that, if it were discharged by the ship in waters to which this Part applies, the discharge would not constitute a contravention of any regulation..."

In my opinion, if an oil spill occurs, it should be this act which determines if there is oil pollution, and not some special regulation by any minister of the cabinet. Obviously there is a great need for strong legislation dealing with the pollution of our environment, not only here in Canada but in North America as well. However, as I read this bill, it seems to me that as a means of pollution prevention or a deterrent, it is very weak since it is not based on international agreements.

Once again we are alone in this, and we have only to look at the failures of previous unilateral actions taken by our Department of Fisheries and Forestry and by our Department of National Defence to realize the folly of trying to stand alone in today's highly complex and integrated society. In fact, the application and enforcement of this bill may well prove impossible because of our lack of manpower and equipment. I cannot help but ask myself: Is this another Canada Water Act, a token piece of legislation?

Our provinces in varying degrees, continue to flounder in increasing seas of pollution. Most of them have boards, commissions or authorities of some kind devoted to the control of pollution, and this chiefly in the area of water pollution. However, their problems tend to increase rather than decrease, and their job is all the more difficult because of a lack of clearcut policy which would specify where their jurisdiction lies.

The provincial administrator trying to find his way in the fog between the Canada Water Act, the newly revised federal Fisheries Act, and this act faces a sea of uncertainty that was never dreamed of by the people who wrote the British North America Act. What we really should have on this continent is an international pollution control commission. This would go a long way toward solving our continuing Canada-U.S. border problems, especially those dealing with water pollution in that area. Such a commission would be helpful on both coasts. Here we are, two friendly nations sharing the commerce and the fisheries of these two great oceans, the Atlantic and the Pacific, and neither of us has any guarantee that sooner or later one of us will not foul them up, with a consequent loss to both nations. We have jointly fouled up Lake Erie, destroying to a great extent the fisheries in that particular lake. The oil from the *Arrow* which grounded in Chedabucto Bay fouled up the fishing grounds and the areas surrounding Sable Island, which is over 100 miles off Nova Scotia. That area was used by Canadian as well as United States fishermen.

• (3:10 p.m.)

I believe that many of our common pollution problems could be faced and solved by a strong, concerted effort on the part of both our countries We should not confuse an international pollution control commission with the present International Joint Commission which deals largely with the technical problems of boundary waterways between our two countries. The body I am proposing would be patterned on the principles of the Convention on International Civil Aviation. If agreement could be reached with the United States on a commission of this type, it may well lead to an international convention which would apply to the operation and control of shipping on a world-wide basis. Such a body could well make some of the most important decisions of our lifetime. Mind you, we must start now and devote our resources to controlling the pollution of the past, the present and the future. We have the know-how and we can see the need. I hope we can find the necessary funds to do what is required, before it is too late.

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse) has given a fair indication, I think, that we do not arrive at perfection overnight in matters respecting pollution. I recall that when the House dealt with the bill in 1956 which was to ratify the International Oil Pollution Convention of 1954, some of us who were in the House at the time felt this was quite a step forward in the control of the pollution of the high seas. Experience has taught us that that was a long way from being an adequate measure. Even though the convention was amended in 1962, we

still find, according to the available evidence before us, that the pollution problems on the high seas are increasing rather than decreasing.

We recognize, Mr. Speaker, in this party, as does the hon. member for South Shore, that this particular bill we are considering is not designed to cope with the over-all problem of the increasing pollution of the oceans of the world. It is the view of the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson), according to the statement he made when introducing the bill, that the bill will do something towards protecting the immediate coastal waters of Canada from pollution by oil and other pollutants carried by large cargo vessels. It is our intention, in considering this bill at the second reading stage as well as in committee, to see how far the measure before us will fulfil the hopes of the Minister of Transport.

In his opening remarks, the minister referred to the days when he was a professional broadcaster and to the instant experts that appeared on every side. He drew some parallel between that and the many people who are now instant experts on pollution. I do not know whether I am an expert, instant or otherwise, on pollution. Being able to recall a little encounter of mine with the minister when he was a professional broadcaster, I can tell the House that since that day I have always considered the minister to be an expert in professional broadcasting.

In his speech, the minister devoted a good deal of time to the question of the creation of a task force, under his authority, after the incident of the *Arrow* in Chedabucto Bay. I have had an opportunity of looking through volume 1 of the report of that task force. While I realize that it does not give us all the answers for coping with problems of pollution at sea, I can say that a review of the report indicates to me that if the minister were not involved in creating instant experts in the field of pollution, at least he had some success in that venture in creating what I would call a bit of instant expertise. To this extent, I found the reading of the report very encouraging. Perhaps one can venture to say that it may have some bearing on the success, in future, of the proposals in this bill, if they are included in the law of our land.

The report is forthright, couched in language that is characteristic of the head of the task force, Dr. Patrick McTaggart-Cowan. As it happens, he crossed my trail some time before I met the Minister of Transport at the time he was a broadcaster. I knew him when we were fellow undergraduates at the University of British Columbia, which is some little time ago now. Having read the report, I found that he put forward his point of view as vigorously as he did in the past when we argued about the major issues of the world as undergraduates. I ought to point out, perhaps, particularly for those from British Columbia who are following these proceedings, that we ought not to confuse Patrick McTaggart-Cowan with his equally distinguished brother, Ian, who has achieved a reputation in another scientific field and who is well known and respected in British Columbia and beyond.

Having read the report of the task force, Mr. Speaker, it came to my mind that there was a considerable contrast between the situation, so far as the responsibility and the ability of the Minister of Transport to cope with the emergency that occurred when the *Arrow* was wrecked, and the situation that had prevailed in the period before 1969, before we adopted the bill which added section 495-C to the Canada Shipping Act.

The hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose) referred to this bill in his speech. I think it is important to note that prior to the passage of that particular piece of legislation, the minister really had no power to act under the law unless and until a vessel was formally abandoned by its owner. That that bit of legislation was enacted in Parliament before the *Arrow* disaster was fortuitous, to say the least. If the situation at the time of the *Arrow* disaster had been that which prevailed at the time the motor vessel *Schiedyk* grounded on the west coast, off Vancouver Island, when we lacked effective anti-pollution measures and no one had any real authority in this field, the disaster on the east coast could well have been of major proportions instead of being contained and controlled to the extent it was. While it is true that the *Schiedyk* was not an oil tanker but a cargo vessel carrying pulp, it is nevertheless true to say that serious damage resulted from the leakage of oil from the fuel tanks of that ship when she went down. For example, there was damage to an important herring spawning area at Nootka Sound. There was damage also, real and potential, to pulp logs that move back and forth in the adjacent waters. As far as I am concerned, it was certainly a warning for the minister of the need to take instant action. To this extent, the enactment of section 495(c) represented another step forward in our rather fumbling approach towards the objective of government having the proper authority to deal with the ever increasing danger of pollution of our coastal waters.

• (3:20 p.m.)

I was interested to find out by chance, as one sometimes does, that the *Arrow* almost docked at the port of Port Alberni in my constituency with its cargo of Bunker C rather than Chedabucto Bay. In any event, there was a substitute "crate" that went into Port Alberni which carried a crew so ill-trained they created a smallpox scare on the Pacific coast. It came into our coastline flying a quarantine flag. According to reports, it was another gerrybuilt cockleshell that should not have been carrying any kind of oil cargo.

We must now consider what improvements, if any, the present bill makes upon the legislative provisions of existing section 495(c) of the act. I suggest there are at least two areas of improvement which should be assessed and considered in depth in committee. One is the provision which is in this bill and which was removed from former Bill S-23, the liability on the polluter to pay. While there will be arguments as to whether this particular provision is adequate, nevertheless there is embodied in the bill direct liability upon the owners of the ship and its cargo, and through establishment of the Maritime pollution claims fund, a supplementary payments pool.

I hope experts from the government's services will be prepared to inform the committee regarding the cost of

the proposals in this bill in the total picture of our economy. We must recognize that directly or indirectly the consumer is going to have to pay the costs resulting from this legislation. We should have detailed estimates of the added cost of oil products in Canada as a result of the requirement for liability insurance, the tonnage tax on oil, the required standards of construction, and of equipment on the ships carrying pollutant cargos to our shores. The committee also should have information of the indirect impact of this legislation upon the Canadian oil producing industry.

If the efforts to control pollution are going to be effective, Canadians must understand what it is going to cost and why. They should be able to assess the cost of this measure in relation to its importance to our environment. If that understanding is not created and developed, we will continue in the future, as has so often been the case in the past, to find that the legislation with high sounding terms and laudible objectives will not receive more than lip service from governments and industry. The exercise in this Parliament will have been futile. The law will not provide any real protection no matter what its provisions.

One important provision in the bill with which I agree is the one setting up special standards for ships carrying pollutants, oil and other substances, through our waters, as well as the establishment of the new pollution inspection service. These seem to be steps in the right direction, but the committee must obviously question whether these new services can be established without too much duplication of existing government services, as well as the way in which they can be efficiently established in order to further the real purposes behind the proposed legislation. I am interested in, and generally approve of, these sections of the bill.

The committee must examine this bill for defects. An obvious defect, which has already been referred to by the hon. member for Fraser Valley West, is that jurisdiction is limited to an area extending only 12 miles from our sea coasts. I imagine the Minister of Transport has also had the experience of travelling along some portions of our sea coasts in a small plane. In my experience, 12 miles off shore from a height of 2,000 feet in a small aircraft is nothing more than spitting distance.

The western edge of my constituency along the open Pacific has historically been known as the grave yard of the Pacific. History books refer to the countless wrecks along those shores. One of the areas included in the new west coast national marine park is the area along the historic life saving trail where there was a single wire telephone line. When shipwrecked mariners crawled ashore they walked along this trail until they reached a telephone which they used to inform someone of their plight. In the days of sail and small steamers, wrecks were frequent. Even though the incidence of shipwrecks is not as great today, nevertheless we cannot discount the impact of wrecks of larger ships. The number of wrecks may be smaller, but the potential results of a single disaster are much greater.

I already referred to the sinking of the motor vessel *Schiedyk* shortly before the 1969 legislation came into effect. Since that legislation came into effect there has been the *Arrow* incident on the Atlantic coast as well as the wreck of a tramp schooner off the northern shores of Nootka Island. If the latter had been a tanker, it would have created a disaster at least as serious as the *Arrow* and from the point of view of logistics, would have been infinitely more difficult to deal with.

• (3:30 p.m.)

It is almost unbelievable that in this day and age, with all the electronic aids to navigation which exist, Loran stations, lighthouses, and all the rest which have been established along that coast, the master of a vessel driving for the shore of northwest America could find himself 250 miles or so off the Strait of Juan de Fuca and take his vessel in through shoals he could not possibly have navigated had he known they were there, until his vessel was finally deposited high and dry upon the rocks. Such vessels, flying the modern equivalent of the Jolly Roger, certainly have no place close to the shores of Canada whether they are tankers or whether they only endanger our sea life to the extent of the fuel they carry in their supply tanks.

It should be obvious that the proposed 12-mile limit, whether it involves a question in our own jurisdiction or of international law, is pitifully inadequate. No one should have any illusions on this score. When I flew over the Soviet trawlers a year ago this fall, watching them operate off the West Coast marine park area, I felt I could almost reach out and touch the sands of Long Beach, though at that point the vessels were some 20 miles offshore. I suggest that if it is to be of any real value, jurisdiction should be extended to the limit of what is referred to as the prohibited zone set out in annex A to the International Convention for the Prevention of the Pollution of the Sea by Oil, that is to say, a distance of 100 miles. The Convention makes reference to what is known, in the Pacific Ocean, as the Canadian western zone extending a distance of 100 miles from the nearest land along the west coast of Canada. On the Atlantic coast, as far as Canada is concerned, the zone would extend from latitude 42 degrees 05′ north, longitude 64 degrees 37′ west along the east coast at a distance of 100 miles from the nearest land. This is the minimum distance which should apply under this law.

I believe we could enforce jurisdiction of this kind, regardless of the position of international law, at least with respect to all ships sailing to or leaving Canadian ports; that is, we could ensure that all the required standards were maintained. I am referring, of course, to the proposed regulations governing ships carrying cargoes capable of causing serious pollution. No greater difficulty would attach to requiring that these vessels submit to inspection 100 miles off our shore, if they were bound for a Canadian port, than at the point of entry into what the bill presently refers to as Canadian waters. If the government is not prepared to make the kind of declaration in the present bill, as was made in the measure directed against Arctic water pollution, I suggest we might, at least, be able to shame other nations whose ships wish to sail close to our shores into operating

vessels of a kind which comply with safety standards. I may be wrong but I would think most of the traffic engaged in carrying oil close to Canadian shores would be originating from or proceeding to ports in the United States. If the wealthiest nation in the world cannot agree readily to ensure that all its shipping using waters less than 100 miles from our shores should comply with the standards proposed in this bill, then, surely, we should be able to shame them into doing so.

There is one other question which I believe the committee should consider, though it may not be so directly related to the terms of the bill we are discussing. I refer to the whole question of establishing what I would call a marine brigade for pollution protection and prevention, since the success of the legislation we are considering obviously depends to a great extent upon the effectiveness of such a course. Full weight should be given to the recommendation of the task force in this connection. The idea that provision should be made for fire protection and prevention at the municipal level has won long-standing acceptance; it should certainly be paralleled in the light of the evidence brought forward in the task force report. So far we have been lax in this respect.

The report makes special reference, as did the minister in his speech, to the part played by the armed forces of our country in the effort in connection with the *Arrow*, and, in addition, to the role of the armed forces in providing rescue teams ready for future emergencies. I noted particularly the reference in the report to the services performed by H.M.C.S. *Cape Scott* and H.M.C.S. *Cape Breton*. The task force recommended that these ships be maintained in a state of operational readiness to fulfil primary roles in the national contingency plan. This reference arises from the possibility that the Department of National Defence might withdraw these vessels from active service, having decided to pursue a different line of policy. This underlines a point which should be considered in committee. To what extent, in the long run, can we rely upon national defence forces when it is necessary to move rapidly to deal with pollution?

Any Minister of National Defence and his policy planners are, naturally, thinking primarily in terms of another kind of defence role. This shapes the direction in which they allocate their funds, train their troops and specifies the kind of equipment they acquire and operate. I put it to the Minister of Transport that we are entitled to detailed evidence showing the extent to which ships of the type I have named do, in fact, meet the requirements of situations with which the bill before us proposes to deal; we should be given the opportunity to assess, in committee, whether or not ships carrying suitable equipment should be available on a permanent stand-by basis for use by the coastguard service in emergencies. It is designed to provide rescue services, but at the present time the Canadian Coast Guard is not adequately equipped to perform the pollution prevention function. I remember once remarking to the hon. member who was minister of transport in the regime of the Conservative government that you could not build a coast guard simply by slapping a fresh coat of paint on a bunch of old vessels. The minister of that day assured me that that was not all that was going to be done. While I am willing to concede that we have done a little more than simply repaint the old DOT fleet, we have not really done very much more.

• (3:40 p.m.)

In assessing this whole question of providing adequate protection against the disaster of oil pollution, I suggest that we have an opportunity to take a fresh look at what might be created in the way of an efficient, mobile, well organized and well equipped Canadian coast guard, one that would perform a number of roles in protecting the sea coasts of Canada for those people who use them and also protecting our natural life—the ecology, as we call it—of our sea coast areas.

These are some of the considerations that come to my mind on looking through the bill before the House, and I have outlined some of the subject matters that should be considered in depth by the committee. I think all of us so far have indicated that we are prepared to see the bill receive second reading and be sent to committee with our hopeful blessing. Some of us hope that when the bill emerges from the committee and returns to the House, it will in fact be a better bill than it is in its present form.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of extending unduly my remarks on Bill C-2 which, I think, is of some importance since it deals with problems of world interest, namely, the pollution of oceans or streams by waste discharged into them or by ships carrying oil especially.

As regards Canada, we have, I think, only two merchant ships left. All transoceanic cargo is conveyed by foreign ships which bring gazoline or oil to Canada and it is normal that the Canadian Parliament should take measures so as to stop water pollution.

Last year, explorations were conducted in the North in order to discover oil or natural gas fields and Indians and Eskimos are complaining that many rivers of that area are already polluted.

We heard recently that the water of James Bay and Hudson Bay, to important fresh water sources, are beginning to be polluted, and the government has done nothing to stop pollution there.

For instance, so far as James Bay is concerned, one puts the blame on shipowners, the pulp industry, Domtar and other companies, because they pour their waste products into rivers like the Bell River, the Harricanaw River whose waters are going to pollute further James Bay.

Mr. Speaker, Bill C-2 is a very important one. It should not be used to protect industries, and to enable them to save millions of dollars at the risk of polluting Canadian waters.

Pollution exists not only in our region. The Ottawa river, a real jewel, which is even larger than any one in Europe, and which is extremely beautiful, is polluted. By

what? By E.B. Eddy and C.I.P., important companies which are dumping waste in it all day long.

I say that it is a crime to pollute a body of water such as the Ottawa river. We have no right to allow companies to do so. They should find a way of disposing their waste products other than throwing them in waters which should not only be protected but should even be drinkable. Only yesterday, our waterways were being discussed. At this moment there is practically but one area in the entire province of Quebec where one may find pure and clear water, and I am speaking of northwestern Quebec. Fishermen and hunters who travel to that area are more than happy to find out that they can breathe fresh air and that they can drink clean water. On the other hand, we have the Ottawa river polluted with mercury which kills our fish. Even commercial catches cannot be used for human consumption. This fish has become a hazard.

Mr. Speaker, had governments acted 25, 30 or 50 years ago, our rivers and lakes would have been protected. Nothing was done. I was reading recently about some people who crossed the Atlantic and reached Barbados on some sort of raft. All the way across, these people saw oil or tar floating on the waters. According to them, the Atlantic Ocean will soon be polluted.

Time has come for governments to wake up and require those responsible for pollution to be careful. Time has come for stringent regulations in order to stop them from polluting our waters.

The Great Lakes are completely polluted. By whom? By steel mills and coastal vessels dumping all their refuse into the water. Finally, everyone causes pollution.

In Hull some people throw their garbage into the Gatineau and Ottawa rivers, whether it be beer cans, oil cans or what have you. Even pieces of wood with rusty nails sticking out are cast into the water.

Individuals are partly responsible for the existing situation. It is a great temptation to put all the blame on companies. But we should blame ourselves also as we are equally responsible. Boaters sailing small pleasure craft on the Ottawa and Gatineau rivers are in the habit of tossing all their refuse overboard.

Today some people who would like to protect public health blame the companies. I also blame the companies, because they pollute water much more quickly than individuals. However, the citizens must also assume their share of responsibility. There are dumps but they certainly do not include the Rideau canal, the Ottawa or Gatineau rivers.

Some persons do not understand the matter at all. As soon as they see the floating waste of the E. B. Eddy, they immediately say that it is responsible for pollution. The E. B. Eddy, the CIP and the mills in Thurso and Hawkesbury, are the main culprits but the people must also take some of the blame and assume their responsibilities in this regard.

As for transoceanic oil transport, Canadian inspectors should go abroad and supervise the loading of ships to prevent them from polluting our waters. This could be a service not only to Canada but to all other countries that import from Canada. Unfortunately, that type of cargo is handled by foreign ships over which we have no control.

As a means of preventing pollution and promoting the Canadian economy, I would suggest the creation of a merchant marine with more ships than now.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I apologize for interrupting the hon. member even if it is only for a moment. I do not think the debate should really include the matter of a merchant marine. The hon. member will agree that if we launch now a discussion on the need of creating a Canadian merchant marine service, the debate will last a long time, and without knowing in detail the bill now before us, I do not think it covers the establishment of a merchant marine. Indeed, I feel the hon. member meant to refer to that aspect of the matter in passing. It should not be the subject of the debate.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your calling me to order since I want to limit myself to discussion of the bill before us. I only mentioned the merchant marine to point out that if we had more suitable Canadian ships to replace those that come to us from other countries and are not suitable, we would do away with pollution of Canadian waters.

However, Mr. Speaker, in order to avoid pollution we must take steps to control imported products and at the same time keep watch on what is happening here.

From the St. Lawrence river to the Great Lakes, pollution has become everywhere a serious problem.

Therefore, this bill must be immediately referred to a committee for serious consideration of proposals to be submitted to the House, in order to efficiently fight water pollution everywhere in Canada and to ensure public health.

[*English*]

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might, at the outset, join with my colleagues and, indeed, everybody who has commented in this House in support of the very broad principles which are set out in these amendments to the Canada Shipping Act. I must, in the same breath, wonder out loud how in the world such lofty principles and objectives could have been so badly approached as they are in the bill now before us. I would hope, in a spirit of charity, that this is simply because there was an urgency to get this piece of legislation drafted to indicate to the world that we are concerned about what is happening in our waters. As I say, that is about the only charitable thing I can say.

Mr. Jamieson: Thank you very much.

Mr. Forrestall: I find it a little strange to be at once in absolute agreement and at once absolutely dismayed, because the minister has a reputation for bringing forward better legislation than he has this time. I doubt if

there is anybody in Canada who even begins to understand it.

I would have to indicate to the minister that the language of the bill is, to say the least, somewhat confusing.

Mr. McGrath: Not worthy of a doctor of laws.

Mr. Forrestall: Yes, forgive me, Mr. Speaker. I had forgotten about that. Might I extend my congratulations to the doctor. I do not blame the minister for the drafting. As I was about to say, I hope the ambiguity of certain parts results from the fact that further legislation is anticipated in this general area.

At the very outset, I should like to direct myself to the question of what will happen to this legislation once we have given it approval in principle. The minister, during the debate on Friday, indicated he was not firm about the intention of government to refer this bill to the special committee on environmental pollution. He said his mind was open to the proposition that this bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Transportation. I should like to support that suggestion. Indeed, I think there is some urgency for referral to a standing committee as opposed to the present intention. I hope the minister, or somebody from that side, will indicate before this day is over that the government will seriously consider changing its present intention in this regard. I say that for a number of reasons, although I think there are three basic ones.

First of all, this bill involves a series of amendments to the Canada Shipping Act designed to approach the general question of pollution. I think there would be great danger in any attempt by a regulatory or administrative group within the government, other than the Department of Transport, to even begin to approach the consequences of Bill C-2.

• (4:00 p.m.)

The second reason I put forward to the minister in support of this suggestion is that, of course, it is a much larger committee and one which is much broader in its representation in terms of the regions and interests of the country. In the attempt by the government on behalf of all Canadians to bring about the type of situation in which desirable controls may be achieved for desirable ends, I believe this proposal merits some consideration.

The third argument I put forward in a brief manner is that I believe the committee on environmental pollution intends, or in any event hopes, to tackle the question of environmental pollution in a broad sense or, if you like, philosophical sense. I think the committee would like to direct its efforts to the broader question of what we are doing to our environment, whether we are going at speeds which are dangerous, whether we are moving too slowly in some directions and conversely in other directions.

Because of the committee's stated hope that there would not be referred to it specific matters of legislation for consideration, at least at the very outset of its deliberations, I hope the government will perhaps consider directing this bill to the Standing Committee on Transportation. These are but three or four reasons. I believe, however, there are many others of which the government is aware. In view of the comments of the minister on Friday night to the effect that he had no serious objection to this bill being referred to the Standing Committee on Transportation, I urge the House Leader to appeal to his colleagues to acquiesce to this request.

There are a number of areas of very broad concern related to this measure. Perhaps I might indicate to the minister some areas in which I know my colleagues will be concerned whenever the bill appears before the committee to which it is to be referred. I should like to touch briefly on some matters which are of particular concern to me. At the outset, before becoming involved in some of the details of the questions which concern me, I might reiterate because I think it is important, that there should be a very early clarification of the language of the amendment. Perhaps the minister might do this by issuing a more extensive press release or by using the media somehow or other to reassure people, for whom I have no particular brief, who are having a little difficulty in interpreting exactly what the government intends.

I now wish to put forward, not a reservation but rather a general thought I have. It has to do with some views I expressed in the House about the possibility of conflicts of interest arising when we give in one department jurisdiction to establish regulations and place upon that same department the responsibility for investigation. I think most hon. members are very much aware of my concern about conflicts of interest which not necessarily have arisen but which could arise under the existing structure of the Department of Transport. I think much the same principle has been ignored in the drafting of this bill. I would ask the minister to give some thought to this matter prior to the bill being considered by the committee in the hope that some amendment might be made which would give to the people outside of Canada affected by this bill the assurance that this would not be an added difficulty. In other words, sometimes it is as important that justice seem to be done as it is that justice be done. I believe the minister is aware of this, but I draw it to his attention.

I am also a little concerned about the limited jurisdiction. Other hon. members have spoken about this and I shall not dwell on it except to add the comment—and I believe the minister is aware of this—that it would be very seldom that a bulk carrier which was not destined for a Canadian port would come inside the gulf stream anywhere near our jurisdiction. I might briefly explain that. The pattern of the traffic route in the north Atlantic is such that it clearly demonstrates that shipping does not come within 60 or 70 miles of our coast unless indeed it is destined for a Canadian port. If there should be any thought in the minds of the drafters of this particular amendment that it would be difficult to be beyond the limits they have now suggested because this might interfere with the normal freedom of passage of ships to and from other countries, I would think they could remove it from their minds.

Perhaps one of the most important contributions I could make to this debate at this particular stage would be to urge the Minister of Transport to appeal to his colleagues very strongly—I know he is quite capable of that—to release the strings on the budget of the Department of National Defence so that it might get on with an orderly program to meet the policing requirements. I do not think this policing is something which should be done by the minister's department. I believe that in 1970 we have reached the point where we must separate the responsibilities of the Department of Transport. I shall not go into the reasons because I think they are very clear. I suggest that never before has it been more obvious that there is a need for a loosening of the budget of the Department of National Defence. It would seem to me that this is the only department of government competent to carry out the policing that is required, not only under this legislation but also under several other measures which presently are before us. The people in this department would seem to be the only people who have the legal status necessary to successfully police this and other measures.

It would be absolutely wrong for us to say to the world that these are the measures we intend to enforce to protect our coast line and then fail to do anything about it. There is no need for me to say anything about the tramp steamships of the world and the condition of those ships which carry bulk cargo around the world. Others have dealt forcefully with this, and I agree strongly with them. In the absence of a Canadian mercantile fleet, it is obvious that we do not have the courage or intention of saying that no pollutant may be carried in or out of Canada except in a Canadian bottom. However, we must be prepared to show the world shipping community that we intend to enforce the provisions of this bill.

• (4:10 p.m.)

It will be difficult to enforce the provisions of the bill. It will be hazardous to send destroyers out alongside oil tankers or, for that matter, alongside fishing vessels. The Department of National Defence will not be able to undertake this job when operating with a frozen budget, and I have not heard any plans announced by the Department of Transport to expand its fleet of vessels by building patrol type boats. In any event, Mr. Speaker, this is not a coastguard responsibility. A para-military operation is required. The coastguard's duties should be the day-to-day maintenance of our waterways and aids to navigation.

Why is it only oil tankers that are to be taxed? Why not tax all ships carrying pollutants? What about the very forceful suggestion made by the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Carter) in connection with the regular movement of phosphorous in and out of Placentia Bay? When the bill refers to the movement of any bulk cargo that is a pollutant, does it refer only to cargoes leaving Canadian ports destined for overseas, or does it refer specifically to the movement of bulk pollutant cargo between Canadian ports? I hope the minister can deal forcefully with these questions.

[Mr. Forrestall.]

Many segments of the Dr. McTaggart-Cowan task force report are ignored by this bill. I hope the minister is prepared to explain in detail why this has happened.

In conclusion I hope the minister will bring about a change of heart on the part of the government, withdrawing reference of the bill to the Special Committee on Environmental Pollution and instead sending it to the Transport Committee where shipping people will have an opportunity to speak to a body that has some continuity in shipping matters, instead of a committee that has no expertise in shipping matters.

I also trust the minister will announce the government's intention to introduce legislation soon dealing with offshore drilling, particularly with reference to the east coast. Provision has been made with respect to drilling in the Arctic, but we are still very much in the dark with respect to regulations governing other offshore drilling for oil and other minerals.

It is to be regretted that, despite the government's efforts, the community of maritime nations meeting at Brussels did not accept the Canadian suggestion to establish an international convention protecting all the world's shorelines and beaches, not to mention the full ocean environment, the birds above it and the fish below it. Protein from the sea may well become necessary to the survival of human life. I hope Canada's efforts in this direction will soon produce meaningful results. The government is on the right track and has responsibility to move unilaterally in the absence of such an international convention. In implementing the bill, I hope we demonstrate clearly to the other maritime nations of the world that we intend to keep our sea environment clean, no matter what the cost may be to them.

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, debate on Bill C-2 has been going on for two days, and most of the points I would like to make have been covered by previous speakers. However, I would like to emphasize two or three matters. I feel a great deal of good can come out of our discussion at committee stage, and I give notice of my intention to propose one or two amendments when we reach that stage because I believe this legislation could be greatly improved if the minister would accept several amendments.

I am not sure that the suggestion to send this legislation to the Special Committee on Environmental Pollution is a proper suggestion. I feel that the legislation is not going to the right committee. I feel it should be sent to the Transport Committee, which is a much larger body than the Special Committee on Environmental Pollution. There is an opportunity in the Transport Committee for more members to delve into the intricacies of the various sections of the bill and to express their views on them. But I think more important than the size of the committee is the fact that for years the Committee on Transport and Communications has been dealing with shipping problems which, I suggest, should not be the subject of deliberations of a committee that has been set up primarily to deal with special environmental problems. The coastal trade, problems of shipping, transport

and matters related to the continental shelf, have been delved into on numerous occasions by the members of the Committee on Transport and Communications. I believe they understand the background of the problems which shipping along our Canadian coasts will face much better than members of the new committee which has just recently been set up.

• (4:20 p.m.)

I suggest to the minister that he seriously reconsider changing the terms of reference and having this matter referred to what I consider is the appropriate committee, namely, the transport committee. Although I must point out that I would very much like to sit in on the discussions of the committee, I realize that our members on the transport committee are very capable, and can certainly handle all the discussion that will take place there.

To get back to the bill, let me say that it deals primarily with pollution control problems as they refer to shipping. I want to say right at the start that no matter what aspect of pollution we consider, it is becoming crystal clear to the government and to the public alike that we need very tough legislation in this field. We have had warnings galore from ecologists and others who have pointed out to us what is happening to our environment.

When we are dealing with a bill of this nature which affects the ecology of our east and west coasts, I feel members of the House and the government in particular should be prepared to write into the legislation some of the toughest provisions that we can possibly make. I am one of those who feel that we do not have too much time to play around with the ecology of the oceans and of the waters and streams in this nation. There are also other aspects of pollution where firm steps have to be taken. I am convinced that in several respects the bill is not nearly tough enough. I support the objectives of the measure before us but, as I said earlier, I feel it would be far more effective if the minister could accept several of the amendments suggested by hon. members who have already spoken. I believe the acceptance of these amendments will help to make this legislation more effective.

For example, I suggest that Canada should extend its jurisdiction with regard to pollution control zones from the proposed 12-mile limit to the same 100-mile limit which we imposed last year in our Arctic waters. I ask the minister, in all sincerity, are the east and west coasts of Canada of any less value to our nation than the Arctic? Is there less chance of oil doing terrific damage in these areas than in the north? I am aware of the delicate ecology in the Arctic area, but I want to point out also that the amount of shipping in the Arctic, even with the possibility of big shipments going from the Prudhoe Bay area and from other oil fields which might be found in that area, will be small when compared with the amount of shipping along the east and west coasts. The oil pollution hazard that this potential shipping will create, far outweighs the damage which might be done in the Arctic area. If there is a section of this nation that needs protection, it is the east and west coasts of Canada. This is where the most development has taken place and where our coastal cities are to be found.

Coming from British Columbia as I do, I am aware of the immense and terrible damage that could be done if a major oil spill were to occur along the west coast of British Columbia. The same situation applies to the eastern area. It appeals me to think that as yet we are afraid to tell the world that we will impose a pollution control zone 100 miles out from our coasts. We already claim a 100-mile zone in the Arctic. We have announced this to the world, so why should we not tell all countries that we are going to have a similar zone out in the Atlantic as well as in the Pacific to protect the shores of Canada? In this way we could have some type of control over the ships that come into the area.

This recommendation does not come from the New Democratic Party alone. This recommendation was made by the task force "Operation Oil" that was in charge of the cleanup of the *Arrow* oil in Chedabucto Bay, and it is contained in their report. I think the minister and the government should take cognizance of what is contained in that report.

The task force points out in their report that the *Arrow* oil travelled over 100 miles from Chedabucto Bay and polluted the shores of Sable Island. No doubt this oil, spilled as a result of one of our worst disasters of this kind, did a great deal of damage to Sable Island, although one cannot say that that island is densely inhabited. This is the recommendation of the task force to the government:

> We recommend that extensive pollution control zones be established to cover the rest of the coast of Canada consistent with the position taken by the government in the Arctic.

I endorse that position 100 per cent. If we can put this protective zone around the Arctic areas, then we should bring it right down the east and west coasts to the U.S. boundary and insist on having some control over oil pollution so far as shipping in this area is concerned.

Another point with which I would like to deal is related to the cost of cleaning up. I understand that under this bill the liability of a ship owner for cleaning up has been limited to $14 million, with the balance of the cost to come from a fund. I am of the firm opinion that if there were an accident involving a big oil tanker and it cost $30 million to clean up the mess, the ship owners ought to be liable for every single penny of the clean-up cost. I think this principle ought to apply on a Canada-wide basis to other industries polluting our streams and rivers. I do not see why the public should be liable for part of the cost of the clean-up. The polluters ought to be made liable. On the day we make ships and shipping companies liable for the costs of cleaning up, we shall begin seeing standards of construction of oil tankers that will to a very large degree, I believe, eliminate many of the oil pollution problems confronting the world today. I have no hesitation in saying that I think there should be unlimited liability on those who, perhaps through accident or otherwise, cause tremendous damage to the ecology of our country. This is the recommendation in the task force report, page 41:

• (4:30 p.m.)

> We recommend that the law should make it clear that those who pollute pay the complete cost of clean-up, including the

cost of any Canadian federal or provincial personnel used in the clean-up, that the ship concerned be impounded until this has been accomplished or assured and that the legal penalties be in addition to this liability for the complete cost of cleaning up the pollution.

I agree with this recommendation of the task force.

May I raise another point? Other members have talked about ships that fly flags of convenience, the flags of small nations that will register any ships that wish to fly their flag. They impose low standards on those ships. We had an example of this in the case of the *Arrow*. Testimony showed that there was inadequate equipment on board, and some of it was not working. Under the bill, Mr. Speaker, some of these things will be corrected. We shall have a chance to check more thoroughly all the shipping that arrives in our coastal waters. Canada should take action against these flags of convenience on an international basis. There should be an understanding, world wide, that we will not allow any of these old hulks that have been picked up for low prices and used by unscrupulous individuals or companies to carry cargoes, which are often improperly insured, to sail our waters. When ships like that, and the *Arrow* is a case in point, have accidents, they hit us hard. In the case of the *Arrow* oil spill, Canada was hit and hit hard by the cost of cleaning up, to the extent of $3 million. Part of the money, I understand, will come out of some insurance fund. These are things that worry me.

May I refer to another point which I think I ought to raise at this time. You know, years ago Canada went out of the large scale shipbuilding business. We do not have much of a merchant marine in Canada. We have merchant ships on our inland waters, but not too many of them. So far as our export trade is concerned, I do not think very many ships are now carrying the Canadian flag. There might be one or two but there are very few, in any event. We should go into this business. We should build a merchant marine for our country and insist on the highest possible standards when building these ships. We should insist that ships built to a certain standard shall sail our waters. If they are to bring oil cargoes to Canada, they must conform to a certain standard. If the ships cannot meet those standards, we should insist that the oil be brought in Canadian bottoms. What is wrong with that? We could do a tremendous service to our nation by building a merchant marine. We could earn large sums of money through a Canadian merchant marine. We could give jobs to thousands of Canadians working the ships and also give work to skilled people in our shipyards. This would help to solve the unemployment problem which is plaguing our nation. I think the House ought to take another look at this matter, and look at it very closely. I feel our need for a Canadian merchant marine ties in very closely with the provisions of this bill and with guarding Canadian shores from shipping which, to be generous, is not of the best.

There is another point I should like to make. I know that other members wish to say a few words before the debate closes at five o'clock but I want to talk about the matter of clean-up. We have been told that already there is a program for attacking oil pollution problems on the east and west coasts, and in the north. No doubt this is so. Although some steps have been taken to assist in dealing with some of the oil spills we have suffered, they are a long way from being perfect. I urge the minister to continue his efforts, not only with regard to the east and west coasts, the north, and our inland waters and rivers, but also to make sure that a tremendous amount of research effort is put into the solution of this particular problem. I think we must all recognize that the use of oil in our country will increase and that there will be more oil spills and larger oil spills in the years ahead, whether we like it or not. We shall encounter pollution problems from oil when we undertake offshore drilling. If there are not adequate plans for cleaning up in the event that there are oil spills, there could be immense and lasting damage to the north, to the fisheries, and to the potential of our coastal areas. Everyone is aware of this. I cannot emphasize this enough. You can never tell when an accident will happen. We must be prepared for one.

I could say much more, Mr. Speaker. As I mentioned earlier, I think that many of the points which have been raised in the House will be discussed in committee. When the bill comes back to the House, we shall have another opportunity to speak on it. If some of our suggestions have not been given consideration, we shall raise them again in the House and ask the minister to accept further amendments which will tighten this legislation. Basically, it is a step in the right direction.

Mr. Norman A. Cafik (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I will not deal with Bill C-2 at any length because I feel, in view of the general support it has received in the House, that it is really not necessary for me to do so. I should like, first of all, to congratulate the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson). When I listened to him last Friday I thought he gave one of the most lucid presentations on any bill that I had ever heard in this House. I generally support the provisions of Bill C-2 which update the Canada Shipping Act. It takes into consideration one of our most serious problems, pollution. It deals with pollution of our Territorial seas and of our great lakes and other navigable waters in Canada. It is high time this was done and I believe that all Canadians support the general intentions of this bill.

Pollution, as we know, constitutes a great problem. I am sure all members of the House, and all people in Canada, are concerned about it and want us to do everything we can in order to correct the situation. The *Arrow* disaster, of course, reminded us of the seriousness of oil pollution in our waters. The step taken by the government in the Arctic pollution bill, of course, was another vital step forward in the protection of our environment.

• (4:40 p.m.)

The minister spoke of the amount of expertise we have developed as a result of our experience in connection with the *Arrow* disaster. On Friday, the minister stated we probably have developed more expertise to deal with this problem than any other country in the world. I hope we will not have to use it. If this bill is accepted, the

likelihood of a disaster from an old tanker in our waters would be greatly reduced. The main provisions of this bill will control the type of ships allowed to sail through our waters. In this way we will eliminate the use of old antiquated tankers which at present pose such a serious danger to our shorelines.

I hope that some steps will be taken to ensure that pollutants are carried in self-contained compartments on these ships. In the event of a break-up this precaution would hopefully result in a loss of only one section of the ship rather than the entire cargo. It is a great step forward to insist as is done in this amendment on proper navigational equipment on board ships sailing within our waters. It is also important to have pilots handle these ships over dangerous areas, as well as to enforce traffic controls similar to the kind exercised in the air routes of the world. It is time we had these safe guards for shipping as well. I am certain hon. members agree on the need for fines for dumping pollutants and the need for security checks to insure that this act is properly policed.

When reading the bill I was quite confused by the terminology regarding the maximum fine of $210 million gold francs. I thought that was a huge amount of money. I have since ascertained that it amounts to approximately $14 million. I am not an expert in the field, but I hope the committee will examine this to see whether it is adequate.

There are provisions in the act to establish a pollution claims fund. A charge of 15 cents a ton will be paid into the fund to take care of surplus damages in excess of the $14 million maximum liability. The other day someone asked what would happen in the early stages of this Maritime pollution control fund. The minister indicated there may be a provision whereby money will be put into this fund to take care of the early stages of its development. I think this is a good idea. I hope the government seriously considers and acts upon this suggestion of the minister.

The bill creates an opportunity to remind Canadians of the cost of fighting pollution. It is evident that the cost of transporting oil and other pollutants by ships under the aegis of this act will result in increased charges for such products. I think Canadians will be prepared to pay the small additional charge in order to ensure that the environment is protected for ourselves and future generations. I am sure we can make the same observation in respect to any measures taken to fight pollution. It cannot be done by a government getting its money from the sky. It must be done by individuals and governments who are prepared to spend money in this fight. Obviously the cost will be borne by either the consumer or the taxpayer, but I think this cost will be acceptable because of the protection it assures for everyone in this country.

Section 738(1) of the bill reads:

> Where the Minister has reasonable cause to believe that a ship that is in distress, stranded, wrecked, sunk or abandoned is discharging or is likely to discharge a pollutant into any waters to which this Part applies, he may, or he may authorize any person to, destroy, if necessary, or remove, if possible, and sell or otherwise dispose of the ship, its cargo—

I wonder why the words "if necessary" and "if possible" are advisable in the section. There may be a legal complication as to what was necessary after the event or whether it was possible to save the ship. I suggest the committee should make some effort to determine whether in fact there could be such a difficulty. Section 747(2) reads:

> The Administrator, on the expiration of his term of office, is not eligible for reappointment.

I do not think that this provision is in any other act. If it is, I have not seen it. I wonder why it is in this particular act. The minister would know whether the administrator is doing a good job. In the event he is, he should be eligible for re-appointment. The committee should give some consideration to this provision.

Sections 761 to 765 inclusive outline the fines on summary conviction. I will not deal with that now. Other speakers have referred to it. These sections of the bill should be carefully studied. I am not privy to any of the facts on which these provisions are based but the committee should be satisfied that these fines will ensure conformity with the act. If the fines are too modest, people will ignore these regulations.

I welcome the amendments to the Canada Shipping Act and the new direction they have given. It is a big step forward in the government's war on pollution. I will have no hesitation in supporting this bill when it comes back from committee to the House of Commons.

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to share with the minister the time remaining until five o'clock. I compliment the minister on receiving a Newfoundland honourary Doctor of Laws degree.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McCleave: I do not know the rights and privileges of such an awesome office. To determine this, I suppose one would have to ask a Philadelphia honourary Doctor of Laws. The minister has stolen a march on not only the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), a Professor of Law, but also the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner). At page 33 of this bill the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson), honourary LLD, has used the expression, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1970. The minister has the rare honour of being first to bring these revised statutes to our attention. I might add parenthetically that the revised statutes do not have to be printed either this year or next year, regardless of what the minister has included in the legislation. In any event, come when they may, they will be called the Revised Statutes of 1970. How is that for a Newfoundland honourary Doctor of Laws?

I welcome that part of the legislation that establishes a fund so that fishermen will not have to chase oil tankers all over the world or to establish negligence or maloperation of the tankers resulting in losses to the fishermen. I think this is splendid.

When studying that portion of the bill dealing with the pollution control officer, I could not understand how that office was set up. I assume this officer would be someone from the Public Service who would have other duties in other departments. On checking with the minister, he advised me this is so. This officer could be a member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police stationed in an outpost if there are no other officials available. Whoever he is, and whoever these other functionaries mentioned in the legislation may be, I hope they will not find themselves in the position of a friend of mine from Beaver Harbour, Nova Scotia, a Mr. Leask, who was appointed a receiver of wrecks some seven or eight years ago. Lo and behold, there was a wreck in part of the ocean within his jurisdiction. But the receiver of wrecks is paid by the company concerned, and in this case, having seen its assets become a wreck, the company had no further interest. In addition, it was a United States company with no assets in Canada on which to levy. I entered for a while into the spirit of the merry-go-round between Mr. Leask, the Department of Transport and the marine lawyer in Halifax representing the United States company, but in the end Mr. Leask never received his payment as receiver of wrecks, and I intend to show up humbly before the environmental committee when this bill goes before it in an effort to see that nobody else finds himself in the position of Mr. Leask.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Finally, there has been some discussion as to whether this bill should be sent to the committee on environmental pollution or to another committee. I think there is much to be said for the contention that it should go to the Transport Committee. Surely, though, we could send it to the committee already designated and then, if we find, after some discussion there, that it ought to be handled by the larger committee, it could be transferred.

I am very much in agreement with those who have said that ships other than oil tankers may be carrying pollutants. I received a blistering letter lately from somebody who had travelled aboard one of the Canadian National ferries operating out of Nova Scotia this year and who had been horrified by the dumping of garbage all over the Atlantic Ocean. I make these remarks in the spirit which very much prevails this afternoon when we are all trying to do something about this serious pollution problem. I was prompted to take part in the debate, as were many other members, by the *Arrow* disaster, and I might point out that the first real debate on this subject took place when I brought the subject up on the adjournment motion late one evening and said that at least Canadian pilots, familiar with these waters, should be carried in these circumstances and also that rules should be laid down setting out navigation routes to be followed by vessels carrying potentially dangerous cargoes. I am glad to find that the bulk of these points, as well as others, are covered in the legislation before us, and for this reason I support the bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I must advise the House that if the minister speaks now he will close the debate.

[Mr. McCleave.]

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): May I first of all thank all hon. members who have spoken in this debate for their support of the principles of this bill, and thank them also for their worthwhile, and, for the most part, well thought out suggestions for the improvement of the measure. I wish to assure the House that if there is any suggestion from any quarter which it is possible to implement and which is within our competence as a Parliament and as a government, we shall be most pleased to do so.

I have taken note of all the comments which have been made during the debate but hon. members will appreciate that with the relatively short time at my disposal it would be impossible to deal with them all. I should like, nevertheless, to deal with one or two of them. In the first instance, with regard to the more or less general feeling that the bill does not go far enough, let me say that in ideal terms perhaps various parts of the measure should be extended. But I believe hon. members have also given their own, and the correct, answer to this charge by pointing out that we have in fact gone further unilaterally in this particular area than any other country on the face of the earth.

What we have done has been to stretch our jurisdiction to the absolute maximum. When we get into committee I shall be pleased to answer detailed questions on this issue and I hope to persuade members that the position is exactly as I have stated.

Reference has been made to the fact that below latitude 60 we have not gone as far as we did in connection with the Arctic pollution measure. Again, I believe the hon. member who made this point himself recognized the reasons behind this approach. There are unique circumstances in the north which do not apply further south. Moreover it is our judgment that we do not need the same powers in the area below latitude 60 as we do in the Arctic. If we were to extend the so-called pollution zones 100 miles to sea off, for example, the east coast, it would be tremendously difficult for us to try to investigate which vessels, among the enormous amount of shipping in that region, were heading for Canadian ports. But I hope to deal with this aspect of the matter also in the committee and if it can be demonstrated there that we could strengthen these provisions in some way I shall show no reluctance about doing so.

I wish to refer now, to the comments made by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) and to thank him for his kind comments. He outlined the position correctly; there is a gap in our fishing zones on the south coast of Newfoundland, but, again, I do not believe it amounts to so great an inhibition as the hon. member believes it to be in terms of this measure. For example, the whole of Placentia Bay can, and does, come within the so-called pollution control zone. So while there is, in some respects, the gap to which he alluded, there are more teeth in this legislation even in these difficult areas than has been appreciated to date.

Finally, I should like to suggest that if hon. members are so disposed we might give second reading to this bill

and refer it to the particular committee named in the motion, but I undertake to discuss with House leaders and others a possible change in this arrangement if it is generally considered that this course would be wise or necessary.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Special Committee on Environmental Pollution.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Rowland)—United Nations—South Africa—Canadian abstention on arms embargo resolutions—Decision on spare parts; the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart)—External Affairs—Appointment of the Board of Governors of the International Development Research Centre; the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles)—Canadian National Railways—Retired employees' pensions—Action to implement committee recommendation for increase.

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, Notices of Motions.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES OF MOTIONS

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

SUGGESTED CHANGE IN STANDING ORDERS TO PERMIT RECORDED VOTE

On the order:

Mr. Baldwin—October 16, 1970

That the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization review Standing Orders dealing with Private Members' Public Bills with a view to making a report to the House with a recommendation that such changes be made as will allow a recorded vote on some of such bills.

Mr. McKinley: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether this motion could stand. I believe there has been agreement that it be allowed to stand and maintain its position on the order paper.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed that motion No. 1 be allowed to stand and maintain its position on the order paper?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Research on Treatment of Animals

RESEARCH

STUDY BY STANDING COMMITTEE OF CARE, UTILIZATION AND TREATMENT OF ANIMALS

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the following matters should be referred to a standing committee, designated by the Prime Minister, with authority to call for persons and papers and report its deliberations with recommendations (a) the use of animals for medical research purposes, their care and utilization, and procedures for government licensing and inspection of, and control over, all premises using animals for laboratory research or medical training (b) as far as federal jurisdiction permits, recommendations regarding legislation providing penalties for those abusing animals, and any persons making a business of raising or catching animals for sale to research individuals or centres and not keeping same in a humane manner (c) the most humane method of trapping fur-bearing animals (d) consideration of the entire Canadian picture relative to the maintenance of fish, bird and animal wildlife and the regulations required for conservation (e) consideration of federal and provincial jurisdiction on the aforementioned items, and proposals for an effective manner of attaining federal-provincial agreement and legislative action.

• (5:00 p.m.)

He said: Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is the fourth session in a row that I have introduced a motion of this nature dealing with the subjects enumerated in the motion now before the House. I hope all hon. members have noted that the motion is presented in a democratic manner. It is non-partisan; it is not dogmatic in nature; it does not put forward answers, solutions or procedures. It merely, but importantly, draws to the attention of the members of the House of Commons matters that I most sincerely and deeply believe should be referred to a standing committee of the House for complete study. This study would embrace research on the part of the committee. Having heard witnesses give evidence, the committee would then be in a position to report to the House of Commons and to the government any recommendations resulting from its studies that it felt were in the best interests of Canada.

I am not going to speak at length on the motion because, as I say, I have spoken to similar motions on three previous occasions. Certainly, I would not want to be guilty of the charge of speaking at length, thereby talking out my own motion. I hope sincerely that on this, my fourth endeavour, the motion will not be talked out but will be referred to a committee for study and report.

I should like to commence by quoting two lines from the most recent issue of the journal of the National and Provincial Parks Association of Canada entitled "Park News". The last paragraph at the bottom of page 15 reads as follows:

The truth is that today's great problems will not be solved. We are too late, and we have failed for lack of foresight. Only tomorrow's problems can be solved, and only if we agree today that we are responsible for tomorrow.

It is those words, Mr. Speaker, that are the motivation behind this motion—the acceptance, the recognition, that we are responsible for tomorrow. This is why I am requesting that we recognize the fact that in this country millions of animals are still used for purposes of medical

and scientific research; that we recognize the fact that, for some reason that I do not understand, Canada is lagging behind the rest of the world in trying to eliminate the inhumane use of animals for medical and scientific research. Even though animals are still used in countries like the United States and the United Kingdom, we do find there a recognition of the need for change, that great steps are being taken in the use of tissue cultures, computers and other new methods of research rather than the use of animals.

I was most interested to read the other day that in the United Kingdom there has been established the first research institute that does not use animals at all for research purposes. This institute is the Walter Hadwen Trust for Humane Research and it employs the techniques of tissue culture, cell culture, organ culture, robotics, films and computers. According to the information I read in one scientific magazine, with these advanced techniques this institute may well become one of the leading research centres of the world that does not use animals.

I wish that every adult in Canada, certainly every member of the House of Commons, could visit laboratories that use animals for research. They would not only be horrified but stupified. I also think people should read truthful and factual publications that give information about some of the types of experiments conducted and give evidence of the suffering undergone by animals used for research.

I realize that there is split jurisdiction in this country in regard to this matter. I know very well that though some provinces have acted, others have not. I am well aware of Bill 194 which recently passed the legislature of Ontario. But there is no guarantee—certainly there is no evidence of this at the present time—that the precedent established in Ontario is going to be followed by other provinces.

It is of interest to note that this particular legislation does not apply to laboratories operated under federal jurisdiction. In addition, I think it is reasonable to hope that the federal government would give leadership in bringing the provinces together in order to establish national standards that would be applied by one inspection branch in Canada instead of 11 inspection branches.

In view of what I have just said, I hope hon. members of the House appreciate why I say that we are late now in studying the treatment, the use, indeed the abuse, of animals for research purposes, and finding out why Canada is not using modern techniques instead of continuing to report to the use of animals for medical and scientific research purposes.

May I just deal very briefly with the trapping of animals. It is my understanding from what I have read that approximately four million animals a year are trapped in Canada for commercial purposes. The majority of these four million animals that are trapped in Canada for commercial purposes are exported and for reasons of expediency and cost of equipment they are caught by devices known as the leg hold or the steel jaw trap.

Neither the leg hold trap nor the steel jaw trap kills instantly: it merely traps. The trappers usually visit their traplines every two or three weeks, and during that time animals that have been caught can starve or freeze to death or even chew off their own leg in an endeavour to escape. If we are going to continue to allow trapping, and a lot of people depend on it for their livelihood and a lot of women for their adornment—although I could never quite understand why women do not realize that beauty needs no adornment—surely we can make a study and bring in recommendations to the effect that instead of using the leg hold or steel jaw trap we use devices which kill instantly even though they cost more. They are in existence. There is the Conibear trap, the Northern killer, the Mohawk trap, the Compensator, the Canada trap, the Fisher trap and the CX13 and CX14. They are either in commercial production, or one or two of them I believe, are in the testing stage. In respect of this matter of killing animals for commercial purposes, if we had any warm blood or humanity in our beings at all we should be interested in a committee hearing the experts, listening to the evidence and bringing in a report.

• (5:10 p.m.)

On the other matter of conservation, this is something which is of vital interest to me. One has only to read the newspapers and the magazines to know that there are many species now extinct on the North American continent, and several right here in Canada are in danger of becoming extinct within a few years. It is not right that we should know of the beauties of wild life, animals, birds and fish, but by our ignorance, stupidity or lack of action we should say to those who come after us, sorry but they are no longer here for you to see, although you might be able to find one in a zoo. We have a responsibility.

Unfortunately, detailed and specific information is not available on all areas of Canada, but I do not believe there is a great differentiation between what is taking place in Canada and in the United States. Only last week it was announced in Washington by the United States interior department that three more types of animals, eight of birds and eleven of fish now face extinction in the United States. The list of the Department of the Interior of endangered species now stands at 101, including 14 types of mammals, 50 of birds, 7 of reptiles and amphibians and 30 species of fish. This is the list according to that department of the United States government of wildlife facing extinction on the North American continent.

At least two years ago they started taking action in the United States. When are we going to start taking action in Canada? I suggest that immediate action is required and that is why I hope this motion is carried today so studies can commence by a standing committee of this House. In addition, the committee could also study last week's report of the conference which was held in Canada by conservationists. It was interesting to note in the newspaper only two days ago that a resolution was passed calling on the federal government and the Yukon

territorial government to set up Canada's first wildlife range. This resolution was passed at the international conference recently held at Whitehorse. It called for the allocation of 600,000 acres of wild range as an adjunct to the 1,000,000 acres established by the U.S. government in Alaska back in 1961. This is a matter for federal interest and action.

This is just one example of the type of study that could be made by the committee for the purpose of making recommendations to other members of the House of Commons. I am not going to carry on any longer. When I started I quoted from a national publication. I should like to conclude by quoting from a provincial publication. This is the most recent issue of *Wildlife Review*, which is published by the Department of Recreation and Conservation of the government of British Columbia. The last paragraph of the editorial on page 3 reads:

> We have not much time left in which to learn to proportion our population to available resources, and to become good enough trustees of our inherited wealth of air, water, earth and forests so that posterity may hope to survive in a condition better than a bestial struggle.

May I say that the birds, the animals and the fish also are interested in posterity. They also have a claim on the inherited wealth of the air, water, earth and the forest but they cannot do very much for their own survival. We, the people of Canada, and the parliamentarians can do something about this and we must. That is why I say that if we, as Members of Parliament, will only recognize that we have a responsibility to those who come after us to pass on a heritage that is richer and more full because it passed through our hands, we will pass this motion so the subject can be studied by a standing committee of this House.

Mr. Tom H. Goode (Burnaby-Richmond-Delta): Mr. Speaker, I might point out at this time that as a result of a private member's bill I introduced last session the name Delta has just been mentioned in this House for the first time. I express on behalf of the 44,000 people who now live in Delta the pride they feel in knowing that their home is now officially recognized by name in Parliament.

The intent of this motion is highly desirable and it is one that I heartily support. I support it particularly as it relates to the special responsibilities that the Department of Fisheries and Forestry has in regulating and controlling the sealing industry of the Atlantic region. These responsibilities involve two areas of paramount concern; the conservation of the seal herd and the development and implementation of the most humane harvesting methods. It is significant, I think, that the recommendation for a committee to study, report on and make recommendations concerning the use, harvesting and conservation of animal wildlife has already been carried out in so far as the Atlantic seal herds are concerned. I am referring to the harp seals and the hooded seals.

Last year the Standing Committee on Fisheries and Forestry conducted an exhaustive study on the whole subject of these seal herds and the sealing operation. It examined the manner in which the seals are harvested and the conservation measures in effect. It scrutinized as well the legislation applicable to the sealing industry.

The committee heard evidence from many persons involved with the seal fisheries. It heard evidence from senior officials of the fisheries service of the Department of Fisheries and Forestry, from scientists and from persons directly concerned with the administration of the sealing regulations. It examined also Canada's severely damaged reputation abroad. Finally, the committee recommended that the seal hunt continue in the Gulf of St. Lawrence under continuing safeguards as to prevention of cruelty and preservation of the herds.

• (5:20 p.m.)

To reiterate, the recommendation for a House committee study of our animal wildlife, in so far as the Atlantic seals are concerned, has already been carried out. However, I do not intend to imply that the department has stopped there in studying and developing management methods for the seal herds and the sealing operations. In fact, during the past year several new regulations were added to those already in effect. A brief review of the evolution of the regulations respecting the seal hunt would, I think, be in order. Although the seal herds have been hunted since the eighteenth century by coastal residents and commercial interests, partly for food but primarily for fur, there were relatively few regulations prior to 1964. During and following that year, several factors contributed to very rapid changes and additions to the regulations. These factors, not necessarily in order of importance, were: the increasing take of seals by foreign sealing vessels as well as our own; evidence produced by the scientists of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada that the seal stocks were being overexploited; the use of aircraft in sealing; and a large-scale international controversy over the humane aspects of sealing.

In 1964, as a preliminary measure, sealing vessels and aircraft engaged in sealing were licensed by the Department of Fisheries. Subsequently, the department, in consultation with the industry and with humane and conservation society representatives, developed a new set of sealing regulations for the Atlantic coast for the 1965 season. Open and closed seasons for operations from ships and aircraft were retained as before and new control measures were introduced. For the first time a quota was imposed; it applied to the southern portion of the Gulf of St. Lawrence—the main whelping area— where the take of young harp seals by ships and aircraft was limited to 50,000. Scientific research had shown that up to 90,000 young harp seals could be taken in the entire gulf without endangering the survival of the herd. Since 1965, the gulf harvests, including commercial and landsmen's catches, have generally been well within the safety margin. The taking of hooded seals, whose numbers were very low, was banned in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Also, the taking of adult seals from whelping and breeding patches was prohibited.

In addition to these conservation measures, new regulations came into force in 1965 which defined the type of club that could be used in taking seals, including its minimum weight and size. Another regulation, which set a limit on the time that seal pelts could be left on the ice before removal to a base of operations, was designed to prevent the possible loss of pelts in storms and changing ice conditions. Good as these regulations were, they represented but a starting point for the actions the department has since taken—consistently in consultation with conservation and humane groups and with the industry—in exercising control over the management of the seal herds and operating methods. Among the measures adopted since 1965, and in force today, there is a provision that anyone engaged in taking seals must have a personal sealer's licence. A primary responsibility has been placed on the masters of sealing vessels to ensure that every crew member complies with the regulation. In the event of violations of the regulations, our fishery officers have the authority to suspend a sealer's licence for up to 30 days.

The regulations covering methods by which seals may be taken have been redefined and made more effective, and the section pertaining to skinning of seals has been strengthened. A prohibition has also been imposed on sealing during hours of darkness. As a further control measure, this year a ban was placed on the use of aircraft, both fixed wing and helicopters for the taking of seals in the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Aircraft could still be used in searching for seals—for which they required a licence—but they could not be used in actual sealing operations. I referred earlier to the quota the department imposed in 1965 of 50,000 on the take of young seals in the main sealing area of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. We could do this because Canada is the only nation harvesting seals there. However, we have been equally concerned for a number of years over the total take of seals from the herds which frequent the Front; that is the area off the coast of Labrador and northeastern Newfoundland. There we compete with the Norwegians in harvesting the seals and any quota or other conservation measure that we would like to impose required international sanction.

Largely as a consequence of Canadian initiatives, international action has now been taken to limit the combined seal harvest from the Front and the Gulf of St. Lawrence. At the annual meeting of the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries in June of this year, agreement was reached on an over-all quota of 245,000 seals from the Front and the Gulf, and this quota will apply in 1971. This figure is based on scientific calculations of the maximum sustainable yield of the seal population; that is, the total number that may safely be harvested without jeopardizing the seal stocks. The ICNAF quota reserves 45,000 seals for capture by Canadian landsmen and small boat crews, whose yearly catch averages this figure. Large Canadian vessels may take 100,000 seals and Norwegian vessels also have a 100,000 limit on their catches. Adoption of the 245,000 quota reduces the seal harvest below the average of recent years, which was about 285,000. It is below the 1970 harvest by Canada and Norway, which totalled approximately 258,000.

Also becoming effective in 1971 will be a five-day reduction in the duration of the hunt. I repeat that; in 1971 there will be a five-day reduction in the duration of the hunt. The season closing date will be advanced to April 24. This change is being made to reduce the take of breeding seals, particularly mature female seals. While the healthy survival of the seal resources requires careful management and restraint in harvesting, there is evidence that the cause of conservation would be little advanced by imposition of a total hunting ban as has been advocated by some persons. Biologists state if hunting were prohibited, the harp seal population would build up from its present level of about two million animals to upwards of four million. However, the natural environment can only support a limited number of animals of any species, and an unrestricted population increase would intensify the seals' struggle for survival. Competition for good in these circumstances would become fiercer, and as a result more animals would die of starvation, parasites, predators or disease.

The population pressure on essential environmental requirements such as suitable pupping areas, would also lead to large annual losses and a serious waste of a natural resource. Controlled harvesting, on the other hand, keeps the seal herds at a safe, self-perpetuating level, and provides for productive use of what otherwise would be wasted. These are the aims of Canada's seal conservation policies. So far in my remarks I have been speaking generally of the sealing industry and of the measures that the Department of Fisheries and Forestry has adopted to conserve the seal herds and to ensure that the animals are handled in the most humane way possible. But what about the people who are most directly concerned, the sealers themselves and their dependents who have a most important stake in this operation? The typical seal hunter is a fisherman in other seasons. For many such fishermen, the returns from their primary occupation are marginal and, despite their industry and resourcefulness, they find it difficult to make what would be considered a reasonable living.

• (5:30 p.m.)

For most of these fishermen gainful employment is suspended from about November until the following April or May because of stormy weather and ice conditions. The spring seal hunt represents for them, as it has for their forebearers for nearly three centuries, the first opportunity to work, to earn money for the necessities of life and to help prepare for a new fishing season. Many of the sealers, especially the landsmen, not only derive money from the sale of pelts but also use parts of the seal as food for themselves and their families. They regard the seal herds as a particularly timely resource to be harvested as are other resources of the sea, such as cod and lobster, later in the season.

I shall not go too deeply into statistics but I think I should mention a few. In 1969, the last year for which full statistics are available, 391 fishermen on 11 large sealing vessels had average gross earnings of $900 for

less than two months' work. The average gross income for landsmen, for whom 3,048 licences were issued, was $120. Thus, the total income to sealers was close to $730,000. These are significant figures when one considers their relative value to the income of the people concerned. Additional earnings went to workers employed in plants where the pelts are processed.

I referred earlier to the participation of representatives of humane and conservation societies in the development of our sealing regulations. The opinions of these groups, which we value, have been based on first hand experience. For the past six years the department has invited representatives of these groups to witness the seal hunt. The observers have included veterinarians, biologists, conservation authorities and other specialists. Their reports, with rare exceptions, have expressed approval of the humane methods employed in harvesting the seals. I quote a few examples. In his report of observations of the 1970 seal hunt in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Mr. Thomas I. Huges, general manager of the Ontario Humane Society, states:

> The Gulf of St Lawrence seal hunt, as it is now conducted, and as far as the young seals are concerned, is without doubt one of the most humane slaughtering operations I have ever witnessed. It is tightly regulated and certainly the regulations were enforced more stringently than in any other slaughtering operations that I know of. It seems reasonable to presume, therefore, that the "ultimate" has been reached so far as a regulated slaughtering operation is concerned. In my opinion there is nothing more to be gained by any further regulations.

Professor Keith Ronald, chairman of the department of zoology of the University of Guelph, has been carrying out studies on the seals for a number of years. Of his experience during the 1970 sealing seasons he states:

> As in the past I flew from spot to spot on the ice, the helicopter landing wherever I directed...I examined the skulls of recent and older kills...I met fisheries enforcement officers far away from their ships, sometimes wet and frozen...They are dedicated men directed by an understanding senior officer.
>
> In all of my activities and observations there was no evidence of any inhumane act... All seals were killed quickly and were rendered unconscious with the first blow.

Finally, I should like to quote a letter which Mr. A. L. MacLaurin, president of the Canadian Federation of Humane Societies, sent to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) on February 9 this year. The letter reads in part:

> The federation wishes to congratulate yourself and your department for your action both in the Gulf and on the Front to eliminate the cruelty inherent in the annual harvest of seals. I wish also at this time to apologize for the actions of some of our members in connection with the hunt as I am well aware that you have been bombarded with a great many completely misinformed and irrelevant letters and petitions on the subject of seals. The federation feels that you have done everything in your power to eliminate the cruel practices and we feel sure that you will continue to do so in the future.
>
> Once again I wish to express our appreciation to yourself and the members of your department for their continued efforts on behalf of the seal herd both national and international.

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, during the few minutes that I wish to take this afternoon I would like to return to the motion, which is a very clear and simple one. My colleague, the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch), who introduced it has been pressing for its adoption for some four years. A number of us during our daily work here have been working very hard with regard to different facets of the motion, which is in four parts although actually it seeks a single purpose: it simply urges that the whole matter of animal welfare be studied by a committee of this House.

There are four matters suggested for study and report. The first is the use of animals for medical research purposes, the second is the possibility under federal jurisdiction of introducing legislation providing penalties for abusing animals, the third is the most humane method of trapping fur-bearing animals, and the fourth is the "entire Canadian picture" in regard to conservation of fish, bird and animal wildlife. These four matters lead to the meshing together of federal and provincial jurisdiction in this respect.

Between members of this House and their constituents, there has been much discussion about animals. All of us at times have been deluged with letters concerning various forms of cruelty to animals or the well-being of animals. I know that a fresh batch of petitions will shortly be on their way to hon. members, urging that Canada take up this matter seriously and do something about it. When you get public opinion reaching such a level in this country, then I am convinced the matter is beyond being partisan in any sense and it is only proper that these matters be studied by a committee of the House. I feel that Canada is a long way behind other countries in this regard. A great deal of protective legislation with respect to animals, and medical experimentation involving their use, is in force in the United States, Great Britain and Scandinavia. We have no such legislation at the federal level in Canada.

I have before me an item taken from the Canadian Research and Development Journal for July-August, 1969, reporting that the tobacco industry was giving a grant of $300,000 to Dr. Hans Selye to "support investigation of any relationship between smoking and stress," and that the industry was also giving a grant of $300,000 to McGill University for an "interdisciplinary respiratory research laboratory." Both these grants appear to be for the purpose of investigating the validity of statements linking cigarette smoking with lung cancer. That is all very well, Mr. Speaker, but at the present time no machinery exists to supervise such experiments, and it is reasonable to assume that animals will be used in them. The work of the Canadian Council on Animal Welfare appears to be largely confined to laboratory animal husbandry and care, and the Criminal Code provides no protection for animals used in such research. For this reason I believe that we in Canada should make a preliminary study designed to introduce legislation to protect animals during experimental research.

An hon. Member: What about human beings?

Research on Treatment of Animals

• (5:40 p.m.)

Mrs. MacInnis: We are doing something about human animals, and it is high time we began doing something about other animals. Only recently have Canadians generally come to realize that the conservation of species in the animal kingdom is vital to the survival of human beings. We are now constantly being told by biologists and ecologists that if we keep on allowing animal species to disappear, if we keep on allowing gaps to develop in the food chain of animal life, we ourselves will not be able to survive as a species. It is no longer a matter merely of polluting our environment; it is a matter of destroying our environment.

As my colleague, the hon. member for Vancouver East pointed out, we know now that there is this other reason for our studying animal welfare. The reason is that it is so tightly linked with human welfare.

I will not go into facts and figures relating to cruelty to animals; we have heard a lot about that subject. I have also received increasing evidence that a great many of the repetitive experiments on animals, to test stress and other factors, are no longer necessary. These experiments have been made over and over again. Also, it is now being discovered that these experiments can be carried out with tissue and by mechanical means which will eliminate the necessity of torturing living animals. No one needs to have this point shoved down his or her throat. A committee of this House could be set up which would call before it different groups of witnesses so that the members of the committee, which would be constituted of members of different parties in the House would be in a position to make up their minds on these matters. We could call before us experts concerned with animal welfare. We could call before us biologists and ecologists who could tell us about the danger to our environment which would flow from letting this matter slide. We could have before us people concerned with conserving species by means of more humane trapping methods, other methods of sealing and other regulations, if such are necessary, all along the line.

The protection of animals should no longer be regarded as a contentious matter among parties. I think it affects all of us, and surely all of us should be prepared to send this subject to a committee without any prior commitment on our part. We should send this matter to a committee for study, just as we have so many of our resolutions and bills. I believe that we shall be surprised by the evidence that comes out in committee, and I am quite sure that we shall be moved to put Canada much closer to the forefront of modern thinking with regard to the protection of animals through regulatory legislation. I would like to give other hon. members a chance to speak on this matter so I shall conclude by urging once again that every hon. member support this resolution to send the whole matter to a committee of this House for study and report.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Parliamentay Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak this evening to the motion of the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch). I must say that I always follow his flamboyant speeches with interest; he delivers them with all the passion and vitality of a 20-year old.

I shall limit myself to parts (a) and (b) of the proposal of my hon. colleague.

Any society with humane feelings must be concerned with the way animals are treated in the field of medical research, and those who use them have added responsibility in that regard.

The Minister of National Health and Welfare and the Medical Research Council share the concern of the hon. member with regard to the use of animals in medical research. Thanks to those two bodies, funds have been supplied to the Canadian Council on Animal Care to enable it to assess the problems concerning the care of animals, and ensure that instructions are given to the appropriate provincial authorities as well as to universities, government departments and research laboratories at the local level. The Canadian Council on Animal Care published a guide on the care of animals used for experimental purposes, which gives instructions to Canadian research and educational institutions, whether they be universities, government or industrial agencies, on the adequate care and lodging of animals used in laboratories.

This guide is extremely interesting and should be read by all those who are concerned with the care of animals. They will see that the Canadian government as well as the National Research Council provided funds to publish this very important book.

This guide is also intended to be used as an evaluation basis for the care given to animals in Canada. The work of the Canadian Council on Animal care has and will continue to help us fulfil our obligations to ensure the highest quality care to animals used for scientific and educational purposes. While studying this problem and preparing this guide, the Council, as was mentioned earlier by the hon. member for Vancouver East, consulted breeding experts as well as researchers and many private and government bodies concerned with this important problem.

The underlying principle which must govern the care to be given to laboratory animals is the prevention of pain or unnecessary discomfort.

• (5:50 p.m.)

Any tests involving pain or discomfort for animals should be avoided unless there are good reasons to believe that they will help promote science and the well-being of all living species. However, if laboratory research animals must suffer pain or discomfort, appropriate anesthetic or analgesic agents should be appropriately used throughout the experiment, in the appropriate manner and administered to them so as to relieve all pain.

Even in experiment, animals should be spared abuse. The guide for the care of animals used for experimental

purposes specifies that wherever possible surroundings should always be the same and even controlled for temperature and humidity.

Animals must always be kept clean and the ventilation system must supply them with an adequate quantity of oxygen. Odors must also be reduced and the environment must be kept in acceptable conditions. Lighting, noise and odors must be controlled.

As with some animals noise can affect the result of a therapeutic dose or the administered medication, these animals must be protected as much as possible from noise.

It is owing to good human care and good treatment that the welfare of animals in ensured. Good treatment comprises the ability to feel and see changes, even small, in the attitude or health of animals, plus the necessary experience to remedy the condition of the animal to its advantage.

I dare hope that the Canadian Council on Animal Care as well as the SPCA and other institutions of the kind will see to it that animals used for research purposes in Canada are treated with kindness. Moreover, I would hope that scientists will study the possibility of using non-sentimental methods in the distribution of scientific information.

Every day brings us proof of man's inhumanity to man, and as long as this situation exists, we can expect to find inhumanity of man towards animal. Scientists have kept us informed of their obligations towards the animals they use for the promotion of science.

Thanks to the efforts made by the Canadian Council on Animal Care, I am confident that the animals used for experiments are receiving satisfactory care. In addition, research laboratories, while aware of where the animals come from, see to it that the suppliers treat these animals in a humane manner. The purpose of such operations is to supply healthy animals for research purposes. It is therefore in their interest to provide well-cared for and healthy animals.

Mr. Speaker, there are clauses in the Criminal Code which provide for quite heavy fines for ill-treatment of animals. To date, several provinces have already adopted legislation aimed at ensuring fair treatment of laboratory animals. In this connection, I would like to remind the House that Bill C-150, or the omnibus bill passed in 1969, deal deals with the treatment of birds and mammals. The object of the legislation is therefore to prevent the ill-treatment of those animals.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that, thanks to the support of the Department of National Health and Welfare and the Medical Research Council, the Canadian Council on Animal Care aims at providing sufficient care and protection for laboratory animals. Moreover, the federal government does not make grants to research establishments that use laboratory animals unless those establishments agree to follow the regulations listed in the guide on the care of animals used for experimental purposes that the Canadian Council on Animal Care has prepared.

Mr. Speaker, a thorough revision of the matter is important. If it is true that today some experiments can be done in a laboratory on living tissues, it is none the less unthinkable to make medical science advance through research on animals, because they represent entities with a heart, lungs, a liver, a spleen, bowels. Whether we like it or not, we will never be able to cultivate at will all those tissues and create some animal.

The hon. member for Vancouver East stated that we are living for tomorrow, that we are responsible for the future. I feel that we are living today to improve society for future generations. The welfare of future generations rests on medical research which must be carried on animals only.

We could also be engaged in similar research in other fields thanks to cultures of live tissues, but I wonder now if we are not merely marking time. I would like to quote an excerpt from chapter 10 in a book written by Mr. Heller and entitled *Of Mice, Men and Molecules*. This excerpt is a true call for help.

[*English*]

Which is more important: dog food, or research on diseases such as cancer, leukemia, heart disease, and mental disease?

This is a legitimate question, because the total amount appropriated by the United States Congress last year for research on all diseases was equal to the amount spent by Americans on dog food.

Mr. Speaker, this thought could be developed to great lengths. To my mind, all scientifically based research must be carried out on animals in laboratories.

I have visited some laboratories. I have met Professor Best in Toronto and Professors Frappier, Selye and Vineberg in Montreal. If Dr. Vineberg particularly had not had dogs at his disposal to try the Vineberg operation, which consists in a revascularization of the coronary system that supplies blood to the heart, I wonder where we would be today.

We have extended lives, we have made a breakthrough in the knowledge of the heart so that some people are able today to lead decent lives, and these advances have been recorded thanks to experiments on animals.

Furthermore, animals are well cared for in laboratories and if we need any evidence of it all we have to do is ask Dr. Selye to let us visit his laboratories where everything is spic and span.

Even if the hon. member for Vancouver East, whose opinions we respect, has eloquently expressed his view—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business having expired. I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

INVESTMENT COMPANIES BILL

FILING OF STATEMENTS AND INFORMATION, QUALIFICATIONS AND DUTIES OF AUDITORS, TRANSFER OF SHARES, ETC.

On the order:

Second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs of Bill C-3, respecting investment companies—the Minister of Finance.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I draw to Your Honour's attention certain facts regarding the recommendation that appears in this bill compared with Bill C-179, which was the number of the same bill in the last session. I submit to Your Honour that this bill fails to meet the requirements of section 54 of the British North America Act, and Standing Order 62.

One always accepts as a basic principle that there must be included in recommendations a clear authority for the payment of funds out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund. I submit to Your Honour that if we compare the recommendation as it appears in Bill C-3 with that which appears in Bill C-179, reading the pertinent sections of the bill it is clearly seen that the recommendation is deficient. The recommendation as it appears in Bill C-3, the only pertinent portion with regard to the expenditure of moneys or charges on the Consolidated Revenue Fund, is at the end of line 5 and reads:

—to provide for the making of short term loans by the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation to the sales finance companies and the conditions and limitations therefor as specified in the said measure and for payments out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund to the said corporations—

I think that is a typographical error; the word should be "corporation".

—for such purposes—

The remainder of the recommendation is not germane to this particular point. Bill C-179 of the last session read:

—to provide for . . . loans to such companies by the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation out of funds advanced out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund; to provide for reimbursement of the corporation out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund for losses sustained in respect of any such loans and for the establishment by the corporation of a special account in the Bank of Canada to which shall be credited revenues derived from such loans and to which shall be charged certain expenditures of the corporation mentioned in the said measure—

I now quote section 29 as it appears at page 39 of Bill C-3:

(1) Subject to subsection (2), out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, the Minister

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel.]

(a) may, on terms and conditions approved by the Governor in Council, authorize advances to the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation (in this section and sections 30 and 31 referred to as the "corporation") of amounts required for the purpose of making loans under section 16; and

(b) shall authorize the reimbursement of the corporation for losses sustained by it in respect of loans made under section 16.

It is paramount, Mr. Speaker, that the moneys for the loans must come from the Consolidated Revenue Fund, on the recommendation of the minister. There is no other source of funds available to the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation for such loans.

(2) The amount of advances outstanding under paragraph (a) of subsection (1) shall not at any time exceed the amount by which two hundred million dollars exceeds the aggregate of reimbursements to the corporation under paragraph (b) of subsection (1).

(3) The capital budget of the corporation submitted pursuant to subsection (2) of section 80 of the Financial Administration Act shall not include information relating to anticipated capital requirements of the corporation under this section.

In other words, the normal budget of the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation cannot in any way reflect possible requirements for any of the loans. This pins it down to the point where the minister must recommend any advances out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund to the corporation for the purpose of making loans to any of the companies which are the subject matter of this bill. Also, the minister must authorize the reimbursement to the corporation from the Consolidated Revenue Fund of any losses. I emphasize this point because section 28 indicates that the Superintendent of Insurance shall ascertain and certify the total amount all the expenditures incurred in connection with the administration of this act, and shall prepare an assessment of the companies governed under the act based upon a formula related to their assets.

• (8:10 p.m.)

I put it to you, Mr. Speaker, that nowhere does the word "expenditures" include provision for losses on loans. Then we go forward to the authority under section 30 enabling the corporation to establish a special bank account with the Bank of Canada. The section reads:

The corporation shall establish in the Bank of Canada a special account to which shall be credited all interest received by it on loans made under section 16 to which shall be charged

(a) all interest on advances made to it under subsection (1) of section 29—

In other words, it will charge interest on behalf of the Consolidated Revenue Fund.

(b) all expenses incurred by it in carrying out its duties and functions under this act; and

(c) any funds paid to the Receiver General pursuant to subsection (2).

That latter paragraph is not germane; it really refers to the reimbursement to the Receiver General of any surplus funds over and above the stated maximum. I therefore put it to you, Mr. Speaker, that the bill clearly requires a recommendation that funds should be advanced to this corporation out of the Consolidated

Revenue Fund. This is not covered by the existing recommendation.

Why the changes were made, I fail to understand. I am not satisfied that the initial recommendation last year was sufficient, but on a closer reading for this occasion I put it to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is clearly deficient and that we ought not to proceed now with the second reading of the bill before us. I submit that the bill should be withdrawn and reintroduced with a proper recommendation, because there is no way in which Parliament can vote moneys without the recommendation of the Governor General as required by section 54 of the British North America Act and Standing Order 62.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the learned argument of the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). The recommendation to which he refers was provided to the government by the Department of Justice after looking carefully into the matter and deciding that it was quite proper in connection with this legislation. Nevertheless, I am sure Your Honour would wish to consider the arguments put forward. I respectfully suggest that we proceed with the second reading of the bill and move the bill into the committee, and Your Honour can then determine whether the recommendation is in order in its legal form.

The hon. member for Edmonton West is a legal expert with some knowledge, and I respect his opinion although I do not place it above that of the Department of Justice. If the recommendation is improper, we can bring forward another. I recall hearing somewhat the same argument last year, at which time hon. members opposite were good enough to permit the legislation to go to a committee of the House for further consideration. In this case, if the recommendation is insufficient we could then, with the leave of the House, take steps to correct it. After all, the recommendation is not the substance of the bill. If there is a technical difficulty which the hon. gentleman has seen and which the Department of Justice has not seen, I would respectfully suggest that Your Honour consider this matter and indicate to the House at a convenient time the steps we should take; for example, whether we should submit another recommendation.

The hon. gentleman is bringing forward a technical argument, after all, because the recommendation per se is not the legislation. As he knows, one drafts legislation and asks the Department of Justice to determine a proper recommendation to the House. The recommendation has been drafted for us by the Department of Justice and I would think it is in order. However, I would never argue with the hon. gentleman who is learned in the law, and if there are technical difficulties we undertake to change the recommendation as Your Honour sees necessary.

Mr. Speaker: The point raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) is obviously one of interest. I would not think it is entirely satisfactory or sufficient for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) to say that the recommendation had been put forward by the law officers of the Department of Justice and there is therefore a presumption that it is right. I suggest that this presumption should not exist.

The hon. member for Edmonton West was generous enough to suggest earlier today, unofficially, that he was worried about this important point. This has given me an opportunity to look into the matter. I must say that having done so, I am not convinced one way or the other. The argument made by the hon. member for Edmonton West is a very strong one and I wonder, as he does, why the recommendation as prepared in the first instance for Bill C-179 in the last session was not used for this particular bill, which is essentially the same legislation.

The recommendation prepared for the earlier bill was much more complete because it spelled out that losses sustained by the corporation were to be included. The essential difference is that the recommendation for Bill C-3 now before us uses only the words "for such purposes". One wonders whether the purposes referred to by the law officers of the Crown include not only the usual mortgage operations but also losses which might be sustained by the Crown as a result of these operations.

My thought is that if the Chair arrives at the conclusion that the recommendation is imperfect, as suggested by the hon. member for Edmonton West, it is a very simple matter for the Crown, at a few moments notice practically, to correct the recommendation. As was pointed out by the Minister of Finance, this was done in similar circumstances last year when it was suggested by the Chair that the recommendation was not proper. In the course of the debate a new recommendation was submitted and the amendment was agreed to by the House.

My suggestion is that we proceed with our consideration of the bill, but not so far as to give it second reading; we would hold second reading until there was either a determination by the Chair or, if my ruling is that the recommendation should be corrected, until the government takes the necessary action to obtain an amended recommendation. In this way we would not arrest the work planned for this evening. We would proceed with consideration of the bill at second reading stage, but would not put the motion on second reading. In other words, we would hold the matter in abeyance until we find some way to resolve the difficulty brought to our attention by the hon. member for Edmonton West.

Mr. Benson: That would be quite agreeable to the government. I regret the hon. member for Edmonton West did not bring his difficulty to my attention as he did to that of the Chair.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): The minister was not here.

Mr. Benson: Had he done so, I would have been glad to look at the recommendation to see whether it needed to be amended. We are willing to proceed now with the business before us, and in the course of the debate we shall take another look at the recommendation. Your Honour can, of course, do the same, and if you indicate

to us that the recommendation should be changed, then we in the government are quite willing to change it.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, this bill is practically identical to Bill C-179 which received second reading in the House of Commons and was referred to committee at the previous session of Parliament. It differs only to the extent that a new clause relating to the revision of the Statutes of Canada has been added and a slight amendment to clause 27 has been made to require the minister to table in Parliament the annual report of the Superintendent of Insurance.

A detailed explanation was given concerning the purpose and intention of the bill when it was before the House for second reading at the previous session, by the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Gray) on February 11, as reported at page 3491 *et seq.* of *Hansard.* I am sure hon. members would not wish to have it all repeated at this time. To recall to mind the general scope of the bill, however, I will make a few summary remarks.

The principal purpose of the bill is to establish a system of reporting and inspection applicable to a class of companies that are acting in a substantial way as investment intermediaries and that are not otherwise effectively supervised. The class of companies to which the act would apply may be described broadly as those companies that raise money on debt instruments and use a substantial amount of the money so borrowed for investment purposes. The main type of company that would be covered by the act are those commonly referred to as sales finance companies, although the act will apply also to other types of companies that borrow funds for the purpose of making investments and loans of other types.

Companies that are subject to the act would be required to file financial statements with the Superintendent of Insurance and would be subject to examination by members of his staff. The superintendent would be required to report to the minister with respect to any company where he considers that the company's ability to meet its obligations is inadequately secured. The minister would be empowered to take one or more of a series of actions leading to improvement in the financial condition of such a company or requiring it to discontinue borrowing from the public. In extreme cases the Attorney General would be empowered to seek liquidation of the company under the Bankruptcy Act. An appeal would lie to the Exchequer Court from ministerial action.

The bill does not prescribe any particular standards of financial strength or classes of eligible investments for companies subject to the legislation. It does, however, impose upon companies the obligation of maintaining themselves in a financial condition to give adequate security to their creditors and of refraining from making investments and loans where there may be a conflict of interest.

Special provisions that would limit the transfer to non-residents of the shares of sales finance companies are also included in the bill. These provisions, similar to provisions in the Canadian and British Insurance Companies Act, the Trust Companies Act, the Loan Companies Act and the Bank Act, would limit the transfer of shares to non-residents to 25 per cent of the total and the transfer of shares to any one non-resident to 10 per cent of the total. Also included are provisions whereby adequately secured loans, for emergency liquidity purposes only, can be provided to Canadian-controlled sales finance companies through the medium of the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation.

In general, the bill is intended to fill a gap in the present pattern of supervision and inspection of financial institutions. The fact that such a gap can have serious consequences has been illustrated by a number of failures of financial institutions in recent years.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, may I first of all point out to the minister that the procedural arguments that were raised on the last occasion had nothing to do with the nature of the recommendations made at that time. If one consults *Hansard* for February 16, 1970, one sees there was some difficulty about the printing of notices and what have you, not only in regard to the bill but also in regard to *Votes and Proceedings.* This gave rise to the procedural argument raised at the time to the effect that improper notice had been given.

The minister has pretty well outlined the content of this bill. On looking at it we observe a strange pattern evolving. Primarily the bill deals with sales finance companies, but not for an instant does it have its origin or its paternity in that class of company. This was the infamous bill, Bill S-17, which began its passage in the other place during the 1968-69 session and was designed to control investment companies. There was at that time some sort of feeling of "big brotherism" on the part of the government that it was going to control the activities of all investment companies in this country.

The Senate Banking and Commerce Committee held public hearings on the bill and, with the aid of their counsel, entirely rewrote the bill with the exception of the title clause. That demonstrates how good was Bill S-17. The vital changes introduced in the other place were, first of all, the reduction of the application of the bill by providing an exception clause in respect of companies that met certain criteria and, secondly, the restriction of the government's power to enact further legislation by Order in Council. One has only to look at the old Bill S-17 to see what a Frankenstein the government had created and was trying to foist upon Parliament. The rewritten Bill S-17—with the exception, as I say, of the title clause—was passed by the other place and received pro forma first reading in this House. Then in a huff the government decided not to bring it forward and the bill subsequently died.

Then last session the legislation was brought forward as Bill C-179 and it received second reading in this House after some debate. It was then directed to the finance committee; but as Your Honour knows, the finance committee was then preoccupied with the White paper on

taxation and the amendments to the Canada Corporations Act and as a result the bill was sent to the justice committee toward the end of April. That committee took one look at the bill and must have thrown up its hands in horror. The government was in no great hurry to get the bill through, because it did nothing with the bill. As a result, the bill again died on the Order Paper. It has now come forward again as Bill C-3 with slight modifications, the major one being based on the criticisms of the bill during the debate on second reading last session.

As I have said, the primary purpose of the bill is to try to control the activities of investment companies. It requires auditors to report directly to the government, not to the client. There are also provisions relating to lenders of last resort, who are subjected to the most stringent conditions. The provisions relating to lenders of last resort contained in the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation Act, as we know from the passage of that legislation some years ago, almost put Shylock in the category of a very kindly old soul. I suggest the conditions laid down in this bill are no better. As matter of fact, this is an attempt to use what I think is an entirely improper vehicle to protect the public from the activities of certain companies which over-extend themselves in regard to the sale of financial paper to people who think that guaranteed investment certificates guarantee repayment, when in fact they are a guarantee of a certain rate of interest that is applied to the particular investment. We have seen a great deal of activity by some of these companies.

• (8:30 p.m.)

This bill purports to deal with certain federal companies. I have very grave doubts—if this is suggested by the minister—that the government will be able to sweep into the net all the sales finance companies operating under provincial charter. This is one matter the minister will have to explain. At the moment I am not satisfied that there is such jurisdiction, and certainly I do not see how the federal authority or the Minister of Finance can touch provincially-incorporated sales finance companies.

If the former minister felt he could not touch trust companies which were engaged in banking activities, and had to set up the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation in the way he did in order to deal with provincial concerns, I fail to see how the present minister feels he can regulate or control the activities of sales finance companies, at least to be logical in the thinking of the Department of Finance. I maintain, however, that the Minister of Finance was always erroneous in thinking that he did not have control of all those corporations, whether federally or provincially incorporated, which engaged in any of the activities that came under the title of the business of money and banking.

In any event, let us consider what has happened with this bill which started off as Bill S-17. The Senate revisions to Bill S-17 are contained in clauses 1-9, 18-28 and 32-40 in Bill C-3. First of all, there are minor grammatical and phrasing changes for which the Department of Justice has a preference and these have been used in the redrafting of Bill S-17 into what was Bill C-179, now Bill C-3. A number of small, administrative changes are made by the bill but they are of no import.

There is the inclusion of an administrative subclause that was not in the Senate version. I refer to clause 27(3). It is inserted because of the non-Senate sales finance company provisions which have been tacked on to the Senate bill. Remember that Bill S-17 made no reference at all to sales finance companies, and it was only last year that the government felt it had to protect the Canadian ownership of Canadian sales finance companies and suddenly thought it had found a safe harbour. It decided to tack on to this bill certain provisions in order to cover the restrictions on the sale of shares in Canadian sales finance companies. Therefore, I am wondering whether we are not now seeing a rather dubious tail wagging a very sick dog.

Let us consider two further changes and their effect in amending the Senate version of the bill. If we look at clause 2(1)(b) and (E) of Bill S-17, and continued in the Senate revision, we read "instalment sales contracts". In Bill C-3 this has been changed to "conditional sales contracts, accounts receivable, bills of sale, chattel mortgages, bills of exchange and other obligations representing part or all of the sales price of merchandise or services". Secondly, the important exemption clause inserted by the Senate as clause 2(3) in Bill S-17 provided that notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraph (ii) of paragraph (g) the companies set out should be deemed not to be investment companies for the purposes of the act. Bill C-3 has inserted into the provision the qualification, unless the company is incorporated after the coming into force of the act, "primarily for the purpose of carrying on the business of investment." I suppose this might be deemed to be supercaution on the part of the drafters of Bill C-179, now Bill C-3, to ensure that the exemption does not apply to a company incorporated after the coming into force of the act.

Let me come to a much more important reservation. The House will recall that I mentioned that the original form of Bill S-17 gave the Governor in Council power to make regulations. The phraseology was such as to prevent any regulation being considered ultra vires. I recall the great consternation and indignation that arose in the other place in respect of the Governor in Council arrogating unto itself, by that inclusion in the bill, a total exemption and the fact that any regulation that might pass should not even be attacked as being ultra vires. This was something unheard of. To their credit, the members of the other place threw out that provision. However in the redrafting of Bill C-179, and carried into Bill C-3, we find these words in clause 32:

> The Governor in Council may make regulations to ensure the proper carrying out of the provisions of this act.

I intend at the appropriate time in committee to move the deletion of the word "proper" because—I put this question to the members of the House—is it for the Governor in Council, or for the courts, to determine whether a regulation is proper to the carrying out of the act? The Governor in Council has no authority, or should

have no authority, to determine that the regulations it passes are proper. It should not have the right to make that decision. The decision remains under the authority of this House and is granted to the Governor in Council. Whether it is proper or improper shall be determined by the courts and not by the Governor in Council.

One strange provision I find in the bill is the same as one I find in the amendments to the Canada Corporations Act. That is the view that the services provided by the government with regard to this sort of policy of "big brotherism" shall be paid for by the industry concerned. We evidenced in Bill C-4 during the last session the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) insisting that the expenditures of his department in looking after the activities of corporations into which there were investigations could be recovered from the companies through the power to apportion these expenses. This is similar, I suppose, to the Department of Justice saying that in the administration of justice a criminal should have to pay for the cost of investigating the offence with which he is charged and of which he may be convicted.

In this instance the administrative and all other expenses incurred in connection with the act shall be pooled. This starts with clause 28. We see the development of a formula by which each investment company would be charged pro rata, depending upon its mean assets. Investment companies are not all of the same nature. Many manufacturing and other types of commercial concerns with substantial investment portfolios which might bring them within the terms of the act in regard to investment companies would be assessed on the basis of total assets, a substantial part over which the Superintendent of Insurance would have no jurisdiction; yet that was the proposal.

• (8:40 p.m.)

There are provisions whereby investigations can be made, and so on. I suppose a company could legitimately say it had to incur expenses in counteracting the investigation of the Superintendent of Insurance. Mr. Speaker, subject to what we will be able to uncover at the time of the proceedings before the committee, the power given the Superintendent of Insurance with regard to these companies is indeed extensive. Any company that is forced, shall we say, to engage counsel or to undertake certain expenditures with regard to the investigation made concerning its affairs in so far as they are affected by the provisions of this act, probably should be able to recover those expenditures from the Crown. But oh, no! The Crown does not believe in a two-way street; it is all one way. Again, this is a point which I give notice I shall raise in order to see that there is fairer play.

There is another matter to which I think the individuals concerned with the preparation of this legislation failed to give any consideration. I refer to the provision that on an investment company's letters patent there shall be a notation that the company is subject to the Investment Companies Act and the restrictions contained therein. When one considers this provision, one can immediately see that if a company is going into a market—particularly the foreign market—to raise funds, potential investors may be driven away.

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

Again, I shall want a very full explanation as to why this should be the case. Is this to be another form of constrained company? There may be a restriction concerning the share ownership, but if this is to happen it must be clearly indicated that the company is only constrained in respect of the degree of foreign ownership of its shares, and that there are no other restrictions. There is also a requirement that the disposition of the assets or any part of the assets may require the minister's permission. Again I ask, has the minister become the senior partner of all investment companies? To what extent is this "big brotherism" to go?

I have already mentioned that the lender of last resort facilities of the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation were designed for one purpose only, which was to protect the deposits of people who had money on deposit with chartered banks, trust companies and other concerns which took moneys on deposit under the terms of the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation Act. But now we see the lender of last resort provisions being made available to sales finance companies which do not take money on deposit. They sell obligations to the public; they do not take money on deposit.

I have read some sections in respect of the previous argument, whereby the Minister of Finance is specifically authorized to recommend the advancing out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of a special loan account. He is also authorized to recommend the payment to the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation of losses that may be incurred by the non-repayment of these last resort loans or any portion thereof. This is entirely new business that is being tacked on to the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation.

There is one last point I should like to make. I am sorry the Superintendent of Insurance has left his position in the official gallery. I am also sorry the Minister of Finance is not here, because as a result of the provisions of this bill and the requirement placed upon the Superintendent of Insurance, I think this very esteemed office and its distinguished holder will be placed in a very invidious position. There is a massive conflict of interest as a result of the provisions of this legislation and the provisions of the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation Act.

We all know that one of the key officials in the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation is the Superintendent of Insurance, because it is his officials who examine the records of trust and other near bank companies. It is the Superintendent of Insurance who makes the actual recommendations concerning the financial condition of any corporation that is a participant in the Canada Deposit Insurance fund. Therefore, as a key official of the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Superintendent of Insurance has an important voice in the approval or otherwise of any application for a loan under clause 16.

One might say: What is wrong with that? But if one reads the legislation carefully and starts with clause 22 and goes through to clause 25, one sees that this self-same Superintendent of Insurance is the policeman dealing with investment companies. He is the sole person authorized to investigate, to make recommendations to

the Minister of Finance and to recommend the withholding of certificates of registry as required under the act. In other words, if there is any one official who has the right to blow the whistle on an investment company, it is the Superintendent of Insurance.

But let us assume there is a sales finance company or other investment company subject to the provisions of the act which finds itself in difficulty and its affairs are examined by the Superintendent of Insurance. He recommends against issuing a certificate of registry, he recommends other restrictions on the operations of the company or that he be placed in charge of the assets of the company, as he could and probably would be. In other words, he becomes a trustee of the assets of the company for the benefit of the shareholders and the investors in the obligations of the company. Then the directors of the company, in order to carry on business, come to the Deposit Insurance Corporation for a loan; and whom do they see on the other side of the table but the Superintendent of Insurance? In other words, not only does he act as investigator and as prosecutor, but he must sit as judge as well.

• (8:50 p.m.)

This is the end result of this tacking on of what I would say is a legitimate proposition of protecting the ownership of sales finance companies and also trying to save some shareholders and investors from certain types of, shall we say, financial imprudence rather than perhaps dishonesty on the part of officials of finance companies. But what are we asked to do? We are urged to create a Frankenstein.

The more I read this bill, the more I am appalled at the thinking that this is correct, that this represents the right procedures. I can just imagine the reaction of any hon. member, were he a director of a sales or investment company that found itself in difficulty. He would have to deal with the Superintendent of Insurance, see the assets ordered to be seized or placed under the tutelage of the Superintendent of Insurance and then, making a real effort to bail out the operation he would have to undertake to pay the most Shylock-like terms, only to find that the grantor of the loan on the other side of the table is no one but the Superintendent of Insurance. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the occupant of that office would have to have qualities absolutely beyond those of any archangel.

I have criticized this bill. There are parts of it which I would like to see enacted but which I believe are wrong in their application. I suggested that the bill is deficient in that it fails to provide for the authority of this House, and I will not have the objections I raised on a point of order dismissed as technicalities. The government is asking this House for authority to be granted to it, the servant of this House—not the master, but the servant—to spend moneys which the Constitution does not give the Governor in Council the right to do. In other words, if the recommendation is deficient the cabinet are saying, "We will patch it up. We will do a little papering-over job and that will be right." But, Mr. Speaker, this bill was given first reading and only then did we see this recommendation.

In actual fact, sir, this is a debate without prejudice, but I will renew my caveat and my objections. I want to see the appropriate recommendation accompany the bill, and not this slipshod work. It is terrible work on the part of someone, to bring in the bill with this type of recommendation. It is an affront, actually, to the authority of this House and for that reason I am so insistent upon the matter.

Depending upon what the government does with regard to the recommendation, I certainly am withholding my consent to any second reading on this occasion. As a matter of fact, I have not quite made up my mind whether I will support second reading of the bill. Frankly, there are certain things about it that appeal to me, but on the other hand I do not think the finance committee is the place to take sloppily-prepared bills and try to dress them up as we had to do with the Canada Corporations Act, which also was Frankenstein-like, prepared by people who did not know where they were heading. Yet the minister has had the effrontery to say that the House should consider this legislation quickly and get on with the job. I recommend to the House that we give this legislation extremely careful examination before we even think of consenting to it.

Mr. P. M. Mahoney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the question on second reading of this bill will be deferred until Your Honour has an opportunity to deal with the procedural objections raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert). I would submit that when Your Honour does have the opportunity to consider the very learned and detailed argument that was presented to us by the hon. member, you will agree that His Excellency's recommendation cannot possibly deal with all the details of the expenditure of public funds that a public bill of this nature must encompass, and that the recommendation appended to this bill does cover in fact, in spirit and in law what is required.

I would be the last to dismiss as technicalities the objections raised by the hon. member. I think they were important objections. They were objections that in substance were raised and dealt with last year in this chamber during debate on the former legislation which, regrettably, did not proceed beyond the committee to which it was referred. Nevertheless, I think that the recommendation does deal with the essentials of the bill.

As the hon. member and indeed the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) before him, indicated, this is the third time this bill, in its essential features, has come before us. We have had a comprehensive historical survey of its legislative history. I do not care to editorialize further on that matter except to say that people who have been the victims of lack of control in this particular area of financial institutions may wonder why three years after such a bill was introduced we have not yet disposed of it in Parliament.

The hon. member for Edmonton West has raised a number of specific details and I think some of them are very important. The hon. member has objected to the concept that under the bill the auditors appointed with

the approval of the minister will report to the government and not to their clients, the finance companies which are paying them. This, of course, is consistent with the practice extant under the Bank Act. In section 63(8) of that act, as well as in other acts, this procedure has been adopted in dealing with key financial institutions.

The hon. member has applied such terminology as "Shylock-type of terms" and "parsimonious conditions" to the Crown's position as lender of last resort under the proposed legislation. Mr. Speaker, the Crown's position in this area is precisely that of lender of last resort. It is in no way attempting to compete with more conventional or usual sources of financing for this type of company. The legislation is deliberately drafted in such a way that recourse to the treasury for financial support will indeed be a last resort. We are not inviting them to come to us, but we are saying that if we ask them to remain Canadian-owned finance companies we have an obligation to offer them an ultimate source of financing if all else fails.

• (9:00 p.m.)

We cannot ask the owners of these companies to commit themselves to continuing to retain the companies in Canadian hands without, at the same time, offering them a market of which they can avail themselves should other sources of financing fail. So I reject very definitely the rather colourful language of the hon. member for Edmonton West. Nothing is built into the provisions dealing with lender of last resort other than a very distinct bias to discourage companies from availing themselves of it.

The hon. member raised a question about the provision in clause 32 of the bill under which the Governor in Council will make regulations to ensure the proper carrying out of the provisions of the act. I am not entirely sure of his objection to that particular provision. There is certainly no suggestion in the provision that Parliament or the Governor in Council is usurping the proper function of the courts in determining the legality of the regulations. However, the provision is essentially the same as that which appeared in clause 21 of original Bill S-17. Again, this is an area in respect of which I must reject any suggestion of unusual conduct on the part of the government.

The hon. member made a great deal of the point that the services provided under this act by the Superintendent of Insurance would be paid for by the industries concerned. This, again, is consistent in principle with the practice followed in relation to the supervision of insurance companies, the supervision of trust companies, the supervision of loan companies and the supervision of banks. It seems rather mysterious to me that the hon. member should choose to make an exception in the case of finance companies. In all cases which I have cited, the expenses incurred in carrying out the supervisory functions are assessed against the companies concerned. The government, in proposing the bill in this particular fashion, intends to treat these organizations consistently with other financial organizations.

The hon. member also made much of the proposition that the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation was being used as a lender of last resort. The bill makes it very clear that the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation is to treat its operations under this act as entirely separate from its other functions. We have a situation here where we have an appropriate agency under the government which can deal with the matter in question, and certainly it is proposed that it do so. There is no conflict of interest, nor is there any dilution of the funds for which the Canada Development Insurance Corporation was created, or any threat to its other activities. This is a separate and entirely distinct operation which it will be conducting. It is an appropriate agency and, indeed, I think a rather practical and economical use of existing facilities by the Crown.

Finally, the hon. member suggested that the Superintendent of Insurance will be in a position of having a conflict of interest under the bill because on the one hand he will be supervising other financial agencies and institutions and regulating finance companies, and in another function he will be the man to whom they will apply for loans of last resort. Again, I reject entirely the proposition that the Superintendent of Insurance will be in an invidious position in this regard.

The hon. member has raised very interesting problems. They are certainly problems that the committee, on which he and I have served for a period of time in rather onerous circumstances, will have the opportunity to explore. I know that I, and I am sure the government, value the opinions and suggestions of the hon. member. We will await with considerable interest the opportunity in committee to explore the propositions that he has put forward. However, it has been said before that this bill is before Parliament for the third time. It is a very important area of financial activity in Canada which I can say, without going into the lurid and well-publicized details, is demonstrably in great need of regulation and of responsible control. I would urge the House, as soon as the procedural problems are disposed of, to very quickly refer the bill to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs for its detailed study and report.

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, I move that we adjourn the debate until later this day, and proceed with the next order of business.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a minor point of order. Since the minister has already spoken, should not someone else move the adjournment of the debate?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member has a good point.

Mr. Greene: In response to my hon. friend's suggestion, I am pleased to move the adjournment of the debate until later this date.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Motion agreed to.

EMERGENCY GOLD MINING ASSISTANCE ACT

AMENDMENT EXTENDING APPLICATION TO JUNE 30, 1973

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources) moved that Bill C-4, to amend the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the federal government has provided assistance to the gold mining industry since 1948 under the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act. The economic position of the gold mines had deteriorated because of rising costs of labour and materials and a fixed price for gold. The assistance was given in order to minimize the social and economic dislocations in the gold mining communities which would follow the abrupt closure of most of the gold mines. These conditions have persisted and the operation of the act has been renewed successively for short terms. The current extension of the act, which was approved by Parliament in 1967 for a period of three years, expires on December 31, 1970.

Delegations representing the gold mining communities and mining associations have presented to me their concern over the effect which termination of the act would have on the gold mining communities. I wish to thank those organizations for their interest and for the views which they have expressed. The government has also had the benefit of the findings of an interdepartmental study group which examined the problem at some length.

It is clear that many of the gold mining communities are dependent for their principal economic support from the gold mines. The majority of the gold mines are dependent on the financial assistance which they receive under the act. Only a few of the 28 lode gold mines now in operation could continue in production without the benefit of the assistance.

A substantial decline in the gold mining industry has occurred in recent years. The number of operating lode gold mines of significance has dropped from 87 in 1948 to 55 in 1960, and to 28 in 1970. The number employed in the industry has been reduced from 22,566 in 1948, to 16,542 in 1960 and to 7,352 in 1970. In addition to the 7,000 gold mine employees, there are some 5,500 other employees in the gold mining communities who are directly dependent to some extent on the gold mines.

• (9:10 p.m.)

Gold mines, to be eligible for assistance, must produce gold having a value which is 70 per cent or more of total value of the output of the mine. Consequently, the gold produced as a by-product by base metal mines is not eligible for assistance. The amount of assistance payable to a gold mine operator is based on the number of ounces produced in a calendar year and the average cost of production per ounce. Only gold sold to the Royal Canadian Mint is eligible for assistance. However, the average cost of production is determined using all ounces of gold produced by the mine, whether or not it was sold to the Mint.

Mines having an average cost of production of $26.50 per ounce or less do not receive assistance. There is only one gold mine in Canada now which has an average cost of production of less than $26.50 per ounce. The rate of assistance increases as the average cost per ounce increases over $26.50 until a maximum rate is reached when the average cost per ounce amounts to $45. The maximum rate of assistance payable on all eligible ounces is $10.27 per ounce. The financial support which the government has provided since the inception of the act has been substantial. A total of $281 million has been paid to gold mine operators from 1948 to September 30, 1970.

Hon. members may have noted the amounts of assistance which have been paid annually, in the Report on the Administration of the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act for the fiscal period ending March 31, 1970, which was tabled in the House on October 15, 1970. The assistance paid with respect to the calendar year 1966 amounted to $15.3 million, for 1967, $15.0 million and for 1968, $13.5 million. Payments for the year 1969 are estimated at $13.5 million. The reduction in assistance payable in 1968 and 1969 was in part due to the sale of a part of the production of some mine operators on the open market to obtain the benefit of the high open market price during those years. With a continuation of the act, it is estimated that the assistance payable in each of the years 1970, 1971 and 1972 will amount to approximately $14.0 million.

Notwithstanding a continuation of assistance, it is anticipated that rising costs and the depletion of ore reserves will result in the closure of more gold mines. Three mines ceased operations in 1970 and one or two more have indicated that they may close within the next few months. Termination of the act would result in the abrupt closure of a majority of the gold mines.

Substantial adjustments face the gold mining communities in view of the continuing decline of the gold mining industry. Consideration has been given to the possibility of increasing the level of assistance under the act as a means of assisting the gold mining communities. However, a change in the level of assistance which would reverse the present trend in the industry or have any significant effect would be extremely costly.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the most appropriate policy for the government to follow, in providing aid to the gold mining communities, is to continue assisting gold mine operators under the act at the present level, to apply the benefits of existing federal social aid programs to persons displaced by gold mine closures and to examine the practicability of other avenues of potential economic support for the gold mining communities. Extension of the act will permit a gradual adjustment of the gold mining communities to diminishing economic support.

For those persons affected by mine closures, help is available through the federal programs of training and mobility for those who seek new employment, and through unemployment insurance and welfare programs.

Alternative sources of employment in the gold mining communities are limited. Additional employment opportunities may be developed in the long term through the discovery of new, viable mineral deposits and through a broad industrial promotion program.

Assistance is provided by my department to mineral development programs through the dissemination of geoscientific information. The recently enacted Regional Development Incentives Act, enhanced by a broad industrial promotion program, might produce additional employment opportunities. The program would involve investigation of the industrial opportunities for the main gold-belt region and the co-ordination of current federal and provincial programs. However, even if such programs are successful in establishing new enterprises, they should not be expected to provide employment opportunities for the majority of the displaced gold miners, although they might help maintain the gold mining communities at lower levels of economic activity in the long term.

It is my view that a full share of the responsibility for aiding in the adjustment of the gold mining communities should be accepted by the provinces concerned, by the gold mine operators and the labour unions and by the municipalities themselves. The government has decided, therefore, to seek authority from Parliament to extend the application of the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act for a period of 2½ years to June 30, 1973, without change in the method of computing the amount of assistance payable to a gold mine operator.

The date of June 30 has been selected in preference to December 31 so that when the act is finally terminated it will occur at the end of the school year and during the summer season. The government is prepared to consider a further extension of the act beyond June 30, 1973, provided satisfactory arrangements can be made to have the other interested parties participate fully in aiding the gold mining communities to adjust to the changing circumstances. The government is examining the possibilities of developing such arrangements.

On August 7, I announced the intention of the government to extend the act in order to end the uncertainty of the gold mining communities with respect to their immediate economic prospects. The Bill which is before the House not only provides for the extension of the act to June 30, 1973, but also introduces certain requirements to be observed by gold mine operators. Clause 2 of the bill prohibits the payment of assistance to lode gold mines which were not in production at the time of my announcement on August 7, 1970. It would not appear to be in the public interest to encourage the development of new or dormant gold mines which are dependent upon assistance payments from the outset.

Clause 3 of the bill provides, as a condition of receiving assistance after December 31, 1970, that operators of lode gold mines will be required to conduct the hiring of all employees through the facilities administered by the Department of Manpower and Immigration, to give written notice of the closure of a gold mine at least four months before the mine ceases production, and to retain, immediately after notice of closure is given, the services of the Department of Manpower and Immigration to assist in finding employment for the displaced employees. The purpose of these requirements is to provide gold mine employees displaced by mine closures with as much assistance as possible in their readjustment. The provisions of clauses 2 and 3 do not apply to placer gold mines, which are few in number and operate on a seasonal basis. Only ten placer gold mines, employing less than 50 persons, applied for assistance under the act for the year 1969.

[Mr. Greene.]

• (9:20 p.m.)

It is my belief that the provisions of this bill offer a major contribution to the alleviation of the special economic and social problems confronting the gold mining communities, and I hope that our consultations with the provinces, municipalities, gold mine operators and labour unions will result in new avenues to attack the problems of the gold mining communities.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, once again Parliament is being asked to extend the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act. There has been an "emergency" in this regard for 24 years, just like the temporary buildings in Ottawa many of which were built at about the same time or even before the act was proclaimed. These emergency pieces of legislation are always with us. The minister has not given very much hope this evening that the situation of the gold mining communities will improve. In fact, the whole tenor of his remarks was that we will see the gold mining industry disappear very shortly.

This matter was also dealt with on September 29, 1967. At that time another minister of the department introduced the act. I made a lengthy address at that time, which I do not intend to repeat tonight; but I believe the remarks I made then are just as applicable now. Apparently there is very little hope of saving the gold mining communities on a permanent basis. The whole purpose of this act is to let the communities and the people down slowly and keep hoping that something will happen before the next occasion on which the act has to be renewed. The minister gently prepared us tonight for the next renewal. He stated this renewal will continue until June, 1973, at which time he will consider a further extension. This is a very unusual and unfortunate situation.

I intend to make only a few remarks on the bill. In many ways the situation in the gold mining communities is worse now than it was in 1967. The unpegging of the Canadian dollar this year has hurt the gold mining industry even more. The world price of gold—as we are all aware—is based upon the American dollar, at $35 an ounce. It has been that way for a long time. As the Canadian dollar moves upward, the mines receive less for their production. The action of the government in permitting the dollar to be freed earlier this year has had many unexpected effects. One is that the gold mining situation and the price of gold is worse rather than better.

One of the reasons gold mining communities and the gold mining industries have not received any increase in the subsidy this year—and this has always been questionable—is that we are at the present time in fact paying 6 per cent or 7 per cent more because of the increase in value. The situation, therefore, is worse because of the unpegging of the dollar. Some of the gold mines in northwest Quebec and northern Ontario, particularly those in northeastern Ontario, are troubled by rising costs. This naturally results from the inflationary trends we have had and by progressively lowering the grade of ore being mined.

It seems that everything that is happening is slanted against the existence of these communities. It is making it more and more difficult for Parliament to renew this subsidy into the indefinite future. However, we must recognize that people as well as money are involved in this problem. According to figures presented by the industry in a brief to the government, there are approximately 6,500 employees in the gold mining industry. Their direct dependents number 15,500. This totals over 22,000 people dependent upon these mines being kept open and operating at least on a part-time basis.

Some communities are dependent upon the continuation of subsidies until such time as an alternative should arise. It is very difficult to retrain people who have always worked in the gold mining industry. It is even more difficult to uproot them from their homes and force them to move elsewhere. The people who are in these 16 communities are settled with homes, schools and families. It is in the interest of this nation that these communities be assisted to remain viable and active. We hope the government will develop a plan for the future of these communities.

I should mention a situation that has developed since the last renewal in 1967. I refer to the good progress of the plan for development of the mid-Canada corridor which has been under active study for over a year and a half. It was originated by Richard Rohmer of Toronto. I was present at a well attended meeting at Thunder Bay in the summer of 1969. It was in fact opened and addressed by His Excellency the Governor General. He extended his best wishes for the success of the venture.

It is hoped that development of this kind will be successful and that the idea will be brought to fruition. It is the hope of many of the people in the mid-Canada development corridor that somebody, somewhere—government, industry or a group of private people—will come up with a plan to save the many mid-Canada communities which are now faced with difficult times. While this situation exists, the gold mining communities must be kept alive and support given to those citizens who have sufficient community spirit to keep them going. During the debate which took place in 1967 I expressed the hope that the government could find an alternative plan for these communities other than the handing over of straight subsidies. It was my hope that mining for other minerals could be developed so that new industries could be established. In some cases, in small ways, the situation has improved since then but the situation now is not one which makes us feel a solution is likely in the near future.

• (9:30 p.m.)

As I said, it is truly a travesty of the English language to continue calling this legislation the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act after 24 years. It is surely the responsibility of the government to provide an alternative for the communities concerned. I know that in some instances the Department of Regional Economic Expansion has provided incentives for industry to locate in these areas. Sometimes it has been successful, but it has come nowhere near offsetting the decline in the gold mining industry.

In these difficult circumstances, Parliament is once a gain asked to approve the continuation of a subsidy from the public purse. I think we are bound to question this policy. We can make suggestions for a better application of the subsidy and the setting of some rules along the lines of those the minister announced tonight; we can sympathize with the people and the communities concerned, but we need to look at the whole question very closely.

In August of this year, shortly after the government had announced its intention to extend the provisions of the act for a further period an article appeared in the Winnipeg *Free Press,* written by Maurice Western, a well-known member of the parliamentary press Gallery, entitled "Golden Subsidies". Mr. Western took the occasion to wonder why Parliament persisted in treating the extension of this act as a routine matter worthy of nothing more than superficial debate. He also drew attention to several other factors affecting the gold mining community, including the fact that the International Monetary Fund had developed so-called paper gold, or special drawing rights, the effect of which was further to erode the value of gold as a commodity connected with international currency. The article is, in a sense, a protest on behalf of the Canadian taxpayers against the continuation of a subsidy without apparent end. I agree there is a basis for this element of criticism and this is why the subject deserves our close attention.

In the end, though, we have been offered no alternatives; none have been developed since the last extention of the act three years ago. In these circumstances we can do nothing, I believe, except protest that the government should have made alternative plans. We must call attention to the fact that this is a continuing subsidy, but we must also let the industry and its dependents down as slowly as possible.

I believe the conditions the minister applied to the present extension represent a further tightening of the grip upon the gold mining community and foreshadow the eventual closing down of operations. It is significant that the minister should have mentioned June 30, the end of the school year, as the termination date. It is a chilling forecast that many families a few years from now are likely to be uprooted and move from the communities in which they now live.

Today we have no alternative but to support the extension of the act as requested by the minister. I believe it is in the interest of the country, on balance, to keep these communities alive and to keep the people in their homes.

It is in our interest now to keep the industry operating in the interim while we continue to hope for the development of policies which will maintain the mid-north and improve it. For that reason, on behalf of the official opposition I support the motion for second reading.

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to speak briefly on this bill which extends the provisions of the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act. Last year, when delegations came from the mining areas to the House of Commons I met members of the delegations, along with others, and heard their views about what should be done. I might say at the outset that I believe the bill which the minister has brought down for second reading this evening should receive the endorsement of the House. I realize that it means subsidizing the gold mining industry, but other factors are involved. Both speakers who preceded me have called attention to the number of jobs at stake, and this is something we cannot overlook, particularly at the present time.

• (9:40 p.m.)

I come from a mining district. While gold is not one of the major metals produced in my area, nevertheless I know what it means for mines slowly to become worked out. Once the mineral in the ground becomes exhausted, or once operations have reached the stage where mining no longer becomes profitable, a gradual decay in the community sets in until in effect it becomes a ghost town.

The thing that worries me about the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act is that when the legislation was first introduced, I believe in 1948, the government of the day knew it was only a matter of time before the gold mining communities would reach the point where even subsidy would not keep them alive. We had hoped that plans would have been made under the Industrial Development Incentives Act to bring new industry to these mining communities. This is essential to the continuation of the municipalities established in these area.

I should like to point out to the House that while many people feel that a continuation of the subsidy might not be warranted, I think it has slowed down the decline of the gold mining industry throughout Canada. As a result, both the government and the small municipalities in these mining areas have been given some opportunity, an opportunity that I do not think has been fully exploited, to try to locate new industries in their areas. I presume that last year every member of the House received a copy of the brief entitled "Submission to the government of Canada on behalf of Canada's gold mining communities by the National Gold Study Committee". Some very interesting information was contained in this brief which I believe can and should be used by hon. members to support this legislation. The minister has indicated that the new subsidy is to be continued until June 1973, which gives us another 2½ years to study the situation in the areas affected and, I hope, to devise on an increasing scale some plans to bring relief to these communities through the provision of new jobs.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to some of the interesting information contained in the brief. The brief points out that many gold miners are in the older age groups. Figures I have taken from the brief indicate that over 50 per cent of the miners presently employed are 45 years of age or older, which indicates that not too many young men are exploring job opportunities in the gold mining industry. Another very interesting fact contained in the brief is that 75 per cent of the miners have had less than 10 years' education. The brief goes on to point out that it would be very difficult to effectively retrain many miners in that age group. Although they could be retrained, people in an advanced age group like this, with limited education, really present a problem.

The brief also clearly indicates that since many miners in these areas own their own homes, if mines were to close down they would be unable to move out of the district to set up a home somewhere else. First of all, there would be the difficulty of a gold miner finding a job in another area. Secondly, his lack of training in other fields would make it extremely difficult to get other work. In other words, when mines close down many of the residents would remain in the immediate area and would have to receive assistance of some kind from the municipal, the provincial or the federal government.

I think these points are an indication that this legislation must be endorsed. This assistance must be given for a further period of time. At the same time, the government must make every effort to make certain that in the areas affected some type of new industry will be established within the next two or three years. I realize some mines will close down and there will be a loss of population in the area, but this should not stop the government making every effort to ensure that alternate sources of employment are found, something that will keep the younger people in the area and enable the municipalities to continue to thrive and to grow.

I do not need to say much more, Mr. Speaker. I am convinced that once the bill has gone to committee and is sent back to the House, an opportunity will be given for further debate. I also understand the government would like to bring back, for a few more minutes' debate prior to the adjournment of the House, the investment bill which the House was debating earlier.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of this debate. By unanimous consent, I would ask permission to present another recommendation from His Excellency the Governor General in respect to Bill C-3, an act respecting investment companies, which if the House so permits I will now read.

• (9:50 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps we should first determine whether there is unanimous agreement to adjourn the debate now before the House.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Finance seeks the agreement of the House to present a revised recommendation in connection with Bill C-3. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

INVESTMENT COMPANIES BILL

FILING OF STATEMENTS AND INFORMATION, QUALIFICATIONS AND DUTIES OF AUDITORS, TRANSFER OF SHARES, ETC.

The House resumed consideration on the following order:

Second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs of Bill C-3, respecting investment companies—the Minister of Finance.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the revised recommendation is as follows:

His Excellency the Governor General recommends to the House of Commons a measure respecting investment companies; to provide for the supervision and registration thereof and the prohibition of certain loans and investments thereby; to provide for restrictions on the transferability of shares of certain investment companies to be known as sales finance companies and for loans to such companies by the Canada Deposit Insurance Corporation out of funds advanced out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund; to provide for reimbursement of the corporation out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund for losses sustained in respect of any such loans and for the establishment by the corporation of a special account in the Bank of Canada to which shall be credited revenues derived from such loans and to which shall be charged certain expenditures of the corporation mentioned in the said measure; to provide for assessments of investment companies by the Superintendent of Insurance to cover costs incurred by him in the administration of the act and further to make certain provisions in connection with the administration of the act.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that this resolution is couched in exactly the same terms as the previous resolution.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): "Recommendation."

Mr. Benson: Yes, the previous recommendation; pardon me. I also understand that the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave) wishes to make a few comments on this matter, at which time we might consider second reading.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Before my colleague takes the floor, Mr. Speaker, I hope the minister can assure the House that all appropriate steps have been taken, in the regular manner, to obtain the recommendation from His Excellency and that everything is in order.

Mr. Benson: I would assure the House that this is the case, although rather hurriedly after the urging of the hon. member.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Is it in the Governor General's own hand?

Mr. Benson: The signature is.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. If we are to return to this order, I suggest the Clerk call the Order and then the Chair will recognize the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave).

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance) moved that Bill C-3, respecting investment companies, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

Investment Companies Bill

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, earlier today at 10 minutes to 5 I had the opportunity to share ten minutes with the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) and the bill under discussion was read the second time and sent to the committee. Now I see that the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) and myself are to be given an even greater challenge. We have only five minutes before, presumably, the same thing will occur in respect of this bill. This can be done, and I hope I will give him his full 2½ minutes. I will do my best, anyway.

Instead of making a speech I should like to present five questions for his consideration and for the consideration of Mr. Humphrys, the Superintendent of Insurance. Of course, I ask for the answers when the committee deals with the measure.

The first question concerns the power in clause 15 which provides that no sale or disposal of the whole or any part of the undertaking of a sales finance company is to be of any effect unless and until the minister approves. I suggest, sir, that we must ask whether this is not a rather extreme power for the purpose of keeping Canadian control over sales finance companies.

The second question would arise from the area of the bill—and it is a large bill, with 43 pages—dealing with loans to sales finance companies. This matter refers to a company that is backed into a corner and needs federal help to get itself out. It also involves the question of the powers that are given the Superintendent of Insurance in the face of this undoubted fact, that never as far as anybody can recall did a federally-incorporated company go down the drain. This whole area of power will lead to questions as to whether this part of the bill is an exercise in remedial legislation, or whether it is simply an exercise in staking-out or acquiring greater governmental power.

The third question, which is vital to the philosophy of the bill, is: Should Canadian companies, or the public, be put in the position of insuring consumer loans by sales finance companies? After all, it will be pretty hard to persuade "Joe Lunch-pail" that he has to put his might and strength behind a company which may be making rather large profits. Does this problem not fit exactly into the recommendations of the Porter commission? My fourth question, Mr. Speaker, is in connection with information obtained under the act. It is our suggestion that this information be privileged. There are precedents we can point to in the Statistics Act and the Corporations and Labour Unions Returns Act.

In the final ten seconds left to me I should like to refer to the position wherein an employee might leave the government's employ and be in possession of rather sensitive information. It is our suggestion that where this takes place and an employee goes outside the public service to a place where the information could be of value, it could only be revealed after two or three years had elapsed since his employment in the public service.

Mr. Speaker: The minister will now close the debate.

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to say that all the questions raised by my hon. friend are interesting and of substance in regard to this legislation. I think they are very important points. I can assure him that when this bill is before the committee, the Superintendent of Insurance or myself will deal with them thoroughly. We are looking for good legislation which will protect the Canadian public and at the same time do the job that needs to be done to ensure investors of security of investments.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): On division.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

UNITED NATIONS—SOUTH AFRICA—CANADIAN ABSTENTION ON ARMS EMBARGO REGULATIONS—DECISION ON SPARE PARTS

Mr. Doug Rowland (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, three weeks ago I had the honour of attending the twenty-fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations as a parliamentary observer. During my stay at the United Nations the special political committee was presented with a resolution sponsored by a large number of lesser developed countries calling for compliance, on the part of all nations, with the Security Council resolution requesting an end to the shipment of arms to South Africa.

The resolution was moderately worded and really represented the absolute minimum in action that one could expect from nations opposed to the policies of apartheid in South Africa. It is no secret that some of the sponsoring countries were moved to ask Canada to act as a sponsor of the resolution. We were to my knowledge the only industrially advanced, predominantly white nation to be so approached. I consider that approach to be a compliment to this country. There were probably a number of reasons for the approach being made to Canada. There was the fact, for example, that under a previous administration Canada was instrumental in making South Africa's continued membership in the Commonwealth impossible, an act which I venture to say has had much to do with the Commonwealth continuing to exist as a multi-racial organization.

There was another reason—the fact that Canada has on numerous occasions verbally expressed its abhorrence of apartheid policies. Finally, and most importantly, there was the Prime Minister's (Mr. Trudeau) angry letter to the British government denouncing its intention to supply additional arms to South Africa. To our everlasting shame, not only did we not co-sponsor the resolution but we abstained on the vote on the resolution, on the explicit instructions of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp), as he informed the House in answer to my question. Our action, or rather our lack of it, could be viewed as nothing but the sheerest hypocrisy by other nations, in view of our previous statements and actions.

The reason given by the Canadian government for its refusal to, in effect, put its money where its mouth is, was that the cabinet had not yet reached a policy decision in respect of the continuation or termination of military spare parts' shipments to South Africa. But it is not as if this resolution was a total surprise to our government. The United Nations has been dealing with the situation in South Africa virtually since the inception of that organization. The question of South Africa is an annual item on the agenda of the special political committee. The Security Council passed resolutions calling upon all nations to cease shipment of arms to South Africa, twice in 1963, once in 1964 and again in July of this year.

• (10:00 p.m.)

This government has had ample time to decide upon its policy with regard to military spare parts' shipments to South Africa and has had ample notice that it would one day be called upon to demonstrate to the world whose side Canada is on. The truth is that this is simply one more example of the wœful unpreparedness of the government to deal with matters of substance in the field of external affairs.

It is not that the decision which the government is seemingly having so much trouble in reaching is so difficult. Even by the standards, if one can call them that, of the white paper on external affairs, the continued shipments of spare parts to South Africa cannot be considered to be in our national interest because they do not bring us much money and they risk permanently alienating approximately 250 million black Africans, not to mention countless millions of Asians, for the sake of the good will of a few million white South Africans. In the long term, where is the greatest potential for material gain? The answer is obvious.

I have used this argument with considerable reluctance, Mr. Speaker, because I do not consider it to be terribly relevant. However, I have used it because it might impress itself upon the minds of those minor league Machiavellians who are responsible for the White Paper. Surely the relevant consideration is that our military spare parts' shipments are of the type that significantly enhance the ability of the white South African régime to repress the black and coloured population of that country.

The government of the United Kingdom could at least argue that the equipment it planned to sell to South Africa is highly sophisticated and costly, of little or no use in the enforcement of apartheid. This argument may or may not impress one. It obviously did not impress the

Prime Minister, if his letter to Mr. Heath is anything to go by. But what can one say in defence of the fact that Canada keeps South Africa's 250 Harvard aircraft operational, aircraft which when equipped to carry 19-pound fragmentation bombs, as are the 100 on active service, are excellent counter-insurgency weapons. Indeed, they would be useless in any other role.

It now would seem that we are also supplying some jet engines for the now obsolete, except for counter-insurgency operations, F-86 aircraft in a move that would seem to be counter to the implicit guarantees contained in Senator Martin's speech at the time the United Nations first requested the embargo. There is no justification for the continuation of these shipments and I am appalled that the cabinet has been unable to reach the same, obvious conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, I dearly would have loved to employ this opportunity to discuss the broader implications of our policy toward South Africa, especially that of our total trade with and investment in that country. However, I have deliberately restricted myself to the narrower question of spare parts' shipments because I believe there is an open-and-shut case against these, and that the government could act and act rapidly to halt these shipments if it chose so to do.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Ouellet (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I find it regrettable that the hon. member for Selkirk should have asked that his question be debated tonight because I am not yet in a position to inform him of the cabinet's decision on spare parts.

Had he shown a little more patience and waited for a few more days, I could probably have made in this House the statement which he requested on October 13 last, as recorded in *Hansard* for that date. Unfortunately, the cabinet has not yet made its decision. However, that should not take too long and I should ask the hon. member to show the same patience as shown by the African and Asian delegations to the United Nations, following the explanations given for our abstention.

[*English*]

The Canadian delegation studied with the greatest of care the text of the resolution before them in the report of the special political committee. The Canadian government was fully in sympathy with the underlying principles of this resolution. However, the Canadian delegation had to abstain on the resolution because its very essence, c'est-à-dire, the implementation immediately of Security Council resolution 282, was then and still is under review by the Canadian government.

When resolution 282 was passed on July 23 of this year, the Canadian government immediately began the very full and careful consideration which a subject of this importance requires. The resolution presented no difficulties for Canada, with one exception. Canada has been applying a general embargo on arms to South Africa since 1963. There have been no lapses in this general embargo. May I point out that in the survey prepared by the distinguished rapporteur of the special committee on the policies of apartheid there was no indication to the contrary. However, Canada continued to furnish some spare parts for equipment which had been supplied to South Africa under contracts entered into before Security Council resolution 181 of August 7, 1963, was passed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. The time of the Parliamentary Secretary has expired. The Chair will now call upon the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart).

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—APPOINTMENT OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH CENTRE

Mr. Ralph Stewart (Cochrane): Mr. Speaker, today in the House I asked a question of the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) with respect to the International Development Research Centre. I wanted to know why he had not named a Member of Parliament to the board of governors in the recent announcement appointing the president and 19 members of that board. Clearly the act, which was passed in this House on February 20 of this year, under section 10 allows that one of the governors may be a Member of Parliament. In this instance, since it was already written into one of our statutes, this was a sterling opportunity to open the door to have representatives on the part of the people on agencies that come under the aegis of the government but enjoy a certain independence.

I wonder why the minister did not bother to say a word about the presence of a Member of Parliament on this board when he made the announcement. If he has decided to do this at a later date, we would all like to hear it. If he ignores it completely as something that is not even in the act, that is another question. I suggest it is too bad if that is the case, because then he would just be ignoring the wishes of this House.

This question is much larger than that of who is a member of the board of governors of the International Development Research Centre. We shall see over the next weeks a number of private members' bills which deal with this very subject of placing Members of Parliament on the boards of directors of various Crown corporations and agencies. I believe this is a question of fundamental principle, because the people of Canada who sent us here expect us to look after their affairs and report back to them; yet in these instances we are not able to tell them anything. We are not able to represent them properly, simply because these groups are completely independent of Parliament.

Even when we ask questions of the minister in this House, we are not able to get an answer because he tells us they are independent bodies. The basic principle of this problem is before us and I hope that many hon. members will avail themselves of the opportunity to speak on the subject over the next weeks. But in the meantime when one of the bills has this principle written into it, I am at a loss to understand why the minister did not include a Member of Parliament on the board and why he did not mention it.

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

• (10:10 p.m.)

Does he think that Members of Parliament are incapable of carrying out the task? Does he think that there perhaps is a conflict of interest? I suggest to him that the interest of the Canadian people is our business, and that that interest would best be served by having representatives of this House on bodies such as this board.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Ouellet (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think that what was said by the hon. member has a lot of merit on many counts and the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp), on February 20 last, had emphasized himself that there were a lot of good things in the suggestions which were made. However, he took that opportunity to raise a series of questions, at that time, about the role which should be played by a member of Parliament, should the government decide to appoint one to the Board of Governors and he mentioned what should be his responsibilities.

If I may, I should like to refer to the questions then raised by the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

I consider it my responsibility as a member of the government to raise certain fundamental questions and to express a view concerning the nature of the real relationship between Parliament and a government agency created by and, ultimately, answerable to Parliament. This question raises the subject of the responsibility and role of the minister and of the member of Parliament.

He said further and I quote:

The role of the member of Parliament on the Board of Governors is by no means clear and this uncertainty poses real difficulties for the MP himself, the Centre and the government. It has been suggested that the member of Parliament will be a channel of communication between the Centre and the Government and between the Centre and Parliament. Does this mean that the MP is, in fact, a full participant in the deliberations of the Board, sharing fully in its responsibilities while at the same time being the representative of Parliament responsible for informing Parliament on these activities? Is it to be left to his own judgment to decide what is confidential and what is not confidential?

This series of questions indicates clearly that the role must be clearly defined and that the government does not consider making such an appointment.

* * *

[*English*]

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—RETIRED EMPLOYEES' PENSIONS—ACTION TO IMPLEMENT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR INCREASE

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, on Friday, October 23, as recorded in *Hansard* at page 514, I put to the Minister of Transport the following question:

Is the minister yet in a position to report to the House on his discussions with the CNR concerning the increases in pensions by the Canadian National as recommended by a standing committee of this House and concurred in by the House itself?

[Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).]

The reply of the Minister of Transport was as follows:

No, Mr. Speaker. I am not at all certain whether it would be appropriate for me to report to the House regarding discussions between myself and officials of CNR. I can advise the hon. member that I have conveyed to the CNR officially the findings of the committee and the decision of the House. If there is anything subsequent to that which I can appropriately report I will, but I assume that this matter will emerge in the normal way through questioning before committees or in some other fashion.

There are few members of the cabinet for whom I have greater respect than I have for the Minister of Transport, but I say to him in all kindness that I do not think he can hide behind statements of that kind. The question of doing something about the pensions of retired employees of the CNR has been before Parliament for many years. In fact, it has been before us for decades. Some of us have seen to that. Finally, last spring, following the increases that were made in pensions of retired civil servants and in light of certain other developments, the government agreed to there being a study of this matter by the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications. That committee went into the whole matter of CN pensions very thoroughly and came up with what I regard as a very useful and significant report.

That report was passed by the committee on Wednesday, September 9, 1970, and was presented to the House by the chairman of that committee on Monday, October 5, 1970. Two days later, on Wednesday, October 7, the House on a motion duly made and seconded concurred unanimously in that report. In other words, that report represents the will of the House of Commons in this matter. It is a lengthy document. There is not time enough for me to read it tonight, but I should like to draw to the attention of the House what I regard as an important element in it. In one place in the recommendations the committee draws attention to what Parliament has done by way of escalating pensions under the Canada Pension Plan, the Old Age Security Act, and so on. It also draws attention to the action of Parliament in increasing the pensions of retired civil servants, not only on a current basis but also retroactively. Then it says this at page 36:14:

The committee strongly recommends that these principles be adopted on a broader basis and that other major employers, including Crown corporations, recognize their obligation to follow the lead of Parliament in this regard. The committee specifically recommends that the Canadian National Railways implement these principles forthwith.

I cannot say that I completely agree with the campaign on which my hon. friend for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart) is engaged, but I am giving him a piece of ammunition. Here we have Parliament expressing itself very clearly on an important issue, yet there seems to be nothing that Parliament can do except make a recommendation. We cannot say to Canadian National Railways, "This is what you shall do." Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the government, through the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) can come pretty close to this. The Minister of Transport could at least have a real heart-to-heart talk with the president of Canadian National Railways and find out why the Canadian National is not prepared to go along with this recommendation, if that is the case. I hope not.

Before we come to the point where we engage in tough kind of talk, and before there are confrontations and what have you, I believe we should have a clear statement from the Minister of Transport in the House as to the position of Canadian National Railways. Does the CNR accept this report as something with which it should go along? Does it agree that it, like the government, must do something to increase the pensions of its employees who have already retired; or does it regard all this as a scrap of paper that the committee worked at, which has no weight so far as the Canadian National is concerned.

This is a terribly important issue, Mr. Speaker. It is closely related to the question of the pensions of retired civil servants. It took us about 25 years to win that. I hope it will not take that long to win this one. Surely, since in this case we have spoken clearly through the unanimous report of a Standing Committee—that being a committee with members of all parties on it—and through the unanimous recommendation of the House of Commons, it is high time for the CNR to meet the will of Parliament in this regard. The Minister of Transport should either report to us that the CNR is going to do it, or he should tell us what the government is going to do about it.

• (10:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I would like first to reply to the member for Winnipeg North Centre and commend him for his continuing efforts in this House in order to secure higher pensions for CNR employees. In fact, there is no doubt that all hon. members would like to see the lot of CNR employees improve as soon as possible.

The hon. member is, however, very well informed on the recommendations of the Committee on Transport and Communications and is aware of the findings of this report which was concurred in by the House.

On October 23 last, the minister informed the hon. member that he had formally forwarded to the management of the Canadian National Railways the recommendations of the committee as well as the decision of this House, which had adopted the report. The normal procedure has therefore been followed and I do not see at this time what more could be done.

Undoubtedly we will have again the opportunity to discuss that question at the committee or elsewhere.

Eventually, the management of the Canadian National Railways will express their intentions or offer suggestions following the representations made to the hon. minister. We will then have the opportunity to study that question on its merit, and to resume discussion according to the circumstances, always bearing in mind the interests of those concerned.

Incidentally, I would like to point out to the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre that in my riding there are a great number of CNR employees and pensioners, and like all hon. members I am as anxious as he is to see that question dealt with fairly and equitably.

I cannot give any more particulars on that matter this evening, but I think that we should soon get more information after the representations made to the management of the Canadian National Railways by the Minister of Transport.

[*English*]

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.24 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, October 27, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SUPPLY MOTION—TIME LIMIT ON SPEECHES

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, it has been agreed by the various parties that in the debate on the business of supply motion that will be called on orders of the day speeches are to be limited to 30 minutes for the main speakers for the government and each of the opposition parties and that remaining speakers are to be limited to 15 minutes.

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): That is agreed, Mr. Speaker. I think there might be special consideration for the minister if he does not want to speak at the beginning of the debate. I suggest that he be allowed 30 minutes, but he would be, of course, the main spokesman for the government.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

NATIONAL SECURITY

INFORMATION LEADING TO INVOKING OF WAR MEASURES ACT

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: Smile.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I cannot imagine what that is all about.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: The Conservatives finally won an election.

An hon. Member: But they lost in Nova Scotia.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister whether it is true, as has been reported in the press, that the government invoked the War Measures Act because, among other reasons, it believed that a group of influential Quebeckers had set out to see whether they might supplant the legitimately elected provincial government of Quebec?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition might like to ask the question in other terms. He has asked the Prime Minister to confirm or deny the truth of a report. In those terms the question obviously is not in order. Perhaps it might be asked directly.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister whether the government invoked the War Measures Act because, among other reasons, it believed that a group of influential Quebeckers had set out to see whether they might supplant the legitimately elected government of the province of Quebec?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I gave in the House yesterday the reasons why the government invoked the War Measures Act and I also gave them last Friday. They are the same reasons, and among them is not included the reason alluded to by the hon. member.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister why he has not already and why he does not now clearly repudiate the story attributed to top level governmental sources, which can only have been calculated to damage the reputations of a number of influential Quebeckers who happen to be critical of the government of Canada?

Mr. Trudeau: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is rather strange that I have been called upon to deny this particular rumour when the hon. member knows that there have been many rumours circulating on this subject for the past many days. I do not know why the hon. member is particularly concerned with the government denying this one. It is not the habit of this government to deny or confirm any such rumours that happen to be circulating.

Mr. Stanfield: Not even in view of the people who are making the allegation?

SUBSTITUTE LEGISLATION FOR WAR MEASURES ACT REGULATIONS—PROVISION OF BILL TO PARTY LEADERS

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): I have a question for the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the special bill which will replace the War Measures Act has now been distributed to the Attorneys General of the various provinces, will it also be given to the leaders of the opposition parties in view of the fact they were asked for their suggestions?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I do not understand the nature of the representation, Mr. Speaker,

precisely because I asked for the suggestions of the leaders of the parties in the House. We have also asked for the suggestions of the provinces which will eventually be involved with the application of any such act. I do not see what the hon. member is suggesting beyond that.

Mr. Woolliams: I wonder if I could clarify my question, Mr. Speaker. The bill in question has already been distributed to the Attorneys General. The leaders of the various parties were also asked for suggestions. I ask the Prime Minister if he will make available to the leaders of the various opposition parties the bill in question so they can analyse it, look at it, study it and be informed?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I should have thought that the purpose of the opposition was to do precisely these things when a bill is brought into the House for first reading. Surely the hon. member is not suggesting that it should be discussed with the leaders of the opposition parties before the House is seized with the bill.

Mr. Hees: A supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South.

Mr. Lewis: It is not a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings.

WAR MEASURES ACT—WHEREABOUTS OF BERNARD LORTIE

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Can the Prime Minister advise the House and the country regarding the whereabouts of a 19-year-old Ottawa student, Bernard Fortie, who was detained by error? His location has not been revealed by either the Royal Canadian Mounted Police or the Quebec police.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): If the hon. member would get the name straight, I might be able to make inquiries.

Mr. Hees: Bernard Fortie.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Hees: A slight correction, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I suggest there should be a substantial correction.

Mr. Hees: The name is Lortie. The Prime Minister has had plenty of time to digest the question. Maybe he can now advise the House on this matter.

Mr. Trudeau: Now that the member knows who he is, we will try to find out where he is, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Hees: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, that is typical of the snide type of wisecrack the Prime Minister makes. The whereabouts of this young, 19-year-old student—

[Mr. Trudeau.]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for York South.

Mr. Hees: He couldn't care less!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That is debate rather than a point of order. The Chair has recognized the hon. member for York South.

WAR MEASURES ACT—NUMBER OF ARRESTS, RELEASES AND DETENTIONS—DYNAMITE, ARMS AND AMMUNITION RECOVERED

Mr. David Lewis (York South): My supplementary question would have been more appropriately addressed either to the Minister of Justice or the Solicitor General. In these circumstances I would have thought that one of the law ministers of the Crown would be here despite the roster.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: They are responsible for implementing the Act. Since neither minister is here, I ask the Prime Minister whether he can give the House a report on the latest information regarding the number of people arrested under the Public Order Regulations, the number released and the number still detained, because they are now detained under the 21-day extension?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The hon. member is wrong in his premise that one of the two ministers is responsible for the administration of this Act.

Mr. Lewis: May I remind the Prime Minister that I did not—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member should ask a supplementary. To remind the Prime Minister of something is debate. If the hon. member has a supplementary, he should ask it now.

Mr. Lewis: With great respect, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister suggested that I had a premise with which he disagreed. I merely want to say that I did not have that premise. I said "implementation", not "application".

Mr. Trudeau: Precisely.

Mr. Lewis: There is a difference. I ask the Prime Minister whether he has the most recent information which one of the other ministers might have had as to the number of arrests under the Public Order Regulations, the number released and the number still detained in jail.

Mr. Trudeau: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Compton.

Mr. Lewis: A supplementary question.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: Order. I apologize to the hon. member for Compton, but I believe the hon. member for York South would like to ask a supplementary question.

[*English*]

Mr. Lewis: I ask the Prime Minister whether he has any further information regarding the amount of dynamite, arms, ammunition and so forth recovered by the police in their numerous searches? I am not asking for the number of pounds. Has there been a substantial amount recovered or is the answer given by the Solicitor General a few days ago still correct, that there has not?

Mr. Trudeau: We know approximately the amount which has disappeared. I do not know what has been found as of today. The Solicitor General will give this answer in the House if he is asked.

WAR MEASURES ACT—CHARGES LAID—NUMBER HELD BEYOND SEVEN DAYS WITHOUT CHARGE

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether any charge has been laid against anyone arrested for commission of the new crime created by the regulations under the War Measures Act?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I have heard of none, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Stanfield: Would the Prime Minister or the Parliamentary Secretary ascertain whether any such charges have been laid and tell us the number of people involved? Could the right hon. gentleman ascertain at the same time how many persons have been held for longer than seven days at the request of the Minister of Justice of Quebec without a charge of any sort having been laid?

Mr. Trudeau: I will attempt to get this information for the House and have one of the law officers of the Crown answer. I can only say I hope it will be as much as possible the spirit of the Act that charges will be laid under the Criminal Code rather than under the War Measures Act, but here again I cannot speak for the province of Quebec which is entrusted with administering the Act.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FINANCE

REDUCTION OF BANK PRIME INTEREST RATE

Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary which I would like to direct to the Minister of Finance.

Has the Minister received a reply from Canadian banking institutions with regard to his request to reduce the prime rate, or preferential interest rate which these institutions charge their best customers?

[*English*]

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): No, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

HOUSING

ROCHDALE COLLEGE—SUGGESTED FORECLOSURE ON MORTGAGE BECAUSE OF CONDITIONS

Mr. S. Perry Ryan (Spadina): My question is directed to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for housing. Has the minister received a letter from city of Toronto Alderman Anthony O'Donahue asking that the mortgage on Rochdale College be foreclosed and that the building be taken over by the government on the grounds that it is a vertical flophouse and has been damaged to an extent estimated at $168,000?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member knows that it is not in order to ask simply whether a minister has received a letter.

Mr. Ryan: May I rephrase the question, then? In view of the alderman's charges that the college is a centre for promiscuity, drug-taking and drug-marketing, and that it is a launching pad for revolutionary groups, is the government prepared to get tough and correct this disgraceful situation?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): I indicated to the hon. member the other day in reply to a similar question that we are very concerned about this matter. We are examining it at the present time and I hope to be able to consult with my colleagues about the decision in the very near future. Our decision will undoubtedly be communicated to the House.

Mr. Ryan: Will the minister not give us a better indication of when this statement is likely to be made?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

FINANCE

REDUCTION OF PRIME INTEREST RATE—DISCUSSIONS WITH CHARTERED BANKS—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): I wish to address a question to the Minister of Finance. Would the minister be prepared to make a statement at an early occasion on the results of his discussions with the chartered banks and with the Governor of the Bank of Canada in connection with the level of interest rates, and also indicate on what basis the government fixed its rates for the new Canada Savings Bonds now on sale?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): First, I should say I was in touch with the chartered banks on Friday, as I indicated to the House. I expressed my opinion to them with respect to the prime rate of interest. I did not ask them or tell them to change their rates because, after all,

that is their business, but I did express the opinion of the government.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Is the minister telling the House that if the banks do not respond to his request he does not intend to take any action?

Mr. Benson: After all, I did not intend to threaten the banks. They express their opinions on our policies from time to time and I think I have the right to express our opinions on their policies.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Finance. In his discussions with the chartered banks, was it indicated to the minister that the banks might be better disposed to reduce interest rates at the close of the Canada Savings Bond campaign?

Mr. Benson: No, Mr. Speaker, that was not the case. I simply indicated my views to the heads of the chartered banks and they said that they would take them under consideration.

Mr. Saltsman: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In order to clarify this important matter, may I ask the Minister of Finance whether, in the event that the chartered banks do not act in the best interests of the country, the minister intends to take action on behalf of the people of Canada—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member will appreciate that the question as asked is hypothetical.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

POWER TO ISSUE ORDERS UNDER AERONAUTICS ACT TO CONTROL ILLEGAL OPERATIONS

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. I hope Your Honour will be a little indulgent as my question is rather involved. Does the minister plan on introducing an amendment to the Aeronautics Act to cover a loophole in the regulations arising out of a Supreme Court ruling in 1968 that the Air Transport Committee did not have the power under the Act to issue orders, with the result that today illegal air transport operations are cutting into the revenues of licensed carriers? If so, does the minister intend to give this matter the urgent priority it deserves?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am quite prepared to be indulgent, and since the hon. member has gone to all the trouble of asking the question perhaps the minister should be given an opportunity to answer it.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to keep my answer as short as possible. This matter has been known to us for some time. There have been consultations with the Air Transport Association members and their executives, and also with representatives of the CTC. If it is deemed that amendments to the Act are necessary in order to correct the situation, I will proceed in the manner suggested by the hon. member.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

WAR MEASURES ACT—LEGALITY OF FINGERPRINTING OF THOSE ARRESTED

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Justice I shall address my question to his Parliamentary Secretary. Inasmuch as it appears that all those who have been arrested under the regulations passed under the War Measures Act have been fingerprinted and photographed, whether charged with any offence or not, will the minister call to the attention of the authorities concerned that fingerprinting is not authorized either under the War Measures Act or the Identification of Criminals Act?

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I shall be very glad to put that question to the minister.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

REPAYMENT OF DEBT—CARR REPORT

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport.

In view of his statement on June 23 last that a very comprehensive study was being made on the reimbursement of the St. Lawrence Seaway debt, I would ask him whether that study is still under way and whether a report thereon will soon be tabled in the House.

[*English*]

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I indicated to the House a couple of weeks ago, I believe it was, that we were awaiting the final report of an organization known as Carr and Associates, the report being a comprehensive study of all aspects of the seaway operation. That report was received during the past two or three days and the officials are studying it. I have asked for a summary to be prepared as quickly as possible, and on the basis of that we will then decide what the next steps are going to be.

* * *

INDUSTRY

INCENTIVES TO INCREASE PRODUCTIVITY

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address my question to the

Minister of Finance. Is it the intention of the government to introduce in the near future incentives aimed at bringing about greater productivity in this country, as the index of industrial production has been falling steadily since the first of the year at an annual rate of 7 per cent?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, if the government has new policies to announce they will be announced in the House, not in answer to a question.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, in view of that usual stock answer may I ask how long the government will remain in its present state of petrified immobility?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Wellington.

Mr. Hees: This is a very important matter to the country, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It may be important, but that is not a question that is acceptable under the rules.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

DEPORTATION OF U.S. DRAFT DODGERS GUILTY OF WRONGFUL ACTS

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Is it the policy of the government to deport United States army draft dodgers or resisters if they are found guilty of any wrongful act in Canada?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member may be familiar with the general state of the law in respect of deportation. If he is referring to situations where someone has committed an indictable offence, the law would apply to any category of persons in the same way.

Mr. Hales: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister what the policy will be if these people are apprehended under the War Measures Act?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I think the hon. member will appreciate that this appears to be a hypothetical question. I should think a question in those terms would hardly be in order.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister whether he can reaffirm the policy of the government announced by his predecessor which was that deserters and draft dodgers would be treated just like any other people applying for entry into this country?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, there should be no difficulty about that and I think the hon. member should appreciate that if there is a change in policy that will be announced.

Inquiries of the Ministry

TIGHTENING OF LAW TO PREVENT ADMISSION OF PERSONS WITH SAME AIMS AS FLQ

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I asked the Prime Minister a question yesterday and now that I see the minister is in the House perhaps he can throw some light on this matter. Has there been any change in reference to immigration laws and regulations concerning people who have the same objectives and aims as the FLQ, to upset the government by means of crime or violence? Has there been any change?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, there has been no change but, of course, persons with a seditious intent would not be admissible under ordinary circumstances.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I am wondering then whether the minister can explain why Dr. Spock, who is speaking at various universities and colleges, and who has been found guilty of an indictable offence in the United States and is out on bail, has been allowed into the country at this time in view of the War Measures Act?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I doubt that the question as asked is in order. The hon. member will recognize that it is asked in the form of an argument and because of this is not in order. I recognize the hon. member for Greenwood.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could rephrase the question.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps I might return to the hon. member in a moment.

* * *

GRAIN

WHEAT—SALE TO PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA—GRADES INVOLVED

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister in charge of the Wheat Board. Can he inform the House about the progress of negotiations being carried on between the Canadian Wheat Board and the People's Republic of China regarding a contract for the sale of wheat?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can report that these negotiations have now been concluded and the Wheat Board commissioners are returning home having completed a sale to China of a maximum of 98 million bushels of wheat for delivery over a 12-month period.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, will the minister inform the House what grades are involved in this sale?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the grades shipped will be largely No. 2, No. 3 and No. 4 northern wheat, with some quantities of Durum and some quantities of Alberta red winters.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

AVAILABILITY OF BOXCARS FOR DELIVERY OF WHEAT

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, may I join with the House in welcoming this announcement. I should like to ask the minister whether he can assure the House and the country that boxcars will be made available for the delivery of this wheat inasmuch as they are so badly needed in western Canada?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, this matter has been raised a number of times and I have reported on the discussions which have been held between the Wheat Board and the railways and between myself and these bodies, and on the assurance of the railways of the supply of boxcars according to the schedule which has been developed by the Wheat Board for the movement not only of these quantities but of the record quantities of grain we expect to export this year.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I will recognize the hon. member for Crowfoot, but I notice there are at least 30 or 35 members rising for the purpose of asking questions. We should try to limit the number of supplementary questions. At the moment I recognize the hon. member for Crowfoot.

Mr. Horner: I should like to ask a quick supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In light of the expected deliveries that have already been announced by the minister and the Wheat Board, can the minister assure the House that this commitment will be met, particularly in view of the difficulties at the already jammed ports at the Lakehead and Vancouver?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, what I can assure the hon. member of is that everything is being done to make sure that any possible difficulty which crops up is in fact met.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

PRICE OF DRESSED HOGS—ACTION UNDER AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION ACT

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture since the Minister of Agriculture has not been present during the last two days and because the question is urgent. In view of the fact that dressed hogs sold for $22 per hundredweight on the public market in Saskatoon on Monday this week, is the minister prepared to initiate action under the Agricultural Stabilization Act since the support price level now set by the Agricultural Stabilization Board is $22.17 per hundredweight?

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for raising the question and I shall bring it to the attention of the minister with the expectation that an answer can be given tomorrow.

* * *

GRAIN

RAPESEED—RECEIPT OF TRUCKLOAD DELIVERIES BY SASKATOON TERMINAL

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I should like to reply to a question raised yesterday by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar regarding deliveries of rapeseed. I am advised that the Board of Grain Commissioners issued instructions to the trade under date of October 14 that the inland elevators at Saskatoon and Edmonton would receive rapeseed on a trucklot basis for the account of grain companies. This facility is now in operation.

* * *

FINANCE

ISSUING OF UNSOLICITED CREDIT CARDS BY BANKS

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. Would the minister give consideration to taking appropriate measures against the chartered banks of Canada to prevent these institutions sending out unsolicited credit cards which place a liability on everyone who receives them through the mail?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to consider the hon. member's representation.

* * *

GRAIN

INTERNATIONAL GRAINS ARRANGEMENT—CANADIAN POSITION IN DISCUSSIONS ON RENEWAL

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration in his capacity as minister responsible for the Wheat Board. Would the minister take the first opportunity under motions to place before the House the position the government is taking in current discussions opened yesterday by the International Wheat Council with a view to renewing the existing International Grains Arrangement and could he indicate who is representing Canada at these meetings?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, senior officials are representing Canada at the meetings. I do not think it would be particularly useful to make a statement on motions. Nothing in particular has changed from the government's position as stated in the past. We support orderly marketing in the international field, and I think it would be premature to discuss the negotiations at this stage.

* * *

TRANSPORT

INCREASE IN CONFERENCE RATES ON EXPORT OF LUMBER TO UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Carleton-Charlotte.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Hugh John Flemming (Carleton-Charlotte): I wonder what that was all about, Mr. Speaker. I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Is it the intention of the minister to cause an inquiry to be made into the recent very substantial increase in the conference rates for the export of lumber from eastern Canadian ports to the United Kingdom, which will have a very serious effect on the volume of exports of this commodity?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I shall be very glad to look deeply into this matter for the hon. member. I assure him that we will continue to give the same generous consideration to New Brunswick that we have always given.

* * *

POLLUTION

REQUEST FOR TABLING OF DRAFT REGULATIONS UNDER FISHERIES ACT

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. It arises from the development of regulations under the new Fisheries Act. In view of the minister's statement to the effect that he intends to circulate the draft regulations in connection with various industries such as pulp and paper to people outside this House, I wonder whether he would table these draft regulations in the House at the same time they are being distributed to others so that we may examine them?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): I shall be glad to do so, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

FISHERIES

INITIATIVES TO OFFSET OVERFISHING BY FOREIGN DRAGGERS—OCEANOGRAPHIC STUDIES

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries and

Forestry. In view of the extensive overfishing by foreign draggers off our shores and in view of the position clearly brought out on the CTV program "W5" on Sunday, can the minister indicate whether his department is now taking any new initiatives to offset the overfishing by the Soviet Union and Germany in particular and to bring his action up to date with his awareness of the need and the problem?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): I am endeavouring to do that, Mr. Speaker. Before the Russian delegation left last week we had a few preliminary discussions about a possible initiative on the east coast of a bilateral nature.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I will recognize the hon. member but I seek the co-operation of hon. members in relation to supplementaries.

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Speaker, this problem is so urgent that I feel you might be a little lenient with our questions in this regard. Can the minister say whether Canada is taking any new action to increase its efforts in the area of oceanographic studies and can he give assurance that the recent moving of the problem north on the west coast of Canada means that we did not give away valuable resources—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The question is one of a very general nature which should be placed on the order paper. If there should be an element of urgency involved it could be returned to tonight.

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Speaker, we have just had negotiations with the Soviet Union and there is a feeling in Canada that we have given away resources because of the lack of knowledge of oceanography.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I understood the question and I suggest it should either be placed on the order paper or, if my assessment is wrong, there is provision in the rules that it may be considered at the time of adjournment.

* * *

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL SECURITY

WAR MEASURES ACT—COMMITTEE TO AID POLITICAL PRISONERS

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

Could he tell us if the Quebec government had consulted the federal authorities before agreeing to recognize the committee that has been established to provide assistance to political prisoners, as announced yesterday by the Quebec Attorney General?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I know that, on this whole matter, discussions are now underway between the federal Minister of Justice and his Quebec counterpart. I cannot say if such discussions dealt with this particular committee.

However, the responsible minister may want to take notice of the question and, if the hon. member puts it to him some other day, he would be in a position to give an answer.

[*English*]

ADEQUACY OF POLICE INVESTIGATION METHODS—IMPLEMENTATION OF ROYAL COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

Mr. C. Terrence Murphy (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. In view of the fact that some three weeks have elapsed since the abduction of Mr. Cross and in view of published statements by law enforcement officers in this country and in the United States that established police investigational methods are not adequate to cope with current revolutionary and terrorist tactics, does the government contemplate reviewing its policy with reference to federal law enforcement agencies and possible implementation of the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Security pertaining to a special security force for Canada?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I think the premises to the question are very serious. On the review suggested by the hon. member I can only say that this question was reviewed last year in great detail and, as the House knows, the decision was taken to appoint a deputy commissioner who would have special responsibility for this and the House knows that the deputy commissioner was taken from outside the force. We feel that this combines the advantage of the commission's report and reflects also the general confidence the country has had in the force in the past.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

ADEQUACY OF SECURITY MEASURES TO PREVENT INFILTRATION OF FORCES AND CIVILIAN STAFF BY UNDESIRABLES

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, I should like to pose a question to the Minister of National Defence. In light of the statement made by his colleague the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion about a week ago in the House that these people, referring to the FLQ, have infiltrated every strategic place in the province of Quebec, can the minister assure the House that the security measures which have been taken over the past years have been adequate to prevent such infiltration into either the armed forces or the civilian staff of his department?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): I have every reason to believe that the security measures have been effective for that purpose.

NATIONAL CAPITAL

INQUIRY AS TO ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMITTEE

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): I have a question for the minister who reports to the House on housing and National Capital Commission matters. Can he say whether consideration is being given at this time to the establishment of a committee of Parliament to concern itself with all matters dealing with the national capital and, if so, whether the intention is to establish that committee during the present session?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): The question has already been put to me but no decision has been made. In the meantime, of course, there is a committee to which those interested in National Capital Commission affairs have access, and that opportunity will continue. However, in answer to the question of the hon. member may I say precisely, not yet.

* * *

GRAIN

BARLEY—EMBARGO ON EXPORT

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): My question is for the minister responsible for the Wheat Board. Has an embargo been placed on the export of barley and, if so, what is the reason for this policy at this time?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): No, Mr. Speaker, certainly no general embargo. If there is a particular market which the hon. member is inquiring about, I would be glad to have further details and inquire on his behalf.

Mr. Dinsdale: Perhaps I could elucidate with a supplementary question. Is the Wheat Board accepting export delivery orders for barley at this time?

Mr. Lang: On a matter like that involving the commercial considerations that enter into the Wheat Board's decision, I would refrain from comment in the House.

* * *

POWER

SKAGIT RIVER—METHOD OF OPPOSING AGREEMENT BETWEEN BRITISH COLUMBIA AND SEATTLE CITY LIGHT COMPANY

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. In view of the minister's speech on October 10 to the Burnaby and Lower Coast Regional Conference in which he indicated that federal government lawyers were searching for ways in which the 1967 agreement between British Columbia and Seattle City Light on the Skagit River flooding might be opposed, I would ask the minister if any way to oppose this agreement has been found and, if so, what action will be taken?

Mr. Speaker: I am not too sure whether this is a matter of urgency. However, in view of the fact that I am unfamiliar with the subject matter raised by the hon. member, the minister might be allowed to reply briefly.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): We are still looking into the matter, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

REASONS FOR CANCELLATION OF VISIT BY MINISTER TO AFRICA

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): I have a question for the right hon. Prime Minister. Could he enlighten the House as to the reasons for the cancellation of the visit of the Secretary of State for External Affairs to Africa?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I believe the Secretary of State for External Affairs considered that until the problem of the kidnapping of Mr. Cross, a foreign representative in Canada, was solved, it would be improper for him to leave the country, at least at this time.

* * *

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

POSITION RESPECTING MINIMUM WAGE LAWS

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. Would he discuss with Canadian National Railways, which has in the province of Saskatchewan, on the one hand, classified itself as a company coming under federal jurisdiction in order not to have to meet the provincial holiday pay regulations, their attitude, on the other hand, in classifying themselves as a provincial company for the purpose of avoiding having to pay their employees the higher federal minimum wage?

Hon. Donald Jamieson (Minister of Transport): I believe that hon. members are aware that part of what might be called this controversy is before the courts vis-à-vis the hotel employees. I will be glad to take the other part under consideration and discuss it with CNR.

RETIRED EMPLOYEES' PENSIONS—ACTION TO IMPLEMENT COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION FOR INCREASE

Mr. Gaetan J. Serré (Nickel Belt): I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Can the minister tell the House whether he has had any indication that the officials of the CNR will comply with the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications concerning increases in the pensions of its employees? If not, what action is he contemplating in order to force the CNR to comply with this recommendation?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): I have answered this question in the House previously. I have formally advised the CNR—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I was going to suggest that as the question has been asked and answered we might go on to the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

WAR MEASURES ACT—NON-PROSECUTION FOR ACTS COMMITTED PRIOR TO PROCLAMATION

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): My question is directed to the Prime Minister. Yesterday I asked the Minister of Justice whether he could assure the House that people would not be prosecuted for acts which were not criminal committed prior to the invocation of the War Measures Act. He replied correctly that the administration of the Act resides with the Attorney General of the province of Quebec in this case. Given the importance of this notion and its centrality to the rule of law, would the Prime Minister assure the House that he will make such a recommendation to the Attorney General of Quebec?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I will ensure that the answer which the minister gave yesterday to the House is brought to the attention of the Attorney General of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—VETERANS AFFAIRS—EARLY IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND WAR VETERANS ALLOWANCE INCREASES

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe) moved:

That this House urges the government to implement at an early date by way of the appropriate legislative amendments the recommendations contained in the 2nd report of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs dated 9 June 1970 and in addition thereto to provide for early payment of adequate increases in the allowances under the War Veterans' Allowance Act 1952 as amended.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I think it is significant that we have chosen today to discuss veterans affairs because in a few days, on November 11, we will hold the 52nd memorial service since the end of World War I.

It is significant also that we have reached a stage in our history when suddenly, as a nation, we are faced with a crisis which may affect the freedom which

Canadians have enjoyed for so many years, a freedom which made us the envy of many other nations which are faced with internal strife almost as a daily routine.

What Canadian, let alone the government of Canada or any Member of Parliament, would have imagined that internal disorder, that uprisings from minority factions, would threaten our democratic way of life at this time in our history? I mention this significant fact because it was not until there was a threat of violence, and indeed the sacrifice of a dedicated Canadian's life, that the country united as one behind the government in their decision to introduce measures to deal with terrorism within our country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Marshall: Canadians also united as a nation when hundreds of thousands of our citizens offered themselves in world wars, not only to protect their own country but to offer and dedicate their lives to stop nations in other parts of the world from inflicting their will, their undemocratic and tyrannical philosophies on free living countries.

We, in Canada, are faced with a breakdown in our national unity because we have forgotten how true national unity is created in a country such as ours. National unity cannot be legislated by governments, by sitting around a conference table, by studies and commissions, or by presenting bills in Parliament. National unity is created in the hearts of people and passed on over the years because our ancestors suffered hardship in discovering and building Canada. We affirmed this unity between 1914 and 1918 and again between 1939 and 1945. Our war veterans pledged their loyalty to Queen and country and defended Canada against tyranny from without. These veterans fought not as people of English, French or any other origin, but each and every one of them fought side by side as comrades and as Canadians.

• (2:50 p.m.)

I think that this might be a good time to look again at these Canadian citizens who made the greatest contribution to preserve our peace through suffering, sacrifice and dedication. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we should take a lesson from the way they were able to maintain unity over the years. They did not remain strong, loyal and united by changing their colours, their flags, or their symbols to identify themselves. Nor did they remain united by distinguishing between members. All veterans in the Canadian Legion, or in any of the other veterans' organizations, are full fledged members regardless of race, creed or colour, or regardless of whether they are rich or poor. And they have the same crests of distinction, Mr. Speaker—each and every one of them—the same beret, the same coloured blazer. The only people in the veterans' organizations who get special attention are the poor, the disabled, the sick. These organizations have raised a good deal of the money to help these veterans through the sale of a red poppy of the same design for some 50 years.

These veterans organizations honour their dead with the same wreaths, and at every gathering they remember those who have fallen with these same words:

> They shall grow not old, as we that are left grow old:
> Age shall not weary them, nor the years condemn.
> At the going down of the sun and in the morning
> We will remember them.

And unless we do remember them, Mr. Speaker, we will continue to disintegrate as a nation. Unless we continue to remember those who are left to grow old, those who unfortunately were wounded and remain incapacitated, then we will surely have condemned those veterans who look to our affluent government for assistance.

Our motion today urges the government to implement at an early date, by way of the appropriate legislative amendments, the recommendations contained in the second report of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs, date June 9, 1970, and in addition to provide for early payment of adequate increases in the allowances under the War Veterans Allowance Act, as well as an increase in the basic rate of disability pensions.

I do not want to pre-empt the Minister, Mr. Speaker, but I spent some time in my office over the weekend re-reading his remarks, as reported in *Hansard* of June 20 last year, when we introduced another motion on veterans affairs. I am sure he will repeat many of the things he said then about the rapid increases in disability pensions from 1948 to 1968. He called the increases from 1964 to 1968—from $1800 to over $3000—rapid increases, and he referred to the increases in 1968 as healthy ones.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I was not here before 1968 but I have been here pretty steadily for over two years and I haven't seen anything happen very rapidly in 1969 and 1970. But I have witnessed, as we all have, a rapid increase in the cost of living in 1969 and 1970, in each and every month. In 1968, the increase was over 4 per cent. In 1969 it was 4.5 per cent. To date in 1970, it is almost that rate again. I have received appeals from all across the country concerning the rapid deterioration of bodies and lives, not only of the disabled war veterans of this country but also of many of the 4 million poverty stricken. Yes, there are lots of things happening rapidly in this Canada of ours, but they are all going rapidly wrong.

The minister has also stated on very many occasions that we should not act too rapidly in bringing about legislation because the review of the Woods committee was so complex and the ramifications so deep that it took them two and a half years to bring down their report. It should be understandable, therefore, if the government takes half that time to bring the report to fruition.

We agreed to this suggestion, as did all the veterans' organizations, and I list them: The National Council of Veterans Associations, the War Amputations of Canada, the Hong Kong Veterans, The National Dieppe Prisoner of War Association, the Nursing Sisters Association, the Canadian Corps Associations, The Canadian Paraplegic Associations, The Sir Arthur Pearson Association of War

Blinded, The War Pensioners of Canada, The Army, Navy and Air Forces Veterans of Canada, and the Royal Canadian Legion.

The Veterans Affairs Committee also agreed, and that committee has sat since last September considering briefs presented by these organizations. We also considered the white paper presented by the government. We reviewed the 148 recommendations, and we presented a report in June of this year. I am sure that the minister would agree, and that the chairman of the committee will confirm, that there was complete co-operation at all times during our deliberations. I am sure he will also agree that the veterans organizations were most co-operative in compromising on the cost of many of the recommendations advocated by the Woods Committee, in order to expedite legislation. I am also sure he will agree that all concerned gave enough time to the consideration of such a complex report.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Marshall: Just this month, Mr. Speaker, before the end of the second session, my party offered complete co-operation to expedite the passing of legislation because time means everything to the disabled veterans. I can only appeal once more to the minister and the government to return the consideration by bringing in legislation immediately. I know such legislation is on the list of bills for this session, but since it is number 22 I hope it does not have to wait its turn to come before the House. I also hope this bill will rapidly be given a much higher priority by those who decide what legislation is to come before the House.

Last August, just over one year ago, as a result of the Woods Committee the government tabled its white paper on veterans pensions. So, we should all be ready to admit that we were given enough time to study the complex report of the Woods Committee and its ramifications, as the minister requested.

Probably the most pressing of the recommendations in the Woods Committee Report were numbers 92 and 93 dealing with a basic minimum pension of 50 per cent for all members of the Hong Kong force who were interned as prisoners of war by the Japanese, and that the widows of ex-members of the Hong Kong force be eligible for consideration of an award of widows' pensions under section 25 of the Act. If I may quote from the white paper, Mr. Speaker, it said:

> That these veterans deserve special consideration has been recognized by government, and it is now proposed to ask parliament to formally recognize this obligation by proposing a separate act which will provide for a basic minimum pension of 50 per cent for all Hong Kong veterans who apply for it, and who have assessable degrees of disability—The effect of this provision will make widows and orphans who were not in receipt of disability pensions of 48 per cent also pensionable under the act and such pensions would begin with the effective date of the special legislation.

There were only 395 Hong Kong veterans as of 1968 receiving less than a 48 per cent pension. The white paper indicated agreement, and in fact promised special legislation over a year ago. An amendment to cover these veterans could have been put before the House any time after the presentation of the white paper and could have been passed at the snap of a finger. But here we are, over a year later, and still nothing has been done.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Marshall: The cost of implementation of this recommendation would be only some $600,000. Yet the government continues to procrastinate while the bodies of these veterans continue to deteriorate. Those who suffered through four years of the most extreme hardships of torture, of malnutrition and the affliction of avitaminosis, for which there is no cure, continue to await some humane consideration after so many years.

There are some 65 members of this House, Mr. Speaker, who are veterans of World War II, and two who are veterans of World War I—the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Badanai), and the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker). The majority of these veterans sit on the opposite side of the House. A good number of them sat on the veterans affairs committee. I wonder if they have any humane feelings; they who must know of the suffering of these veterans. I wish they would show some intestinal fortitude by standing up in their caucus meetings and pleading for some reasonable sense of priority in the implementation of legislation for the veterans.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer once more to the minister's reply last year in which he quoted a statement made by the right hon. Prime Minister on June 17 last year:

> We have to review all aspects of social legislation. We are doing this; we do not want to settle special cases. A special plea can be made not only for the veterans but for old people, for retired civil servants and for all sections of people in society.

Well, bully I say to him, Mr. Speaker, but I also say that the increases for the poor, the aged, the blind and the retarded have not been coming along too rapidly. The white paper on social security is also ready, but that appears pretty far down on the list of impending legislation. I hope it includes some indication of action to implement increases for those burnt-out veterans coming under the War Veterans Allowances Act. The increases for these veterans and their families have not been too rapid or healthy.

• (3:00 p.m.)

The last increase for veterans in this category was in 1966, and we do not hear too much bragging about the single rate of $105 per month or the married rate of $175 per month for these veterans. I do not have to remind the House how much below the poverty line these figures are.

It is worth while mentioning, Mr. Speaker, the situation with regard to war veterans allowances, because if ever we have failed our citizens we have failed those who are recipients under the War Veterans Allowance

Act. These are the veterans who become eligible after the age of 60 and are permanently unemployable because of physical or mental disabilities, or who are unable to maintain themselves due to a combination of economic handicaps and physical or mental disabilities and are unlikely to be able to do so. It is worth while mentioning the restrictions on these veterans. A single veteran in this category cannot have assets over $1,250 and a married veteran cannot have assets over $2,500.

I would like to show you some of the letters I get, Mr. Speaker, telling me that the veteran or his wife went out to try to earn a little more to buy some extra food or clothing, or to buy a little radio in order to hear about this great Canada and the great things that are coming in the new decade we are entering. Then, they find that what they earned is deducted from their next month's cheque.

Mr. McGrath: Shame.

Mr. Marshall: All that the department has done for these veterans during the past two years I have been in the House has been to cut down the staff of certain district offices which are charged with the responsibility of helping these people and of seeking out those who can qualify for this pittance on reaching this age. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I repeat—bully for the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) when he says a special plea can be made not only for the veterans but for the old and for all sections of society. These people agree, too. Everybody in Canada agrees. They all come under the massive social security report which sits in the office of the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) ready to be tabled; and the related legislation sits way down on the list I mentioned before.

So, let us bring forward the legislation on veterans pensions and social security. The special plea of these people is getting louder and louder, Mr. Speaker. So, let us show some humane consideration instead of philosophizing and let us pay attention to the needs of these people.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Marshall: I am sure that the minister will advise us of the exact dates on which the pensions legislation and that relating to income security will be introduced. I hope he will not give us the same answer that the Prime Minister gives when he criticizes the opposition for asking the government to spend money. He answers that if we want the government to pay out more money they will have to raise taxes, and then the opposition will criticize that. Well, in case he is going to use this tale of woe again I will tell him I am not accepting it, because it is a lot of bully beef.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Marshall: In my short period of time in this House, Mr. Speaker, I have learned that money is thrown around by this government "like it was going out of style", and for some of the strangest things that one could imagine. They are too numerous to mention, but one example would be the giving of grants to town fools. I must say, though, that I did not appreciate the remarks of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) yesterday in the House when I asked, simply and courteously, whether he would advise the House when the legislation on income security, which includes war veterans allowances and the veterans pension legislation, would be presented. His answer, though, is a pretty good indication as to where he stands with regard to veterans. It is obvious that he was one of the six cabinet ministers who vetoed the recommendations of the Minister of National Health and Welfare and directed him to cut his recommended increases to the poor by some $500 million.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Marshall: I wonder which of the other cabinet ministers were included in the nasty six?

An hon. Member: They are all the same.

Mr. Marshall: There are many items in the Veterans affairs Committee report with which I could deal. I refer to the 100 per cent pensioners; to stabilizing pensions; to benefit of doubt and appeal procedures, and to attendance allowances. Not the least of these matters is the basic rate of pension; but I am sure my colleagues will deal with these adequately. I will close my remarks with this appeal to the government.

I am sure that the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Dubé) would have liked to have brought forward legislation before now. It is apparent that he is deterred by a cabinet which continues to downgrade the department and by the "whiz kids" who prefer to create new departments like Information Canada, which can only be described as a $7 million money-eating monster to produce political propaganda that nobody wants to hear.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Marshall: There is also an inference to be drawn from the government's spending sums like $200,000, on art work that kiddies in kindergarten could do better. I only hope, as a result of this debate, that the minister, with the help of many veterans who are members of caucus, will appeal to the government to stand behind the promises made to the 160,000 of the almost 1 million Canadian war veterans. I hope he will do this with the zeal and vigour which he says is being used in the care for veterans, and that legislation will be brought forth, before it is too late to care for many of them.

Mr. Lloyd Francis (Ottawa West): Mr. Speaker, we, on this side of the House, are pleased with the motion that has been brought forward, which gives us the opportunity of reviewing a matter that occupied the attention of

many members of the House in the course of the previous session. The minister will speak at the end of this debate and will reply to the points raised by members on the other side of the House. I know that hon. members here anticipate his remarks with a good deal of interest.

The veterans affairs committee, at the end of our sittings in the spring, presented a report which was unanimously adopted in this House. It has been a source of some satisfaction to those of us who worked on the committee, Mr. Speaker, to know that there has been so much team work in what we were doing and that the committee was able to examine a great deal of evidence.

It is now 25 years since the initial veterans charter was adopted in 1945. The process of revising the work of the Pension Commission began in 1965 with the appointment of the Woods committee. That committee took some 3 years to do its work. It presented 1,300 pages of evidence and 148 separate and distinct recommendations concerning the work of the Canadian Pension Commission. Of those recommendations, the overwhelming majority was acceptable to the government and involved a restructuring of the Canadian Pension Commission and a simplification of its procedures. But the report of the committee went considerably beyond a mere restructuring and reorganization. It introduced a number of basic principles which called for a careful examination; it was not possible for the government at that time to accept them, just as it was not possible to accept the report of the Carter Commission on taxation.

The device which the government adopted in this case was the device of the white paper. In August, 1969, the minister who is now sitting in this House brought down a white paper on veterans affairs which was a very significant document. A number of hon. members participated in the matter of the Hong Kong veterans. I have discovered, and I have received correspondence subsequently from a number of veterans who were so involved, that some of our men were captured in Indonesia, Malaya and many other parts of the Far East, and they suffered as much privation as the Hong Kong veterans suffered. The white paper clearly recognizes our obligation and, without question, its recommendations were unanimously accepted.

The white paper also dealt with other matters, such as the benefit of the doubt provision. It talked about restructuring the Veterans Bureau and brought forward a number of recommendations acceptable to the government which were, without any question, acceptable also to everyone who understood what had happened in this field. But, in bringing down that white paper, the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Dubé) very carefully stated that this was a general outline and that the government would not take an inflexible position. The government was indicating those areas which were acceptable to it and it was asking, in the most democratic fashion possible, the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs, which was composed of members from every party represented in the House of Commons, to look at the Woods report and the white paper, to sort out matters and make recommendations to the government concerning those other matters on which it had not been possible to reach agreement.

I had the honour, Mr. Speaker, of being the chairman of that committee. That is something of which, during the course of my public career, I have been very proud. I regard the service in the past session of this Parliament as one of the greatest opportunities I have had.

• (3:10 p.m.)

The committee met 39 times. It heard from 14 organizations and a number of witnesses, including the minister and spokesmen of the department. The committee never lacked a quorum, Mr. Speaker. I say that by way of tribute to those members who served on the committee. This committee met when the House was not sitting in September of 1969. When a committee meeting was called, we never failed to establish a quorum.

I wish to pay the greatest tribute to the minister at this point. Without question, in his attitude, appearances before the committee and representations, he carefully avoided taking any dogmatic or firm position. He always said "This is what we think is right; this is what we are prepared to do." He put forward some proposals in which he believed, as well as those who were giving him advice. They firmly believed this was the best pattern of administration with regard to the appeal procedure.

Although the committee studied the entire range of 148 recommendations, the members spent a great deal of time in two major areas of special concern. I wish to speak today about these two areas. The first was a request of the veterans organizations to establish an independent body which would be above the pensions committee and which would pass judgment at the appeal stage.

In the course of my life I have had the honour of serving in the public service of Canada for nine years. During that time I learned a little about the principles of public administration. The principle of standing one independent body above another independent body was of great concern. Where such a structure has been established, it has not always been a good pattern of public administration. There is a basic rule which states that the laws of the land must be respected and accepted by the great majority of those to whom they apply. A law and a body of procedure that is not acceptable to the people who must live and work with it will not be a good law or a good procedure. This was the basic principle that guided the committee in its report regarding the appeal procedure. We felt we had to make this recommendation in light of the persistent and non-deviating suggestions with regard to an independent appeal board.

There was no way to judge the workload after the initial backlog was dealt with. There was no way to judge how many persons would be required for these different agencies after there was a stabilization of workload. For that reason, we recommended that appointments should be for a five year period. We suggested that the government study this after five years to see whether the procedure was the proper one.

Another area which gave us a great deal of concern was those veterans suffering from severe and multiple disabilities. The white paper contained a set of proposals with regard to this. The proposals in the white paper were misunderstood in some quarters. There were representations to us to the effect that a means test was required. I certainly did not read that into the white paper. The minister expressly repudiated that anything like this was intended. Without question, the committee made it clear that the case for additional allowances for certain categories of multiple and severely disabled veterans above and beyond the 100 per cent basic rate was a strong case.

The hon. member who moved this motion in very emotional terms stated the debt that Canada owes to those who served. There is no greater debt owed by a nation than that owed to those who served a nation and suffered physically, emotionally and mentally. Many of our veterans have had many trials and tribulations. The committee made some recommendations which went above and beyond those in the white paper.

The report we presented was in two sections. We listed those recommendations of the Woods Committee with which we were in general agreement and those in which we were not in agreement. We stated our reasons and, in some cases, suggested modifications. The committee completed its report and presented it to this House in June. It was unanimously adopted by resolution of this House. I was pleased to see a reference in the Speech from the Throne to legislation that will be introduced. When the minister speaks on this subject he will be able to say much more than I can say.

A great deal of attention has been given to the recommendations of the committee by various organizations, the minister and his department. It has been the source of a good deal of pleasure to note in the August issue of the *Legion*, the national magazine of the Royal Canadian Legion, that the cover featured photographs of the committee members. The editorial that follows is very complimentary. I will not quote it in detail. It reads in part:

> —the report has the unanimous concurrence of the House of Commons and we assume that the next step will be for the Minister of Veterans Affairs to seek Cabinet approval of the report, following which officials of the Department of Justice can set to work preparing the necessary legislation.

The editorial is a very realistic appreciation of the steps in the legislative process. There is a very quiet, confident note in the editorials of the *Legion* and publications of other veterans organizations. It is a clear appreciation of the good will that has been displayed. This good will has not been marred by partisan behaviour in the committee. I am confident there will be a general acceptance of the program to be introduced.

I wish to quote from the latest issue of the war amputees *Fragment*. The remarks in this article concerning the report of the committee are particularly complimentary. Perhaps it would be better if some other hon. member repeated them. It reads in part:

> The 1969-70 Parliamentary Committee can take its place, right along with the renowned Veterans Affairs Committees of the past. It was the task of this Committee...to take the raw material of the Woods Report, measure it against the Government's own White Paper on Veterans Pensions, add in the rather well-documented views of the Veterans organizations, and come up with a proposed plan which would meet the need.

There is every indication, in spite of the fact the committee turned down some of the key recommendations such as age escalation, that these organizations are generally pleased with the work of the committee. The question we must now ask ourselves is, what is to be the pattern? What is it reasonable to expect?

On Friday of last week we completed the debate on the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. Other national emergency measures were brought before this House which were the subject of special debate. I know that time can pass in the course of a session without us really being aware of it. I say to the members of this House that the veterans of this country can have complete confidence in the measures being prepared and brought forward for legislative enactment. From the statements made by members opposite, this matter will not be prolonged in a partisan debate. Members will work in the spirit in which the work was carried out in the committee and they will be pleased to approve this legislation.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, we are delighted that this day in the House of Commons is being devoted to a discussion of veterans affairs, and I take much pleasure in commending the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall) for having introduced the motion which we are now debating. If I might say so, I could not have drawn it better myself. But having said that, I must indicate that at the end of my remarks I intend to move an amendment to make it slightly better than it is.

• (3:20 p.m.)

I go along with the remarks which have been made by both the previous speakers concerning the excellence of the work of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs. I have had a fair amount of committee experience over the years in this place and I have served on no committee I have enjoyed more. We had matters of real substance to deal with, we found dedication and devotion on the part of all members of the committee, and I believe that as a result of our work and co-operation we produced a report which, in the end, was better than I had hoped at the start might come out of that committee. May I say in this connection that it was precisely because of the unanimity we felt in that committee concerning all the important phases of our work, and because of the unanimity on many points at all stages—the Woods Report, the white paper, the committee report—that I regret there has been so long a delay in implementing those things upon which we were agreed.

I look upon the introduction of this motion today by the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe as primarily a way of speeding things up. If as a result of today's debate the minister can announce that the legislation will be on the order paper within the next few days,

this will have been a very worthwhile day. Like other hon. members I am greatly concerned at the length of time it has taken to get action on these matters. The dates are well known to us all but perhaps I might repeat them. It is more than five years since the Woods committee was commissioned to do its job. True, it was a big job and it took the committee a long time to complete it. But when that committee was appointed, the hope was that something would soon be done to improve the position of veterans. Yet here we are, five years and a month later, and we still have not seen the legislation which was recommended as a result of that study.

The Woods committee was appointed in September, 1965. It made its report in March, 1968, about two and a half years later. It was a year and several months before we heard anything from the government of the day. Eventually, the white paper was produced; that was in August, 1969. I am happy to say that the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs began its deliberations in the following month, September, and its report was made to the House in June, 1970. As has been stated by previous speakers, shortly after this report was presented to the House, the House of Commons concurred in it. I recite these facts for two reasons: first, to indicate the length of time we have been dealing with these matters and, second, to show that with regard to all those things on which we have agreed there has been enthusiasm, unanimity and concern. I do not like this long delay. In fact, it seems to me that once this session started and the debate on the Speech from the Throne had been concluded, almost the first legislation brought into the House by the government should have been the bill implementing the promised improvements in our veterans legislation.

The motion proposed by the hon. member who began this debate deals in the main with two subjects. First, there is the whole question of the amendments to be made to the Pension Act arising out of the study by the Woods committee. Then there is the question which was not referred to the Woods committee, namely, the consideration of changes in the War Veterans Allowance Act. Accordingly, I should like to divide my remarks between those two general headings.

First, with respect to the proposed changes in the Pension Act, other members have already indicated that there are some changes upon which we agree. Let us have them as soon as we can. In particular, we have agreed on certain new procedures that are to be established, and we have agreed on the special appeal board to be set up over the Pension Commission. The hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis) was perfectly correct in his description of the way in which this matter was discussed in the committee and I think it is fair to say that the various veterans organizations, particularly the representatives of the National Council of Veterans Organizations who stayed with us right through the piece, deserve great credit for their assistance and for their perseverance. As hon. members know, what has been recommended in the matter of appeal procedures is a five year trial period and, like the hon. member for Ottawa West, I believe an arrangement of this kind will work only if it suits those concerned. I trust that the legislation will carry out this particular recommendation.

Veterans Allowance Increases

One of the features in the Woods Report, in the white paper and in our own report, which has been agreed on right down the line, concerns the treatment of Hong Kong veterans. The provision is a straightforward one, namely, that any Hong Kong veteran who has any disability at all should be treated as having a 48 per cent disability, or more, so that his pension will be a 50 per cent pension and so that his widow will automatically get a widow's pension in full. This has not been contested at any point and I still do not know why some effort was not made last session to bring in a bill to put this provision into effect. We have agreed on it all down the line and we made an offer in the committee on behalf of our respective parties that if such legislation were brought forward it would be agreed to without debate. I regret very much that no action was taken by the government in response to this offer.

We also agreed that there should be a settlement of the question of the quantum of the basic pension. A number of questions of that sort were agreed on in the committee, whether on a unanimous basis or after discussion, and I see no reason why these things should not be before us right at this time.

There are two or three matters about which we felt strongly in the committee, on which agreement was not reached. Even though no reference was made to them in the report, I hope, even at this stage, that consideration will be given to them. One has already been referred to, the provision for automatic aging. The veterans organizations felt very strongly about this, and so did many of the members of the committee. I hope that those who are going to draft the legislation might yet take a good look at that particular proposition.

• (3:30 p.m.)

I hope that all of the recommendations contained in the report will be included in the legislation. For example, I have in mind a provision about which we had a good deal of discussion in the committee, namely the treatment of widows of veterans where the pension of the veteran before he died was less than 48 per cent. As hon. members are aware, in such cases there is no automatic pension for the widow; her only recourse is to make an application under the War Veterans Allowance Act.

Despite the non-concurrence of the White Paper, our committee recommended that a provision be made in such cases for a pension as of right to be paid to the widow on a pro rata basis. I admit that in some cases that would not amount to much. In some cases the widow would still have to fall back on the War Veterans Allowance Act, particularly if her late husband's pension was down around the 10 to 20 per cent level; but it would mean a good deal to those whose pension was between, say, 35 and 45 per cent. This was recommended by the committee and particular attention was drawn to it in the preamble to the report. Therefore, I hope without question that that provision will be in the legislation when it is presented to the House which I hope will be in a few days.

I think the picture is reasonably clear in regard to those things that were covered in the Woods report. We started with a lot of disagreement, a certain amount of disillusionment and some uncertainty, but as a result of our living together with this problem for a long period of time, and as a result of the very good work done by the veterans organizations which appeared before the committee, we reached a pretty solid consensus about the things that should be done in regard to those matters that had been referred to the Woods committee. As a result of that unanimity I plead that there be no more delay and that the legislation be brought in. I am satisfied this House will give it very quick passage indeed.

However, before one leaves the Pension Act, which as I say was referred to the Woods committee, one has to take note of the fact that there was not referred to the Woods committee the basic amount of the disability pension. Any suggestion about increasing veterans pensions—I am now talking about disability pensions—was not, therefore, part of the terms of reference of the Woods committee nor part of the terms of reference of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs.

I do not think we will be as proud of ourselves as we like to think we will be if, despite all this work, and despite our devoting time in the House of Commons to the question of veterans legislation, nothing is done to increase the rate of pensions paid under the Pension Act. I hope that matter will be dealt with.

If it is necessary to bring in two separate bills in this regard, then let that be done. Let there be included in one bill the matters we have agreed upon, those matters about which there is unanimity in every case or almost unanimity, and I am convinced that every party in the House will let the bill reach the statute books in record time. Then, let us also have another bill dealing with the rates of pension paid under the Pension Act.

This leads me to the other aspect of the motion moved by the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe, namely that something should be done at this time to provide for early payment of adequate increases in the allowances paid under the War Veterans Allowance Act. To my regret the subject of the War Veterans Allowance Act, not having been referred to the Woods committee, was also not included in the terms of reference of the standing committee. But the veterans and widows who come under the aegis of the War Veterans Allowance Act are the people who seem always to get the short end of the stick.

I plead that the minister not delay any longer the bringing in of amendments to that act. Let him not ask us to wait for the White Paper on social security or on income maintenance, or whatever it is to be; that matter has been delayed for so long that there is no telling when it will be brought in. And when it is, I assume that it will deal with matters relating to the population of Canada in general.

I have no hesitation in standing here as a non-veteran, like the minister, and saying that we owe something special to the veterans who have served this country. I want to see what is sometimes called the social security legislation for our veterans, or call it, if you will, social welfare legislation—the War Veterans Allowance Act—kept a few stages higher than the social security or social welfare legislation that applies to the population as a whole.

That was the basis on which the War Veterans Allowanc Act was brought in in the first place. That was in the period when the old age pension was payable at age 70 only, and on a means test. The purpose of the War Veterans Allowance Act was to provide to those who had served in World War I an opportunity to get at age 60 a pension that would compare with the old age pension that was paid at age 70, and to get that pension not only at an earlier age but on a means test that was less stringent than the old age pension means test.

Over the years there seems to have been the tendency somehow or other to ask why, since this is social welfare legislation, it should not be enmeshed in our general welfare legislation. I do not think that approach is good enough. Those of us in this Parliament who cannot claim to be veterans would be a little ashamed, I think, if we were to abolish the principle that Parliament ought to do something better for those who served their country in time of war.

Therefore, I call for the War Veterans Allowance Act to be dealt with separately from the white paper on social welfare or income maintenance. We have touched on some matters already without waiting for that paper. It used to be agreed that everything had to wait for that paper which is to be brought down by the Minister of National Health and Welfare, but last December there was an announcement, and then in March certain legislation was presented to the House. I was very glad that the legislation was introduced without waiting for that paper, because it dealt with the pensions of retired civil servants, retired members of the armed forces, retired personnel of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and quite a few others. It even made a slight reference to Members of Parliament. None of these groups was called upon to wait for the white paper on social security. I am not at the moment asking any questions about the motives for that action at that time, for my views are well known, but the fact of the matter is that the ban against dealing with matters of this kind until the white paper on social security has been published was broken by the introduction of that legislation.

I think the same can be said with regard to the white paper on unemployment insurance. Certainly the committee dealing with that white paper is asked time and time again how come it has that white paper before the country is given the white paper on social security. So I suggest that the sacred principle that we must wait for the white paper of the Minister of National Health and Welfare has been shot high, wide and handsome.

If there is any group of people that deserves special consideration, it is the group we know as our veterans. Therefore, I insist that it will not be enough to bring in legislation simply implementing our report, and hence dealing only with the Pension Act and those matters

covered in the Woods report; there has to be legislation that deals with the War Veterans Allowance Act, and any other legislation that will give our veterans the breaks they deserve.

• (3:40 p.m.)

So, Mr. Speaker, I take my hat off to my friend, the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe, in that he put in his motion today one of the things we should be discussing now before the government brings down its legislation. Figures have been given and so on, and let me just remind hon. members of the House of the means test ceilings that are in the War Veterans Allowances Act; $145 a month for a single veteran and $245 a month for a married veteran. Those are the maximum total amounts of income they can have. Let me remind members that those who come under this are the ones who are, to use the vernacular, always getting it in the neck. In other pieces of legislation dealing with important pension improvements—I have in mind the guaranteed income supplement and the increase in pensions of retired civil servants—some people get increases without losing something they already had. When a recipient of the War Veterans Allowance Act qualifies for the guaranteed income supplement it comes off his war veterans allowance. There are retired public servants who qualified last spring for the increase that we put through in what was Bill C-194 last session, and Members of Parliament will remember Bill C-194. Yes, there are retired public servants who got that increase and then had it taken off their war veterans allowance. This is just not good enough and I do not think we should stand for it. The least we can do is raise the ceilings on the war veterans allowance.

I think we must also raise the amount that is paid under the War Veterans Allowance Act and we may have to do something about this sacred principle that you cannot do something for one unless you do it for another. I think we may have to make special legislation that says that when increases are provided, those getting the war veterans allowance shall not get it with one hand and have it taken away by the other. The people who suffer this kind of thing the most are those who come under the War Veterans Allowance Act.

I hope the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis), who has spoken of the good work we did on the veterans affairs committee, will not feel what I am saying is in criticism of the work of that committee, because it is not. That committee did not have this subject referred to it, so we could not discuss it. We tried to do so a few times but he listened long enough to be sure we were out of order and told us so.

Whether or not we had this before us in the committee, the matter is before us today quite properly in the motion made by the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe. It is before us in the context of the whole question of veterans affairs and this Parliament has to deal with it.

One of the reasons I am so glad this motion has been put down today, and we are having a discussion, is that we are doing it before the minister brings in his legislation. Sometimes after the government has brought in its legislation and has said that is it, those speaking for the government do not like to make a change. Now, they can do this. I say to my friend the minister that he can go back to his department, or he can talk with his chief advisers who are up there in the gallery listening and watching us and say: Look, we better not cope with this problem after we have had a rough time on the floor of the House. Let us bring it in now. Let us say we were going to do it all along. That would be so wonderful we might even let the government get away with making that kind of statement.

Seriously, this is the area of greatest deficiency in what we are likely to get. We are almost certain to get in the general legislation a series of amendments to the Pension Act in relation to things we recommended in our report. I hope we get them all and perhaps one or two more but we are almost certain to get that. Whether we will get something adequate in respect of the basic rates under the Pension Act I do not know, but unless we also get in this session legislation to amend the War Veterans Allowance Act we will not have given our veterans in 1970 the fair treatment and justice to which I believe they are entitled.

So, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that by special order made today I am permitted to talk for half an hour, there is no reason why I should do so. I am happy to draw my remarks to a conclusion and to indicate the amendment I should like to move to the motion which was presented by the hon. member from Newfoundland. I recognize that the way in which this motion has been put down it will not come to a vote tonight, but rather is a motion for discussion. Likewise I recognize that the amendment I move will therefore not come to a vote tonight. Usually, we like to have votes on the propositions we make but I think this is an indication of the above-party approach we take on veterans affairs. We state our propositions and we state them strongly, but we are not trying to divide the House. What we are trying to do is put into the minds of the government what ought to be done in the hope that it will be done under the legislation that is to be brought down.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the amendment I wish to move has to do with the date at which any increases under the Pension Act or under the War Veterans Allowance Act might be paid. I am suggesting in my amendment that all such increases should be paid retroactive to April 1, 1970, or to such earlier date as may be appropriate in certain cases. Those last words imply that there are some things in the recommendations which in themselves will call for an earlier date.

My strong and earnest suggestion in this amendment I hope is quite clear, namely that any of the increases at all must be made retroactive to April 1, 1970. Why did I pick that date? I could have picked a date way back when the Woods committee was set up, when it presented its report, when the white paper was drawn or when our committee made its report. There are dozens of dates one could pick. I picked that date because that is the date at which increases in pensions to retired civil servants,

retired RCMP personnel, retired members of the armed forces, the permanent forces and so on became effective. It is also the date on which certain changes took place in the Members of Parliament pension plan. I would say that these increases we are now asking for our veterans should be retroactive to that date, and not one day later.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have pleasure in moving, seconded by my colleague, the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch):

That the motion be amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma, and by adding immediately thereafter the following words:

"and this House also urges that consideration be given to the making of any increases to be provided under the Pension Act or under the War Veterans Allowance Act retroactive to April 1, 1970, or to such earlier date as may be appropriate in certain cases."

I hope that in the way in which the House can do so, namely by what it says and by the attention it pays to this debate, the House as a whole will endorse the proposition of the main motion, that there should be early legislation in respect of the Pension Act and the War Veterans Allowance Act. I hope it will also endorse the proposition contained in my amendment, that the increases we hope will be provided under these two acts will be made retroactive back at least to April 1, 1970. Surely, this is the least we should do.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The Chair has looked at the amendment just put by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and it has a reservation as to the reference to the Pension Act in the amendment, knowing that the motion refers only to the War Veterans Allowance Act. This might have the tendency to open the debate further than intended by the general terms of the motion proposed by the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall). In any case the Chair will, with this reservation, accept the motion.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, would you permit just a brief comment. The motion moved by the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe calls for legislative amendments that contain the recommendations set out in the second report of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs. I happen to know that you were a member of the committee and Your Honour must know that everything in that report is a request for amendments to the Pension Act. It seems to me it is just a different way of saying the same thing, when I refer to increases under the Pension Act as well as to increases under the War Veterans Allowance Act.

• (3:50 p.m.)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. I do not wish to go into the terms of reference or the questions the hon. member has in mind in respect of the committee's recommendation concerning an increase in pensions. I have indicated to the hon. member that the Chair is ready to put the motion with some reservations. Therefore, I shall put the question immediately. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, seconded by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch) moves:

That the motion be amended by changing the period at the end thereof to a comma, and by adding immediately thereafter the following words:

"and this House also urges that consideration be given to the making of any increases to be provided under the Pension Act or under the War Veterans Allowance Act retroactive to April 1, 1970, or to such earlier date as may be appropriate in certain cases."

[*Translation*]

Mr. Henry Latulippe (Compton): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to say a few words about the motion put forward by the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall) as well as the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

There have been many studies and proposals concerning veterans. The government's White paper is an outcome of the Woods report.

Mr. Speaker, all this work was essential. Legislation providing for the welfare of our veterans should be revised because many of them have primary economic and financial needs to met, although they are unable to perform certain tasks as adequately as healthy people.

The legislation has been revised several times. Each year, the Committee on Veterans Affairs and the House have dealt with the needs of veterans.

I believe the information received until now is adequate and I think we could recommend implementing the conclusions of the Woods report. Besides, enforcing the decisions taken concerning the needs of the veterans has become imperative. It has always been a question of money and I believe that the implementation of the Woods Report was delayed on the same grounds. Indeed, the more we beat about the bush, the cheaper the whole business becomes for the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, it is in the area of veterans' pensions, in my opinion, that we find good reason to congratulate the government. What is particularly remarkable is the attention it has always given to veterans and their families by paying them pensions constantly in keeping with the rising cost of living.

During the war and even afterwards, the widow of a veteran received at least $100 a month for herself, $40 a month for the first child, $30 a month for the second child, $25 a month for the third child and every other one. These are allowances which I consider appropriate.

What is also remarkable is that the children of veterans' widows, while receiving monthly allowances of $40, $30 or $25 were entitled at the same time to monthly allowances of $6 for children under ten and of $8 for those between 10 and 15 inclusive. Those over 15 who wanted to go on with their studies received higher allowances than those paid to the children of parents who were not veterans.

The pension of war widows has been increased very often in keeping with the cost of living. As a matter of fact, from $100 during and after the 1939-1945 war, it

had gone up to $115 a month in 1958. Today, it is even higher and reaches $150 a month, I think. I have no intention of blaming anyone for giving special consideration to veterans, war widows and their children. On the contrary, I believe such action deserves commendation. I even believe that, in many cases, the government could show even greater generosity to those who have sacrificed their lives, their freedom or their health in order to save their fellow-citizens during world wars or other conflicts. It is only in 1968, or 23 years after the last world war, that it was decided to make a thorough study of veterans problems and this culminated in the 1,300-page Woods report. We are still trying today to consider an increase in veterans pensions and other allowances as part of the commitments of the government of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, as regards the studies about our duty to pay Canadian citizens certain sums of money other than salaries for work done or interest on capital, I feel that they are not undertaken with the primary concern of meeting the basic needs of our citizens, but always for considerations other than the right to existence which is the right of every citizen all through life, whether a soldier or an ordinary citizen, the son of a soldier or the son of an ordinary citizen, the widow of a soldier or of an ordinary man, who works the whole year through and who is liable also to be a victim of incapacity or of premature death on the workfront instead of the battlefront.

Mr. Speaker, the man who dies at work is also serving his country without enjoying the same benefits as soldiers.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. I suggest to the hon. member for Compton that the debate must bear on the terms of the amendment and the subamendment under consideration, which concern the second report of the Committee on Veterans Affairs, as well as allowances and pensions paid to veterans.

The fact that the hon. member was going to engage in a discussion which goes beyond the scope of this debate leads me to remind him that even if his remarks suggest that other Canadians are in need of government aid and that these people may be considered just as important as veterans, the hon. member must just the same speak directly to the amendment and the subamendment now under consideration.

Mr. Latulippe: Thank you, Mr. Speaker; it is perhaps true that I somewhat wandered from the subject, but I think that those comments are pertinent. However, as a result of your suggestion, I will try to discuss only the amendment and subamendment concerning the passage of the legislation and the carrying out of the reports' recommendations, especially those of the Woods report and the many questions raised therein.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words on pension rates. Those rates were not referred to the committee to survey the work and organization of the Canadian Pension Commission, or Woods committee. It, however, heard statements on the matter which were summarized in its report. The rates now in force and their relation with the standard of living in Canada were dealt with in a special study. The government intends to take it into consideration with respect of the general assessment mentioned earlier.

The amounts that have been paid since January 1, 1968, represent an annual pension of $3,180 for single veterans and of $4,056 for married veterans, as well as an annual supplementary allowance of $2,400 in some cases. The supplementary pensions for pensioners' children are $408 for the first child, $520 for the second and $240 per year for the others. In the case of orphans, those amounts are doubled. On the other hand, all those recommendations were accepted, I believe, almost unanimously, by the committee which recommend the adoption of the Woods report and its main recommendations.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, the subamendment of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre reads in part as follows:

—that consideration be given to the making of any increases to be provided under the Pension Act or under the War Veterans Allowance Act retroactive to April 1, 1970, or to such earlier date as may be appropriate in certain cases.

We, Créditistes, support that subamendment, Mr. Speaker. Parliament must implement those recommendations as soon as possible, with a view to meeting the needs of veterans. The main recommendations in the white paper introduced after the publication of the Woods report should also be taken into account.

In this regard, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre mentioned several things I would have liked to say, but in order not to repeat the same thing, I shall say merely that the Créditistes approve the amendment of the hon. member, as well as the motion of the Progressive Conservatives, to the effect that we should, as soon as possible, implement the recommendations of the report, with a view to giving our veterans the benefits to which they are entitled.

[*English*]

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, June 20, 1969, and again May 4 of this year, were days allotted to the opposition and they chose to deal with the subject of veterans pensions.

This is a worthwhile and welcome debate because it reflects the interest of members of all parties in the human side of the question. In all the years that I have been a member of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs—and that dates back to the time when the hon. member for Brandon-Souris (Mr. Dinsdale) was the committee chairman—I have seldom encountered partisanship when the needs and the wellbeing of war veterans were being considered.

It may be useful to put on the record the introduction to the government's white paper on veterans pensions. It reads in part as follows:

For the past 50 years, Canada has recognized and freely accepted her obligation to pay compensation for disability and

death arising out of military service, in so far as it is reasonable and practicable to equate monetary values with human suffering and bereavement.

This is done through the Pension Act, the keystone of Canadian veterans legislation since 1919. It provides for the payment of pensions to the disabled veteran, his widow and his orphan, and to his dependent parents, sisters and brothers.

In addition, an award of pension also makes the recipient or his family eligible for other benefits. The veteran himself becomes eligible for medical treatment for his pensioned condition, special re-employment training if he needs it, war veterans allowance, and funeral and burial grants. After his death, his widow is eligible for war veterans allowance, and his pensioned children for advanced educational assistance.

The veterans of Canada comprise about one twelfth of the country's total adult population. Approximately 832,600 of these are veterans of World War II (or of both wars or of Korea) and another 112,600 are veterans of World War I. Of these two groups a total of 136,800 veterans were in receipt of pensions under the Pension Act as of December 31, 1968, and a further 29,800 pensions were in payment to the dependents or survivors of veterans.

• (4:10 p.m.)

For many years the Pension Act and the Pension Regulations which preceded it, have provided that pensions should be related to earning power; and the adjudication of pension claims has been the responsibility of an independent and impartial tribunal.

While adhering strictly to these basic principles, successive governments have found it necessary to review and amend the act in one way or another. Indeed, there have been few years during the half century when some change hasn't been made to the act.

The government is indeed aware of problems affecting war veterans, as well as thousands of other Canadians, and it is doing all that is possible to meet the situation in a rational way. There is no reason to assume that it has not kept faith with our comrades.

With regard to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), I shall not find great difficulty in supporting it. I recall the statement that he made during the debate on June 20, 1969, when he voiced the suspicion that the government was going to draft legislation in advance of hearings on the Woods Report. We all know how wrong he was in his assessment, Mr. Speaker.

As pointed out by the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis), the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs held 39 meetings and heard witnesses from no less than 19 veterans organizations. I wish at this point to name the principal ones: The Royal Canadian Legion, the Army, Navy and Air Force Veterans in Canada, the War Pensioners of Canada, the Sir Arthur Pearson Association for War Blinded, the Canadian Paraplegic Association, the Canadian Corps Association, the Nursing Sisters' Association of Canada, the National Dieppe Prisoner of War Association, the Hong Kong Veterans Association of Canada, The War Amputations of Canada, the National Council of Veterans Association in Canada, the Nationally Chartered Veterans Organizations, etc.

The Committee examined in detail each of the 148 recommendations of the Woods Report and, of course, all the proposals contained in the White Paper were closely scrutinized. The long and laborious study of the White Paper, which kept the Committee working several weeks during the summer parliamentary recess, is evidence that the members of the committee took their responsibilities seriously. When the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis), Chairman of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs, presented the report to the House, its members had reason to feel that a good job had been done. It was a good report upon which, no doubt, legislation will be based.

One cannot exactly blame the government for the delay in the implementation of the recommendations contained in the report, because a great deal of work is involved in the preparation of such a complicated piece of legislation. As an example, the Committee spent considerable time reviewing the appeal procedures suggested on the one hand by the white paper and, on the other hand, by the Veterans Associations, which were essentially modifications and extensions of the Woods recommendations. We were very much concerned about the principle of an independent review board being stacked on top of an independent pension commission. This appeared to raise a fundamental question of public administration, but the representations by the Veterans Associations were strong, persistent and deliberate on this point and, under the circumstances, the committee decided to recommend that the procedures essentially recommended by the veterans associations in the final hearings in April 1970, should be adopted with a slight modification.

The committee had also reservations concerning the observations of the veterans associations on the ability of the Canadian Pension Commission to delegate responsibility to field staff, and also on the suggestion that a single commissioner should be able to make decisions. It was the opinion of the committee that decisions should be signed by more than one commissioner in the interests of uniformity of administration. The committee had also reservations regarding the ability of 12 commissioners to be able to cope with the work load.

The committee felt that it would be difficult to foresee the operations of the Pension Review Board with any degree of certainty or to forecast, with any degree of assurance, the number of claims which would come before the board and the commission for adjudication in the future. Therefore, the committee suggested that the organization and procedure of both the Review Board and the commission be reviewed every five years. For these reasons, the committee considered the appointment of commissioners for a specific term being preferable to a life appointment, which veterans organizations had recommended. I have cited only one of the many points in the recommendations which are of a complicated nature, requiring a great deal of work in drafting the bill, which once introduced I am confident will please everyone concerned.

I am not questioning the sincerity of the mover of this motion. In fact, I congratulate him. Nevertheless, it should be made clear that we on this side consider the interests of war veterans with just as much zeal and dedication as any of those sitting on the benches of the opposition. I have also great faith in the minister, who has pointed out on several occasions that it is the Gov-

ernment's duty to consider the problems affecting the one million veterans of Canada. Happily, not all of them require assistance, nor do all especially need to appeal to the Government.

I am confident that the Government will always ensure that Canada's pension legislation is kept in harmony with modern concepts of social justice and its obligations to those who, in war and in peace, have placed their lives at the service of their country.

Mr. J. Chester MacRae (York-Sunbury): Mr. Speaker, I have followed with interest several very able addresses on this vital subject. The matter of veterans affairs is one that should never involve political partisanship. The welfare of those men and women who served their country in time of war, and of their dependents, is too important for it ever to become so petty as to involve political partisanship. I was glad to see that those who addressed the House refrained from that.

• (4:20 p.m.)

The mover of the motion, the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall) is a man for whom we in our party have a very special affection. Others in the House have spoken about the technical side of what has happened; I should like in the few minutes at my disposal, and I promise not to be too long, Mr. Speaker, to address myself to the human factor. The hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe served in the last war as a private soldier. He went to France on D-day, June 6, 1944, perhaps as the only man in the Canadian army with the rank of provisional officer cadet. He was waiting for his turn to go to OCTU, for his officer's commission. The colonel of the regiment, with which I was also serving, invited him to go along, and so the hon. gentleman took part in the greatest military operation in the history of the world as an officer cadet.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacRae: He later ended up with the rank of full colonel and was in charge of the entire reserve forces in the province of Newfoundland when he retired to come to Parliament. I felt he gave a very masterful address.

I must say, too, although perhaps some of my colleagues will not agree with me, that the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis), who served as the chairman of our committee during the past year, also gave an impressive address. Our relationship has been a very happy one. My major interest in public life has always been veterans affairs and I found that during this past year especially we have worked very well. There was very little, if any, partisanship in the committee. There were some points with which we did not completely agree in the deliberations of the committee, yet the report we brought down was an unanimous one. I think the report was a good one, too.

Although the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is not a veteran, I know he has a very deep interest in the veterans of this country. He has expressed that on many occasions. Although I disagree with his socialist theories, being a right wing Conservative, I appreciate his deep concern for the welfare of his fellow Canadians.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacRae: The hon. gentleman from Fort William (Mr. Badanai), who has been a friend of mine since he came to this House in 1958, also addressed the House very well, I felt. I can well remember what his predecessor, the Reverend Dan McIvor, said to me in 1957 after I had made my maiden speech in the House of Commons. I was speaking on veterans affairs, and on the estimates of the minister of that day, the beloved Colonel Alfred J. Brooks, who later became Senator Brooks and leader of our party in the Senate. After I had spoken, Mr. McIvor came over. He crossed the floor of the House and congratulated me and he gave me a piece of advice that I have remembered ever since. He said, "Don't try to be an expert in too many fields; there is too much going on here. Take up two or three subjects and try to know as much as possible about them." I never forgot that. He was a very fine gentleman, as is the hon. member for Fort William.

I should like to say this: it is now 52 years since the end of World War I and 25 years since the end of World War II. Those years have gone by very quickly. Of the more than 1.5 million men who served in Canada's wars, about 961,000 are still living. They are 961,000 very, very important men and very important women. May I recount an incident that took place in the last war. As hon. members know, a hospital has been built at Ste Anne de Bellevue. I had occasion to visit Ste Anne de Bellevue in 1941. My brother was dying there at the time. He had enlisted in the Regiment de Maisonneuve, a French Canadian regiment. There were men who had been there since 1914 and even 1918. Many of them were undergoing psychiatric treatment, because these men had been shellshocked. In the Second World War they called that condition battle exhaustion, although I think shellshock describes it better. What struck me was this: when they passed me in the corridor in my officer's uniform, they recognized the officer's rank and snapped to attention and saluted. That moved me deeply. These men were living in the past, in those days when their minds had been destroyed by the shell fire and yet they recognized an officer.

Previous speakers in this debate have referred to the work done by the chairman of the committee. Other speakers have alluded to the report of the Woods committee which I think, Mr. Speaker, is the most important document on veterans affairs that has ever been produced. It refers to veterans problems—perhaps problems is not the right word. It refers to the situation of veterans in this nation. I know Mr. Justice Woods personally and I served with him on the national command of the Canadian Legion. That report was a masterful document. As other speakers have said, the white paper followed the tabling of that report. Submissions were put forward by many of the great veterans organizations in this country.

The hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe and others mentioned the organizations which made their views known.

Finally, after many meetings, and after deep thought and a great deal of work, we had the report of the veterans committee brought before the House of Commons. I share the regret of other members of my party and I suspect, of members on the government side as well, that we have not yet introduced any legislation. I have a very special reason for saying that, Mr. Speaker. I am deeply interested in the welfare of our veterans, as the minister knows. We were born in the same county and have both lived for most of our lives in the same community in the Restigouche River Valley.

Let me say that the brutality, the starvation, the privation, humiliation and torture that were suffered by the men of the Royal Rifles of Canada, and the Winnipeg Grenadiers at Hong Kong is second only to the horrible treatment that was meted out to those who were imprisoned in Hitler's concentration camps. I know that the minister will agree with me when I say that many of these men are broken in body and mind. I have seen the welts on their bodies and the scars. I know one young lad from Campbellton who died after being beaten with rifle butts because some Japanese guard was displeased with something he had done.

These are things we ought to think about when we consider these men. I do not mean to be critical, but I feel that the legislation should have been brought down a year ago so that we could have taken care of these Hong Kong veterans by bringing them all up to the 48 per cent level. I understand that 395 of them have not yet been brought up to that point. I think the legislation ought to be made retoractive because, in this past year, several more of them have died. The mortality rate among these men has been very high because their lives have been shortened through the starvation they endured day after day, month after month and year after year. The food they were given daily was the amount of rice a man could hold in the palm of his hand. That was not all. They trapped rats and spiders as well as snakes to try to obtain a little more protein to keep them alive. So, I say to the minister in all sincerity and honesty, do not delay any longer; let us do something for these very, very courageous men who have suffered so much on our behalf.

I should like also to mention this point. It has been discussed in the past. It concerns the hon. gentleman who is occupying the chair at this moment. The veterans affairs committee went to Europe in 1966. Its function was to attend a number of ceremonies, to visit battlefields and visit Canadian cemeteries. We discovered that there are 850 cemeteries in France. We visited the battlefields of the Second World War from Normandy to the Rhine. We went to Ortona and Casino. Then, we went to the first war battlefields, to Ypres, Vimy and Passchendale and to the others. It was a most moving experience. I know that there has been a certain amount of criticism of committees going out of this country. They are criticized even for travelling in this country. Nevertheless, I believe completely that that was one of the most valuable trips, for want of a better word, that any committee has ever taken.

• (4:30 p.m.)

On that trip, Mr. Speaker, you were the Chairman of the committee. I think I speak for all who were there when I say that we found Your Honour to be a gentleman; able, kind, efficient and sympathetic. I became better acquainted with Your Honour. It was a pleasure to be with you at that time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacRae: Recently I read an editorial on remembrance. On the 25th anniversary of D-Day, one year ago, I had hoped to be in Europe. However, a heart attack intervened. Some of my colleagues attended, including the hon. member for Northumberland-Miramichi (Mr. Smith) and the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall), both of whom served in France on D-Day. In Holland there is a memorial to the Canadian Scottish, a very fine Canadian regiment. Among the Europeans, the Dutch people were among the most horribly treated by the Nazis. Under Hitler's tyranny some unspeakable brutalities occurred. Recently, I spoke with a widow who is now living in Fredericton. She informed me that when the Germans left her village in Holland near the end of the war most of the men were already in slave labour camps. The last act of the Gestapo and the S.S. troops was to take the 17 remaining men in the village, mostly teenage boys and old men, line them up against a wall and shoot them. The Dutch have much to remember.

A year ago a group, mostly former officers, placed a wreath at the memorial there to the Canadian Scottish. After the wreath was placed some young lads, 17, 18 or 19 years of age, tore down the wreath, stamped it into the ground and insulted the Canadians standing there. Of course, the older people were horrified. They apologized and made amends. An editorial regarding these young people stated, "How can they be expected to remember what they were not around to forget?". But there are still a great many Canadians who are here to remember. There is no more important body of Canadian citizens than those who wore a uniform and served in time of war, and no more important body than the women and children who waited for a husband or father who in so many cases did not return.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacRae: I support the motion of my distinguished and gallant comrade in arms, the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe and the subamendment of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). With all the sincerity at my command, I urge the minister not to delay any longer than necessary the introduction of the best possible legislation for these very important Canadians.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy LeBlanc (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy and pleased, like those hon. members who had the floor before me, with this opportunity to take part in the debate on the important motion introduced by the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall), whom, besides, I wish to congratulate.

Mr. Speaker, may I be allowed to congratulate also the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis) for the very elaborate speech he delivered a while ago, supplying us with many explanations and interesting and useful information concerning his work. All of us recognize that he was a most devoted and dynamic chairman of the Committee on veterans affairs.

It is therefore my pleasure to express my opinion on the motion of the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe and on the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles).

This motion is actually quite interesting and comes at the right time since we have just finished the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne and the debate dealing with the adoption of the measures which the government has had to take to deal with certain problems threatening the peace in this country.

The government is encouraged to introduce a bill aimed at implementing as soon as possible the recommendations of the second report of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs, and one cannot but be delighted. So is it in so far as increases in the allowances paid to veterans are concerned. It is normal that Canadians hope that the upgrading of allowances will allow all veterans to face the current increase in the cost of living.

We are very happy to have the opportunity to discuss this motion, with the hope that effective legislation will be passed soon. Veterans have the same needs as other citizens, but they have merits that others do not have.

While some other Canadian citizens were able to take advantage of their younger years in order to prepare for their future, by getting an education which would allow them to practice a trade or profession, ensuring their welfare and that of their families, those veterans sacrificed many years of their youth.

And the purpose of their activities during those years they sacrificed, so to speak, was certainly most sublime. This was the defence of our country, of freedom—which gives us cause for reflection, these days—of democracy, and Christianity.

The veterans I know best are of course those of my riding of Rimouski. Several of them come regularly to see me. Then I am able to ascertain that their needs are very easy to meet and that the government should more and more look into their problems in order to give them the help they deserve.

There are some of them who, after having lost the best years of their lives, as I said earlier, are facing financial and other difficulties. There is at present no special measure to help them.

There are others who, after having met with accidents which cannot easily be documented at times—accidents which could have occurred as they were performing their duties—are suffering terrible pain and are extremely handicapped. There is perhaps a lack of specific organizations to study their cases in order to apply the law in their favour and that of their family.

Sometimes, they do not get the proper kind of counsel when going before the Appeals Board. They often lack money and sufficient education to properly inform counsel defending them.

It might, in certain cases, be appropriate to have legislation authorizing them to avail themselves of the assistance of independent counsel, or, as we say in Quebec, of lawyers in private practice.

There should not be undue emphasis, in order not to mislead the Canadian people, on the fact that the government or Parliament delays taking active and efficient interest in presumably bringing forth a bill since, after all, legislation for the purpose of assisting veterans does exist.

When, a little over five years ago, the government established the Woods Committee, other people realized how important the problem was. Within the framework of the country's overall policy it was desirable, while helping veterans as much as possible, to proceed with some caution. As a rule commissions cannot get their work done quickly.

It is said that the report was tabled in 1968, or thereabouts, and I find it normal that the government should have prepared a white paper to make it easier to pass suitable legislation.

Since we are living under a democratic system, it is necessary that the representatives of the people may express their views on these issues. Even though commissions of scientists had scrutinized these questions, the committee went to work. The hon. member for Ottawa West said earlier how exhaustive the study was and with what determination all hon. members discussed the matter for the greatest benefit of veterans.

The committee report was brought before the House in June 1970, before the summer adjournment. At the beginning of this new session, we are precisely talking about legislation to be introduced eventually.

As for the speech of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre, I listened to it with much interest. While he was depicting the situation to us, I noticed his experience, the ease with which he spoke of these matters, his knowledge and his skill. Generally speaking, I share his views on this subject. As for retroactivity to April 1, 1970 for veterans' allowances I feel that his arguments are very interesting. I also wonder why he draws so much attention to other problems.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that I support the principle of the motion and the amendment and I am happy to find that some concern is shown for our veterans.

I hope that the government will, as soon as possible, introduce a bill that will satisfy the wishes of those who have fought for our country and our principles in other lands throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, when we have shown our veterans that, together, we have endeavoured to improve their lot and to enable them to be active citizens despite handicaps or diseases which are a direct consequence of their activities on war theatres, then all of us can make a contribution to the progress of Canada. I hope that the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Dubé) will take the necessary steps in this connection.

• (4:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. William Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand): Mr. Speaker, it gives me much pleasure to take part in this debate today. I was a member of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs and, speaking as a relative newcomer to this chamber, I can say that my service on that committee has been one of my more rewarding experiences as a member of the House of Commons. In that committee there seems to be no sparring for political advantage; everyone seems sincerely and honestly to be working for the benefit of the veterans of this country.

I support wholeheartedly the motion moved so eloquently by my hon. friend the member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall). No one who listened to his speech could help but be moved by the sincerity with which it was delivered and the well chosen language in which it was couched. I congratulate him upon the timeliness as well as upon the content of this motion.

The theme of my own remarks is the need for urgent action. Other hon. members have pointed out that there are certain landmarks evident in the course of our progress toward effective legislation. Mention has been made of the work of the Woods committee, perhaps the beginning of this long road, and of the deliberations of the veterans committee of the House of Commons under the impartial chairmanship of the hon. member for Ottawa-West (Mr. Francis). The report of that committee was tabled in this House. Then, it was in the hands of the Minister of Veterans Affairs so that he could bring forth the much needed legislation. But since that time I fear we have had nothing but promises that the question is being studied, that his officials are working on the legislation. This legislation has been long awaited. I have no doubt that the officials are doing their best. But surely this is not good enough. How long must we wait? Perhaps it is not unfair to say that we are beginning to wonder whether the government is so callous as to wait for the law of attrition to come into operation; for the inexorable passage of time to take its toll of our veterans in the country. Those men who risked their all in the service of their country surely deserve a better fate.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Reference has been made in the debate to the timeliness of this motion in view of the fact that in two weeks-time we will celebrate Remembrance Day. This was alluded to by the mover of the motion. Surely this legislation, so long in production and in introduction, would be the finest tribute to the fallen and the brightest wreath for the cenotaph of memory that the minister could lay in the ceremony that remembers our veterans.

In honouring them in this way, we would not only be honouring those who have paid the supreme sacrifice; we would also be giving desperately needed assistance to the living, to those who are barely existing on present veterans allowances.

The other facet of the motion deals with the very great need for an increase in our veterans allowances. Perhaps it would be redundant or repetitious again to draw attention to the poverty line laid down by the Economic Council of Canada in 1968, which was set at $1,800 for a single person. Surely, during these inflationary years the cost of living has increased much beyond that figure, yet the allowance for a single veteran is only $1,260 a year. The poverty line was set for a married person at $3,000 a year, yet a married veteran receives an allowance of only $2,100 a year. I suggest that is adequate evidence that there is a long awaited need for an increase in our veterans allowances.

If that is not enough, Mr. Speaker, let me inform you that any member of the House who has visited a Legion branch or a branch of the Army, Navy and Air Force Veterans Associations to talk to the men knows that many of these veterans are living in conditions of what I would call object poverty and despair. As has been pointed out, when these people are able to earn a few extra dollars by one means or another, this money is immediately deducted from their veterans allowance. Not because our officials want to do this; in the main they have the welfare and the good of our veterans at heart. But the officials are tied by the act and regulations under which they work. As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) said, if it is necessary to bring in two bills, then let us do so. But let us see if we cannot do something to assist people living in the conditions I have described.

I said at the beginning that I would be brief, and I conclude simply with this. I urge, with all the sincerity, at my command, that the government bring in the long awaited bill or bills to benefit our veterans. Let the minister rest assured that he will receive all the assistance necessary from members on both sides of the House to give the legislation speedy passage.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. It is my duty at this time, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau); health and welfare—measures to reduce the cost of hospital, medical and dental care; the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Stewart); national defence—reconsideration of closing of Rivers air base; the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Lundrigan); fisheries—initiatives to offset overfishing by foreign draggers—Oceanographic Studies.

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—VETERANS AFFAIRS—EARLY IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND WAR VETERANS ALLOWANCE INCREASES

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Marshall:

That this House urges the government to implement at an early date by way of the appropriate legislative amendments the recommendations contained in the second report of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs dated 9 June 1970 and in addition thereto to provide for early payment of adequate increases in the allowances under the War Veterans Allowance Act 1952, as amended.

And the amendment thereto of Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).

Mr. Jack Cullen (Sarnia): Mr. Speaker, may I say at the outset that I welcome the motion. I particularly welcome its timing, so very close to November 11, and also that it has been moved before the promised legislation has been presented to the House. Members of the House who have been widely interested in the welfare of veterans endorse any vehicle that highlights our responsibilities to our veterans.

I was a little disturbed, though not particularly surprised, at the comment of the mover of the motion that the Liberals or the members of this party should stand up and be counted, that they should raise cain in caucus about expediting this proposed legislation. I say to the hon. member that I hope he is not falling into the same trap he fell into in 1968 when he underestimated the ability, talent, intelligence and independence of the members of this party.

Let me also inform the hon. member that it is not only in the quiet and secrecy of the caucus that Liberal members put forward their points of view. Before the national convention of the Dieppe veterans and the P.O.W. association I spoke in favour of the kind of action that this resolution envisages. In other words, we are not pressing the government quietly and secretly in caucus, but doing so before the public and in public print, as is the case in the House today.

As a member of the committee on veterans affairs, I feel that the members of the committee have good reason to be proud of their efforts on behalf of the veterans. This committee is probably one of the most non-partisan committees that exists. All members of the committee who have spoken today have highlighted this fact. It has been my privilege to sit as a member of this non-partisan committee, and I think it is the most non-partisan committee of which I have been a member during the two years I have been a Member of Parliament.

I think tribute must also be paid to those members of our veterans organizations who collaborated to present the consensus of their member groups. I think mention should also be made of the splendid presentation made by Mr. Don Thompson and by Mr. Chadderton, who had the job of focusing the needs and requirements of our veterans organizations for the committee in a way we

could understand them, as well as high lighting the salient features and points that these groups wanted to make.

We have received some splendid commendation in *The Legion* magazine, which called the veterans affairs committee report a victory for the democratic process. I should like to say amen to that. The manner in which the report was documented and presented should command the attention of all who would like the government to change the legislation. However, in order to encourage the success of the democratic process, I agree with the mover of the motion that the legislation must be presented as soon as it is reasonably possible to do so.

Although every member of this House is familiar with the history, I think it should be pointed out once again that there were 148 recommendations made in the Woods committee report. And what a splendidly comprehensive and informative report it was. Following that, we had the government's white paper with its comments on the areas in the Woods committee report that it was prepared to accept, the things it would like to change, and those recommendations the government found unacceptable.

Then, following that, there were some 23 appearances by representatives of veterans groups alone, to say nothing of several other meetings held with officials from the department. I was particularly pleased that the veterans representatives saw fit to meet with the officials of the department when a misunderstanding of interpretation arose so that the true facts could be put before them, rather than what one person thought a section meant compared with what another person thought it meant. Then, they appeared before us with a consensus of interpretation as to what the white paper and the Woods committee report had to say. Following all this, we presented our committee report. It would seem to me that based on this report, the history of investigation and discussion of other reports, we now have all the background material. It is now time to act. As one who sits as a member on the government side I recognize that governments must establish priorities, but it would be my feeling that the veterans have every right to insist that their welfare rates are very close to the top of the list of priorities.

• (5:00 p.m.)

On November 11 we will be reminded not to forget. We will be reminded that this generation saw their duty and accepted it. I suggest that we should not lose sight of the fact, as Mr. Robertson said in his book "The Shame and the Glory", written about Dieppe and that group, "these were a generation of remarkable Canadians". Probably at no other time in our history has there been such a united Canada, and our veterans led us along this path. I am sure that each and every member of the service proudly wore the "Canada" Patch on his shoulder. A significant step toward our independence was taken when we declared war, not automatically on the coattails of Great Britain, but after some consideration so that it was, in fact, a Canadian decision.

The least we can do for the deceased veteran is to remove as much stress and strain from the family he left as is possible. We have splendid legislation and only recently made amendments to the Children of War Dead Act. This is a good piece of legislation. We also have to recognize that among all too many veterans there is an apathy. I say this is an apathy, not laziness. Our most sophisticated medical opinion has now given recognition to this fact. It is abundantly clear now that men who suffer from this kind of apathy do so usually because of the service they performed during the war years or as a result of the effects of their incarceration as prisoners of war. We must also not forget those who are less capable of earning a living as a result of injuries suffered during the war.

It is my feeling that if a veteran is to be helped he must be helped by the members in this House. Veterans have a splendid record of self-help through funds established to assist those who are temporarily financially embarrassed or who need immediate cash assistance. This, at best, is a stopgap measure and the kind of thing that should never be necessary. To date the veterans groups have accepted their responsibility through the presentation of their brief to the committee. The Legion groups have, in addition, a scheme for calling the Members of Parliament before their various meetings to speak to them. They invariably ask us this question each and every time: Mr. Member of Parliament, what have you done for me lately? It is my hope that after this legislation there will be a regrouping so that other gaps in the legislation may be plugged.

We must always be vigilant to the needs of veterans. We in this House of all people have an obligation not to short change the veteran or, as the poem says, "We will not break faith with those who died". We will and we must remember the veterans. It was surprising for me to hear that Canada had no prisoner of war association. I appreciate there is the Hong Kong veterans group and also the Dieppe and POW veterans organization. There is no POW association as such.

The Hong Kong veterans position, as so clearly pointed out by the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. MacRae), was such that they did not need a large association. Their plight was so obvious the public recognized that they must be helped by the government. The Dieppe and POW associations have endeavoured in the past to have medical examinations conducted to ascertain if there was a pattern of illness running through these particular veterans. About 1,600 medical records were studied by the Department of Veterans Affairs. We seem to forget, when talking about POWs, that the Dieppe POW's were roped and later chained for a period of one year. There was always the possibility in their minds that they might not come out of it alive. Toward the end of their incarceration, a number of them were forced to go on long marches. One of the veterans who appeared before our committee told us of a 700 mile forced march.

The reason I comment on the necessity for a prisoner of war association is that during their incarceration there were no medical records kept for these prisoners. It is for this reason I should like to see the benefit of the doubt clause exercised in favour of these veterans.

There is one more point I should like to leave with the House, Mr. Speaker. Somehow we have to get through to the younger generation, that generation after mine. I was not old enough to serve in the second world war and my heroes were not Rocket Richard, Gordie Howe and other hockey players. My heroes were Colonel Merritt and those who served in Canada's forces. Somehow we have to get through to the younger generation which has never known war, but some of whom are the most violent protesters, that veterans do not glorify war. When they attend services on November 11 they are paying tribute to brave comrades, dead and alive and the strongest anti-war sentiment is expressed by those who participated in war. I was surprised and disturbed to hear that in some areas thought has been given to creating a civil disturbance during the Remembrance Day parade when those veterans are paying tribute to dead comrades. I hope these misguided individuals will not be carried to that extreme. I hope they will appreciate that through this kind of remembrance the veterans are not glorifying war but are pointing to the horrors of war.

In summary I want to say this. We must not lose sight of the need for priority for veterans. They were successful before our committee. They were persuasive in their arguments and they made many of us change our point of view. The democratic process worked. Legislation is required soon. I have every confidence in the present Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Dubé); I am sure he will take this action and take it in a hurry. If he is in doubt about this I would plead with him to rid himself of this doubt and bring before this country the kind of legislation the veterans have urged.

In the *National Legion News* for June, following the report of the committee, these comments were made:

> The long-awaited parliamentary committee recommendations on the Woods committee report have won warm approval from Canada's veterans.
>
> The report of the committee of veterans affairs, presented Monday in the House, embraced many of the recommendations of the original Woods report. The newly elected president of the Royal Canadian Legion, Judge Redmond Roche, Montreal, described it as a "significant step forward in the restructuring of Canada's pension program for veterans".
>
> He termed it a most helpful document which should form the basis of new legislation which will bring about long sought improvements in veterans' pensions.

This is my concluding word. Judge Roche, speaking on behalf of the 11 national veterans organizations, has expressed hope that the government will proceed with the drafting of new legislation based on the report.

Mr. Harold E. Winch (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, may I say, in rising to speak on this most important motion before us, that I intend to be exceedingly brief. Members who have spoken before me have fully and adequately conveyed almost all my thoughts and sentiments on matters affecting the veterans of this country. May I say that about the only thing with which I disagree, is the confidence in the Minister of Veterans

Affairs (Mr. Dubé) expressed by the previous speaker. I am not prepared to give him a vote of confidence until we have action, not excuses, legislation and not a series of promises. The proof of the pudding is in the eating, and it is only after action that the minister will be entitled to a strong expression of confidence. I hope the time is not too distant when I, too, can express confidence in the minister.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Without any fear of contradiction, I can say I feel certain hon. members of the House are unanimous concerning the need for changes in the legislation, changes in the regulations and changes in policy. Because I am so strongly convinced that statement is correct, I shall not take the time to repeat what has already been said concerning the excellence of the work of the Woods commission and the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs. I believe it is obvious that the only thing that requires repetition is that in the time available as many of us as possible should express to the minister and the government our belief that there is a matter of urgency involved and a need for action. I most certainly agree with hon. members who have said this is a matter of top priority. It certainly is in the constituency of Vancouver East.

There are thousands of veterans in Vancouver East, and thousands of them are members of veterans organizations such as the Royal Canadian Legion and the Army, Navy and Air Force Veterans of Canada. All the time they say: when, oh when, is something going to be done? Is the government delaying because month by month and year by year so many of us are dying that there will be fewer and fewer in respect of whom the government will have to accept a greater financial responsibility? This is what the veterans are saying, everybody knows it. I think it is shameful that it should be necessary for our veterans to engage in this type of thinking. It certainly is necessary, however, when we realize that the studies were first commenced over five years ago and we are still awaiting the legislation from the government.

I said I would not repeat what has already been brought to the attention of the minister and the government, but I should like to add the thought that I hope in his deliberations the minister is prepared not only to bring in legislation dealing with the Hong Kong veterans but also Canadian prisoners of war in other areas. One only has to speak to the veterans, as I do so often being a member of both the Army, Navy and Air Force Veterans of Canada and the Royal Canadian Legion, to be aware of the effects of the imprisonment, starvation and hell they went through in the camps in Europe, some of them for long periods. I believe this merits immediate consideration. I hope the government will keep this in mind.

I most certainly hope there will be immediate action to resolve a great many of the veterans problems which are brought to the attention of Members of Parliament. I refer of course in particular to the vicious, pressing situation surrounding those who of necessity receive the War Veterans Allowance. This has been mentioned by many members, particularly by my colleague the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). However, I wish to add my plea for immediate action in this regard because of the numerous cases which come to my attention and which I know come to the attention of other hon. members. I should like to stress something that perhaps is one of the greatest matters of urgency, apart from a change in the regulations and increases in pensions. I refer to the need to get away from something that I know must be a major concern to Members of Parliament in handling veterans problems. I refer to the fact that quite often it is necessary for a member to say he cannot do anything for a veteran because the board states that the condition is a pre-enlistment condition. If I have ever heard a hypocritical statement that is it.

When the government of Canada needed men and women to offer their lives and limbs for Canada, these men and women were examined by doctors and their cards said that they were A-1. Then, they went overseas and thousands did not return. Yet, years later when those who did return suffer from disabilities caused by their experience in war, they are turned down because of a pre-enlistment condition. Mr. Speaker, I know all of us express in our hearts the opinion that if the man has offered his life for Canada when Canada required his services, and when Canada and the government said he was A-1, no government and no country has the right years later to say he cannot receive the allowance he requires because of a pre-enlistment condition. Because of my experience over a long period in handling the cases of veterans I wanted to mention, in addition to all the other arguments, the necessity for recognition of the urgency involved before too many of our veterans pass on to the Great Beyond.

I noted with interest the remarks of previous members about Remembrance Day being two weeks away. Thousands upon thousands of people across Canada will be standing before the Cenotaphs of our country honouring the fallen. That is as it should be. But it brings to mind the statement of the men and women who offered their lives in war, "We shall not fail". The veterans of Canada, Sir, did not fail this country in time of need. I think perhaps the greatest honour we can give, not only to those who died but more specifically to those who came through and lived, is to say that by November 11 the government shall introduce all the various pieces of legislation required to meet the needs of the veterans and to bring into effect the acceptable sections of the report of the Woods commission and of the report of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs. I conclude by saying, sir, the Canadian veterans did not fail us. Let us not fail them.

Mr. D. W. Groos (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have an opportunity to take part in this debate. I do so at somewhat short notice. I was very interested in, and I should like to say here and now that I support, the motion put forward by the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Mar-

shall). His constituency does not quickly come to mind but I heard the hon. gentleman's speech and I will remember it for a long time.

When you recognized me, Mr. Speaker you referred to me as the hon. member for Victoria. In Victoria, we have many veterans who are disabled and many of their dependents, and the next of kin of deceased veterans. I think Victoria, in particular, has a reputation for being a city which did not spare its sons to defend what it thought was just cause, whether it was in the Boer War, in World War I and World War II or in the Korean War. Speaking personally, in my little class at school in Victoria, of the 13 pupils 12 were veterans of the second world war and the thirteenth could not be a veteran because he was serving in the U.S. merchant marine.

• (5:20 p.m.)

When we speak of veterans pensions—and this is one of the few points that has not been brought up so far in this debate to my knowledge—many people think that all veterans receive pensions. We all know that this is not the case. We are speaking here today not of everyone who has served this country but of a special few, and of the survivors of those special few. I enjoy my work on the Veterans Affairs Committee because we help each other to help others, and surely that is what Parliament is all about. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that veterans in good health in this House and in the various veterans organizations, of which there are 11 across the country, are not trying to help themselves. We are trying to help others: the disabled, the next of kin of our war dead, and the so-called burnt-out veterans who cannot make their way in this competitive and complicated world. These are the people we are trying to help. We all do it in our own way.

I look around me and I see many of the hon. members who have already spoken on this and on the other side of the House who have helped out in special ways. The hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. MacRae) spoke about the Hong Kong veterans. A great number of us put in reports and recommendations to the Woods committee when it was conducting its hearings. I put forward a series of recommendations at that time, and now I would like to put in a special plug for the benefit of doubt clause to which reference has been made by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch) who just preceded me. I feel very strongly about this. I am speaking about the benefit of doubt as it relates in particular to veterans who served overseas, because as you, Mr. Speaker, know and as every other veteran knows, veterans who have served overseas have often been denied the benefit of doubt because they have no proper medical documentation. Every veteran here will agree with me when I say that the best documented veteran is the soldier, the sailor or the airman who stayed behind in Canada. Naturally, he has the best documents because he did not have a chance to lose them anywhere. So, as I say, I would like to put in this plug for the overseas veteran who is suffering as a result of the so-called benefit of doubt clause, and I hope it is removed soon, the sooner the better.

The other day when I was at the Calgary airport I saw the now elderly and somewhat tattered Lancaster aircraft mounted outside the airport as a monument to the past. For me it was a poignant sight and it set me to thinking of our war dead, of our veterans, and of our efforts on their behalf. When I say "our efforts" I am thinking not only of the House of Commons and its Veterans Affairs Committee but also of the various veterans organizations and groups which have appeared from time to time before our committee to put forward their ideas and to give us the benefit of their advice. I had an opportunity to work closely at one time—and I am happy to say we were rewarded with some success a few years ago—with one of these groups. I am referring to the Hong Kong veterans. I will not say any more about their plight because I think much has already been said on this subject, but certainly we must not stop in our efforts to help them until every last one of them receives the minimum 48 per cent disability pension which will give protection of some sort to their wives and families.

Looking at this aircraft on the pedestal outside Calgary against the backdrop of events in Canada today, I wondered what had happened to our sense of values. We may personally and individually place the welfare of our veterans and their dependents or their next of kin high on our own scale of priorities, but this sense of values of which I speak, and its high place in our personal scale, must be reflected and incorporated in the legislation passed in this House. I can find no fault with the motion brought before the House by the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe, and I urge the government to take speedy action to bring about a sizeable increase in both the range and the scale of benefits available to veterans and their survivors. I ask the government to go beyond the point of restoring the purchasing power of the former pensions and allowances. To my mind, those pensions and allowances were far too low, and I ask the government to remember that.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Finally, I ask the government to remember that when we enter into wars we have to realize that there is always a price to pay and it takes a long time to pay because it is a price in blood and a price in money. We are asking the government today to see to it that the nation does its duty by paying money. This is the least expensive and easiest form of payment. We should not have to wait much longer. Judging by the tone of this debate so far and by my experience with other veterans legislation that has been introduced by the government in this House, any legislation that they may care to introduce to alleviate the situation described here so eloquently today by other hon. members would, I am sure, pass very quickly. I am equally sure hon. members would delay not one whit any other government business that the government may wish to bring before the House. So my final plea, Mr. Speaker, is through you to the minister and the government to let us now get on with our job.

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I of course support the motion and I am only sorry that we have to raise this matter again. It is now 25 years since the fighting stopped in Europe, and somewhat less than that since the boys came home from Korea. But in my opinion the occurrences of the last few weeks have clearly shown that in the final analysis there is no prosperity, no freedom in a rough world except when some of our citizens pay for it with their lives, their health and their devotion. On behalf of these people who cannot be here to beg for themselves I am proud to be able to be here and beg. I am only sorry that we have to beg.

Many years ago the people of Canada, through their representatives in the House of Commons, passed the Pension Act. I believe that act is quite adequate to handle the situation. There is no necessity for a long report like the Woods committee report, which comprised some 1,300 pages in its final form, outlining in clear terms the duty of the Canadian people and of the Canadian Parliament to the people I have mentioned. Nevertheless, we now have that report. It was somewhat expensive to obtain. It is comprehensive. The Woods committee went into almost every phase of the Pension Act. As a result it has underlined what was clearly understood before its work began—that the people of Canada want to give those who have served their country so nobly and well, particularly in war, full compensation within the budget that they can meet.

The act was not foolishly generous. It only purports to give these men and their families a minimum return, which is nothing less than to put them back into civilian life as nearly as possible to the competitive position they occupied before they joined the forces. The level at which it was hoped to return them to civilian life was that of an untrained labourer. Perhaps some people would say that here is democracy working at its best. Equality was the dominant thought in the minds of the taxpayers of Canada when the Pension Act was first passed. They understood it would be administered in the fairest way possible. Section 70, which I think is the key to the whole act, stated in clear terms that the benefit of the doubt was to be given to veterans.

For reasons which the preceding speaker clearly brought out, the best soldiers, best sailors and best airmen are frequently incapable of documenting how they lost their health, unless they were wounded by gunshot, shrapnel or mine explosion to the extent that their wounds are self-evident. But it is very difficult for those who served in the front line and those who were prisoners of war to produce any document to prove that their failure in health is due to their war service.

I repeat that the people of Canada, through their members of Parliament, placed a section in the act stating that the benefit of the doubt was to be given to these men. If the benefit of the doubt had been given to them, there would be no necessity for a great deal of the Woods report. But the Hong Kong veterans had the greatest difficulty over the last 25 years even in getting a proper hearing because the people who interpreted the act asked them, "Where are your papers? Where is your medical evidence?" But, Mr. Speaker, we saw men blinded by malnutrition. We saw 190-pound men reduced to a handful of bones.

I had the privilege to help some of these people off the troopships when they came home. Their mothers did not recognize them; their wives did not recognize them. Because a third of them were blind at that time, they were not able to recognize their mothers and wives. Do you need the benefit of the doubt under conditions like that? But it has taken us 25 years of argument, hairsplitting and voluminous reports to reach the stage where we have achieved unanimous approval of measures to meet their needs.

The members of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs were unanimous in the recommendations. Most of them are veterans themselves and know the story well. That committee unanimously recommended immediate action. I am very proud of the members who sat on it, from the very amiable chairman right on down through all party lines. They worked hard. They gave up several weeks of their own time to sit on the committee, to make sure that a concise and accurate report was given to the House.

But what did we get then, Mr. Speaker? We got delay. We got talk about priorities. We need no talk about priorities in this matter. Where do we put those men to whom we owe our affluent society, all the great chances we have in Canada, all the wealth we have, all the freedom we have? All we are asking is the absolute minimum required to keep them in decent clothing and shelter. The minimum pay of an untrained labourer in the public service is all we are asking for them.

The Standing Committee has given its unanimous approval. I do not know why there should be delay. I for one would be willing, without debate, to vote the necessary money. I am willing to have my income tax raised—and that is a rare concession—if that is what is holding matters up. If it is only lack of money, let us pay it. Let us borrow the money if we do not have it, and pay it to these people. I do not want to go into a long list of the frills that we have enjoyed, but I deny that there is in this case any valid argument on the necessity for weighing priorities. This matter is of the highest priority. It is a debt we all owe.

The only argument that could be advanced for not giving an increase here and now is that we do not have the money. But I do not believe that, Mr. Speaker. We cannot have it both ways. We cannot say we are one of the most prosperous young nations on earth, that we have the answers to most of our economic problems, that we have things under control, but that we cannot pay this miserable debt to the people who most need assistance.

• (5:40 p.m.)

This is a great opportunity for our Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), who perhaps in the past has been misled by his own ideology or training in peacetime schools, to show us that now, in the age of his maturity he can give

us the kind of leadership in peacetime that we expected in wartime for our soldiers. It is not necessary for one to be a veteran in order to reward our soldiers. The present situation gives the Prime Minister a great opportunity to show that he is now willing to stand where Canadian servicemen stood in 1939 when they faced physical danger.

If the Prime Minister has only to face political danger, I think he ought to be willing to give us leadership in this regard and to tell an unwilling cabinet and an unwilling treasury board to approve improvements in veterans legislation. I challenge him directly to say that to the cabinet. If he gives his approval to measures which will improve the lot of the veterans, I do not think many members of the cabinet, of the treasury board or those on his side of the House will oppose him. They will go along with him.

The members who served on the Veterans Affairs Committee said unanimously that these improvements are long overdue. Lest people think that I, along with the Veterans Affairs Committee, am trying to take credit for the country's awareness of the plight of the veterans, let me hasten to say that the Canadian Legion has carried on this great campaign on behalf of fallen comrades and those who have been left behind. If being turned down on many occasions could discourage some people from acting, the organization representing the Hong Kong veterans would long ago have quit trying to do something. Nevertheless, they showed the same fortitude in carrying on this campaign on behalf of their needy brethren and others as their brethren showed in the past. They made a heroic attempt to see that the right thing was done.

I would be remiss in my duty if I did not say that I appreciate the effort and assistance of Dr. Richardson who brought in a magnificent report on behalf of the Hong Kong veterans. I think his report would have been unnecessary if section 70 of the act had been properly utilized. He documented the ills from which most of these boys suffered; ills such as avitaminosis, which in plain, layman's language means starving to death slowly. That magnificent report gave us an opportunity to act correctly because it brought clearly to our attention the very specific needs of this group of men.

I was greatly heartened, Mr. Speaker, when I heard that the Hong Kong veterans were to be the beneficiaries of specific legislation. We gave unanimous consent to this proposal in committee, so far as we could speak for all members of the House, and said we would not oppose the legislation in the slightest degree. Also, we gave credit to the officials of the Department of Veterans Affairs and of the Department of National Health and Welfare for knowing exactly what was needed so far as veterans were concerned. We have agreed unanimously over the years that these veterans should receive special attention and that we should set aside substantial sums of money in order to help them. Their priority must be brought up to date.

In Canada we have no system of rewarding a man for valour. We invest him, when the situation merits, with a plain red ribbon. But the man who carries this plain red ribbon—I am referring to the Victoria Cross, the highest award we can give our heroes—will no doubt say that there are many equally brave deeds which have never been recorded. I suggest that the greatest award we can give our heroes is in taking soon a new look at our veterans legislation, so that we can reward those who served so well in our time of need and look after their wives and families who, in many cases suffered even more than the soldiers who had comradeship to bolster their morale and share their burdens even unto death.

Mr. Murray McBride (Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if any member of this chamber wanted to select a motion for debate to demonstrate to all Canadians that it is possible for us in the House of Commons, despite our varying orientations on many issues of policy, to attain an amazing degree of unanimity, he could have selected none better than the motion now before the House. Indeed, the motion does credit to its mover. It is one that I hasten to support.

For my part I wish to comment on a matter that has not been mentioned today in the many eloquent speeches on varying aspects of the topic before us. There is a tendency in our culture for people who are not veterans to be embarrassed when someone mentions veterans affairs. They assume that non-veterans should hold their peace and leave the discussion of veterans affairs to the "pros", to the people with actual experience. I suggest to the House that a fairly plausible argument could substantiate the opposite point of view. It is this. It seems to me that we ought to be pleased in Canada that we have not experienced a major conflict since the Korean war and that therefore we do not have a continuing supply of newly created veterans. It is a good thing not to be in the "veteran-making" business.

Secondly, it seems to me that we ought to be very pleased that our young Canadian men and women who have reached their adult years following the Second World War are willing to stand shoulder to shoulder with those who are veterans. Like others in this chamber who have spoken this afternoon, I am one of those. However, I have the good fortune to come from an area of eastern Ontario that has a large number of Legions. There are seven in my constituency. I know personally a number of veterans who keep me well informed from the "inside" point of view.

In dealing with comments that have been made in preceding speeches, I say very forcefully that I completely concur with what several speakers have said. I think the first member to mention the subject to which I am about to refer was the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. MacRae). Other hon. members also spoke on the matter. I concur in the suggestion that the Hong Kong veterans are entitled to special consideration. They have a special claim, and this fact should be reiterated in this House time and again.

The circumstances of their lives are more difficult than those of some other veterans who were treated better.

In addition, I think hon. members all know of the sense of frustration felt by families in which a veteran has

died. I refer to the sense of frustration in particular of people who have become aware, as most Canadian families which include a veteran are now aware, that we are literally on the eve of a significant overhaul of our veterans legislation. Constituents have come to me recently to express a keen sense of frustration and even bitterness about a veteran, a member of the family, who has died before this progressive step has been completed.

• (5:50 p.m.)

I assume that the reason for placing this subject before the House today is that we are so close to November 11. Approximately one year ago, on November 7, 1969, the member for York North (Mr. Danson) introduced Bill C-146, to amend the Remembrance Day Act. The gist of the bill was that the Sunday prior to November 11 would be a national day of remembrance or memorial. As the hon. member stated at that time, the eleventh hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month is at present, ignored by large segments of our society and misunderstood by equally large segments.

There are two choices in this matter. One alternative is to hold the line and, in spite of the worst fears of many of us, witness the continued erosion of this very significant day of remembrance in the history of Canada and, indeed, in the history of the world. The alternative is to reorganize and restructure. I am not sure of this quotation, but I think it was Cicero who said, "He who is ignorant of what happened before he was born is destined to remain a child for ever." This quotation came to mind this afternoon when I listened to the hon. member for York-Sunbury tell the House of the incident where a group of Dutch youths tore down a wreath which had been placed on a memorial by a number of Canadian veterans. I suppose for some there is a thin line between being a warmaker or a warmonger and, on the other hand, holding in reverence the casualties of war.

The purpose of the Woods committee was to analyse the situation in which veterans now find themselves so that our society might better, and in very practical ways demonstrate our corporate reverence for those who paid the price and suffered the pain of war without idolizing or praising that which must be diligently avoided. We must aid war victims, not nurture reference for war. I suggest that we should do something—I do not pretend to have a brilliant insight into this matter—along the lines suggested by the hon. member for York North, that is, something to help our young people better appreciate the significance of Remembrance Day. We might thereby create a better mood in respect of this whole subject.

An hon. member mentioned there had been rumours that during the parades for Remembrance Day ceremonies this year some people were planning demonstrations on the assumption that those who parade on November 11 are swordrattlers, warmongers and hawks, and if you are not that kind of person you should oppose them. This is a dastardly misreading and misunderstanding of the facts. Because of this situation I again looked at the bill of the hon. member for York North. I know he was vilified by many people in our country, even by some loyal veterans. But perhaps we could do something so that Canadians would seriously and positively appreciate what we try to do on November 11. If one had to help war victims, without idolizing war, in the days of sword and spear, it became all the more essential in the days of bullets and bombs and a must in our day of mushrooms and missiles.

Every member of this House must, as I do, receive letters and delegations on behalf of veterans whose situations are tragic. As the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Groos) pointed out, all veterans do not automatically receive a pension. I am continually amazed at the number of Canadians who somehow assume that by virtue of being a veteran one receives a pension. People write to their Member of Parliament and ask why a certain veteran is not receiving a pension. It is obviously a widely held belief that all veterans automatically receive pensions, but as the hon. member for Victoria correctly stated, this is not true.

Obviously, for a few veterans a present situation in which they find themselves, unfortunate as it may be, cannot be linked in any direct way to war service. We are all aware of this and I need not belabor the point. However, for some there is a linkage. Therefore, time is of the essence as far as the implementation of this massive updating of our veterans legislation is concerned. When veterans die while such sweeping improvements are just around the corner, there is naturally a sense of frustration, sometimes bitter, not only by the next of kin but by all sensitive members of the House and indeed all Canadians who champion this cause.

I firmly recognize and appreciate the fact that war veterans legislation is being given proper priority by the government of Canada, especially by our distinguished Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Dubé). I wish to read two paragraphs from the white paper on veterans pensions.

> Since World War I, Canada's legislative programs for the rehabilitation and welfare of her ex-servicemen and their dependants have been recognized, internationally as well as nationally, as being broad in their scope and generous in their provisions. And this legislation has been kept flexible and dynamic; it has been amended regularly to meet the changing needs of those it serves, and to adjust it to changes in the concepts of social justice and in the Canadian economy.
>
> Through the Pension Act, Canada endeavours to compensate as fairly as possible for the economic disadvantages caused by disability of bereavement which is related to military service. To place an accurate monetary value on human suffering and sorrow would be virtually impossible, because of the many imponderable and subjective factors involved.

May I call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member wishes to call it six o'clock. He has only two minutes left in which to speak. If hon. members agree, it might be better to allow him to finish his speech.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. McBride: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to emphasize the conclusions of the white paper. I concur in

the sentiments of the magnificent speech of the hon. member for Sarnia-Lambton (Mr. Cullen). I am aware, and I am sure hon. members recognize, that much of that which we try to recompense through veterans pension plans is without price and beyond cost. It is impossible to place an accurate monetary value on human suffering and sorrow. However, let it be clearly recorded that Canadians of all ages should be delighted to see more tax dollars, a larger part of the public purse, being used to aid that noble and diminishing number, the war veterans of Canada.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member may call it six o'clock, but it does not guarantee that he will be recognized as the first speaker at the commencement of the sitting this evening. It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair.

At six o'oclock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Central Nova): Mr. Speaker, I have followed with interest the debate upon which the House is now engaged. I begin my contribution by saying that I fully endorse the excellent motion which has been placed before the House by my hon. friend from Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall). He is a fellow Nova Scotian who went far afield and has done well in the great province of Newfoundland. Of course, we shall always welcome him back when the time comes.

I also endorse the amendment moved by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). Taken together, the motion and the amendment make a very forceful plea. The report of the Veterans Affairs Committee is, of course, founded upon the studies undertaken by the Woods committee; the background has been discussed in detail by other hon. members and I do not intend to repeat what they have said. Nevertheless, there are a number of aspects I wish to discuss; some of them may be called housekeeping or legal matters.

I agree with those who have said that the report which the committee made to this House and to the government was an excellent one. It covered most of the points made in the Woods committee report and set out the lines which it hoped the government would follow when introducing legislation affecting veterans. The government now has the report in its hands, and the question is: What kind of legislation will be brought in and when will it be introduced? Of course, we do not know precisely what is to be contained in the legislation and this is why we, as members of the opposition, are putting our ideas forward at this time.

There are certain provisions which I feel should be contained in any legislation to be placed before the House. One of the recommendations contained in the report concerned the appeal procedure. As I recall the government's White Paper, it proposed the setting up of a directorate of pensions as a branch of the Department of Veterans Affairs, the effect of which would be to restrict opportunities for appeal. I trust the government will provide, in the legislation to be brought before Parliament, for a separate pension review board as recommended by the committee. This would afford veterans the opportunity, at their request, to submit pension cases for final review on the basis of a final interpretation of the act. This is most important. I can think of a number of veterans in my area and, for that matter, throughout the country who would undoubtedly have their files reopened if this course were adopted.

Another question which comes frequently to the attention of the Pension Commission and, undoubtedly, to the attention of hon. members, concerns the presumption of medical condition. This matter was referred to earlier today by the hon. member for Vancouver East (Mr. Winch). It is possible that under the terms of the existing legislation the commission can do no other than reach the decisions it does. But since so many of these decisions are reached on the basis of a veteran's pre-enlistment medical condition, I must go along with the hon. member for Vancouver East in this respect. I trust that the legislation will deal with this question of the presumption of medical condition. The white paper, as I recall it, stated that if an adverse medical condition manifested itself within six months of a man's enlistment, it would be excluded from this presumption. The committee felt that this period should be limited to three months.

• (8:10 p.m.)

To return to the question of the interpretation of the Pension Act, I recall sitting on several Veterans Affairs Committees and one clause that always gave us, and undoubtedly many veterans, problems was the benefit of the doubt clause. The Woods committee report proposed a completely new basis for the benefit of the doubt principle which would mean, in effect, that a pension adjudicator would be allowed to find in favour of a veteran's claim even though the veteran had not established his claim by a preponderance of evidence. In such a case the claim would be resolved in favour of the veteran rather than the government through its Department of Veterans Affairs.

To be fair to the government, the white paper recognized the problems that have arisen over the interpretion of this section of the act and proposed the rewriting of the section to incorporate guidelines in regard to what constituted the benefit of the doubt. Although I hope this proposal will be taken up, I contend the benefit of the doubt principle should be applied in favour of the veteran, not in favour of the government. A veteran should not have to prove his case by a preponderance of evidence.

I have also had quite a bit to do with veterans bureaux in the Atlantic area as well as in Ottawa, and I have nothing but praise for them. It has been suggested that the veterans bureaux are serving two masters, and I do

not think that this should be the case. I would support the conclusion agreed upon by the parliamentary committee and proposed by the Woods committee that the veterans bureaux should be established under a separate part of the Pension Act so they can report directly to the minister. They should be cast in the role of acting strictly as the applicant's advocate and should be relieved of the responsibility of reporting unfavourable evidence to the commission. Such a recommendation was endorsed in the government's white paper and supported by the parliamentary committee of which I was a member.

I have several files in my office in connection with members of the regular forces who have been injured while on duty. According to the relevant section of the act, members of the regular forces must show that any injuries were sustained in the course of duty. Sometimes this is quite difficult to prove. In some instances, where there was an irregularity, it has been held they were not acting in the course of their duty. For example, I recall a case concerning a young airman who was walking across an air base in this country, against a red traffic light, en route to the control tower when he was knocked down by a civilian vehicle. The commission did not rule whether he was injured in the course of his duty, but held that since he was guilty of contributory negligence at the time, he was not entitled to a pension. There is no provision in the act to deal with this situation.

The committee was of the view that the act should be revised to provide presumptions upon which a pension could be approved where death or disability had arisen from physical training, sport activity, transportation and other acts done as part of service operations, training or administration. I hope that this point will be covered by the minister and will be included in the legislation to come before the House.

Other hon. members have spoken about the burnt-out pension under the War Veterans Allowance Act. I have many files in my office on this issue. It has already been pointed out that the present allowance is $1,260 for a single person and $2,100 for a married person, both figures being below what we have called the 1968 poverty line of $1,800 and $3,000 for a single and a married person respectively.

I also want to raise the question of permissible income, which is better known as the income ceiling. I think this ceiling should be raised. At the present time, to be eligible under the legislation the combination of other income and the allowance that a veteran receives must not exceed, if he is a single man, $1,740 a year or, if he is a married man, $2,940 a year—still below the poverty line. I suggest the income, including the war veterans allowance, the burnt-out pension, should be at least $2,280 for a single person and $3,840 for a married person.

Not long after the guaranteed income supplement legislation was passed, I met a veteran on the street in my home town who told me he had applied for the GIS because he was told it would not affect his war veterans allowance. However, his war veterans allowance was cut and he found himself worse off, financially, than he was before he applied for the GIS. I fail to see any equity in this situation. I contend that payments like the guaranteed income supplement, old age security and so on, should not be considered income and included in the income ceiling prescribed by the War Veterans Allowance Act.

I have taken enough time in this debate, Mr. Speaker. I fully endorse the matters that have been put before the House by the committee. As I said when I commenced my speech, the question is: When will the government bring in the new legislation? I say the sooner, the better. I hope the legislation will contain the most important of the points that I have put before the House this evening.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs): If I may, Mr. Speaker, I should like to begin by extending my congratulations to the mover of the motion under study, the member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall), and to all those who took part in this debate.

I should like to say how happy I am in my capacity as Minister of Veterans Affairs to see that all members put veterans affairs above political partisanship and sincerely voice their opinion on what should be done for our veterans.

We all agree that the Canadian people will be forever indebted to our veterans and that we must do our utmost to help them.

Besides, successive governments since World War II have accomplished great things to give veterans what they deserve. We are proud of what our governments did for those men who did not hesitate to go overseas and fight for our democracy and freedoms.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dubé: Mr. Speaker, I could summarize the measures our country has taken since World War II to show its gratitude, but I shall only mention the program for rehabilitation to civilian life, education assistance to veterans, assistance programs for the children of war dead, measures to help veterans settle on farms and housing assistance. I cannot keep on like this, although I would like to do so, because in all fairness, we must recognize that all Canadian governments have acted decently with respect to war veterans.

Last May, I had the opportunity and the privilege and the honour of heading a delegation of veterans who went to Holland to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the liberation of the Dutch people. It should be recalled that Holland was liberated by Canadian troops. Actually, this is the only country in the world ever to be liberated by Canadian forces. During the ceremonies, I had a chat with Prince Bernhardt and among other things I told him about my duties as Minister of Veterans Affairs and about the activities of my department. His Royal Highness was amazed at the efforts made by the Canadian government for the well-being of its war veterans. Indeed, I know of only one other minister responsible for

war veterans apart from me, and it is my French counterpart. Our allies, the United States and Great Britain have decided after a period of 25 years that having such a department was no longer justifiable. We have continued to do so and I am pleased to announce to the House that next week, I will have the opportunity to go to France, to revive our common memories, to renew our good relations with that country, to meet my opposite number the French Minister of Veterans Affairs, and to visit Vimy and Beaumont-Hamel as a representative of the Canadian government before those great monuments which are the symbol not only of glorious wartime feats, but also of the many Canadians who gave up their lives or in certain cases their limbs or their health.

But the members of the Canadian government, Mr. Speaker, do more than stand at attention in front of monuments—

• (8:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

What we are trying to do is not only to stand at attention before monuments, but we do remember veterans and we are continuing year after year trying to give them the best possible services available in Canada. These services will cost Canadian taxpayers this year $500 million—half a billion dollars which we are dispensing for our veterans. We are trying to do this in a very efficient manner so as not to spend uselessly the taxpayers' money. I am sure that no Canadian will ever reproach us for giving that much attention and that much financial assistance to our veterans. I know that all hon. members, especially from what I have heard this afternoon, want us to do even more. They can rest assured that the points they have made this afternoon with reference to disability pensions and war veterans allowances have been well noted.

Of course, it is not my place to make an announcement now, but I can assure the House that this government, as all Canadian governments have in the past, will do its utmost for our veterans. Before we talk about increases I should state—perhaps the public does not know this—that at the present time a Canadian veteran with a family of five receives in disability pension the sum of $5,496 a year, tax free. I am very pleased about that and I say it with joy. Of course, we intend to do more. Some hon. members who spoke this afternoon claimed that veterans were living in dire poverty. With regard to war veterans allowances, they were increased in 1965 and again in 1966. We know of course, that the cost of living has gone up; we are not blind to that situation.

Most of the members who spoke this afternoon stressed the urgency of passing legislation in this field and said we were not moving fast enough. I would agree with them. I would be the happiest man in this House if all my problems were solved in one day—but this is not how democracy works. If the wheels of justice are slow, the wheels of Parliament are even slower. This legislation is not being delayed by me.

Perhaps I should state a few facts. It took two years for the Woods committee report to be presented. It is a good report which contains 148 recommendations. The House of Commons Committee on Veterans Affairs sat for ten months. I should compliment that committee and its chairman. The members took time off from their holidays and away from their families and businesses to come here and work on behalf of the veterans of this country, with no extra pay. During that time they heard a number of witnesses—I do not know how many—from veterans associations who appeared on 19 occasions; they received 19 briefs. The committee studied those briefs and produced a report. I received that report only the day before this House adjourned for the summer recess. During the summer recess the report was brought before the appropriate cabinet committee, at which time decisions were taken. The whole matter now is being sent to the Department of Justice for the purpose of producing legislation. I am confident that the legislation will be introduced in the very early part of this session.

This all took a long time, I agree, but it was not delayed by me or by anyone in the House. This is the normal process of legislation; it does take time. When the legislation is introduced, I think all members of this House will find that it was well worth waiting for, because it will be good legislation; it will be advanced legislation, modern, generous and very humane.

We have been talking all afternoon about veterans. I am not a veteran; I was only 12 when the war was declared. People do not seem to realize that 50 per cent of the population of Canada today is under the age of 25. There is what you might call a generation gap or a memory gap. If there is a generation gap between two generations, I think the large portion of the burden of bridging that gap is not on the younger generation but, rather, on us. We are the ones who created the world in which they live. They were not even witness to the events that shaped our times.

• (8:30 p.m.)

I think that veterans and veterans associations, which are very well structured across the country with Legions in almost every small town, have a role to play and are equipped to play it well. They must explain to the young people what they themselves did 25 years ago to preserve the freedom of the world, its unity and the unity of this country. I believe the veterans of this country now have a very strong role to play in our unity. They may be called upon to fight again, not with guns and bayonets but with the moral fibre of their courage and with dignity because of the respect and appreciation they receive from the people surrounding them. They should use that quality to again help the government and the members of this House to cement unity in this country.

When they fought 25 years ago they cared not whether the comrade next to them was from Manitoba, Quebec or New Brunswick; they fought together for principles in which they believed very dearly. They came back here and there was no war outside the country to which they would be sent. There is no war in this country now, but there is no doubt there is a struggle in which they can help and make a contribution because of their experience

and the appreciation they have acquired from their fellow citizens.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I shall thank again those who have taken part in this debate. I am most satisfied to realize once again that they have put veterans affairs above party politics, and that we are all convinced of the need to do more for those who have fought to preserve democracy and our freedom. I fully agree with them and I wish to give myself entirely to this cause. I have the feeling that, in a short while, all veterans will be most satisfied with the government's attitude towards them.

[*English*]

Mr. Marshall: Mr. Speaker, would the minister permit a question?

Mr. Speaker: Would the minister permit a question before he resumes his seat?

Mr. Dubé: Yes.

Mr. Marshall: Would the minister indicate to the House what is to be contained in the social security report which is to be tabled during this session, in the way of social security measures affecting veterans who come under the War Veteran Allowance Act?

Mr. Dubé: It is very difficult for me to anticipate legislation or report on it before it is presented to the House. However, so far as I am concerned, as I have said many times in this House, war disability pensions are paid as of right to Canadian veterans and will continue to be so paid. So far as war veterans allowances are concerned, these are closer to the field of welfare in the sense that they are not paid because of disability but because veterans are deemed to have aged more quickly because of their service overseas. I can assure the House that whatever is done will be an improvement on the present situation.

Mr. McKinley: I have a further question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will be allowed to ask a question of the minister if the minister is prepared to reply, but I might point out to hon. members that a number of hon. members wish to speak and we should give them an opportunity to do so.

Mr. McKinley: The minister has explained to the House that there will be legislation forthcoming which will be generous, among other things, but he neglected to say how soon it will be introduced. Can he say how soon it will be introduced?

Mr. Dubé: Mr. Speaker, I am not the master of the House; I do not know how fast we will move. However, it is one of the bills that was annexed to the Speech from the Throne, and I would think it would be introduced early in this session. But how soon, I do not know.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, first of all I should like to offer my congratulations to my colleague, the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall) for bringing forward this motion at this time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McGrath: I especially congratulate him on the speech he made in the House today, a speech which certainly caught the ear of the House and which demonstrated the hon. member's deep concern and wide knowledge of the problems facing the veterans of this country. Mr. Speaker, the service record of the hon. member, his record of service to the veterans of this country and, indeed, his service to the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs is well documented in *Hansard* since the beginning of this Parliament.

I was rather surprised that the minister elected to intervene in the debate at this particular time. One would have expected the minister to wind up the debate. I am sure that if time did not permit him to do so, the House with its usual traditional courtesy would have extended to him as much time as he desired to properly wind up the debate. I agree with the minister that the debate quite properly should be conducted in a non-partisan manner. But having heard the minister I find it very difficult to continue in this non-partisan vein because I believe—and I say this with great regret—that the veterans of this country, to put it mildly, will be very disappointed in the contribution the minister has made to this debate.

I think the veterans of this country expected, and indeed deserve, something a little more tangible, a little more definite and more expressive from the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Dubé). I do not know what the minister was alluding to when he said that 50 per cent of the population of this country is under the age of 25. I do not know whether he was trying to suggest that the country no longer cares about its veterans. If this is what he meant, I would suggest it is not so because, like the minister himself, I was only 12 years old when the war ended and I am deeply conscious of my responsibility to those who were old enough at the time to volunteer for service, did so and served this country with distinction. As a young Canadian I am deeply conscious of the great debt we owe those who served Canada in both world wars.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McGrath: I am also very conscious of the fact that I have a responsibility to represent in this House the veterans who live in my constituency, in my province, and indeed all the veterans of Canada. We all have this responsibility. I am particularly conscious of the contribution the veterans are making to my own province and to my own constituency, just as I am deeply conscious of the contribution they made to preserve the very society they are now helping to sustain.

Perhaps we should reflect for a moment upon the wording of the motion. It is a very simple motion. It is a motion calling upon the government to do two things. First of all, it calls upon the government to implement a

unanimous recommendation of one of the Standing Committees of this House, a recommendation contained in the second report of the Committee on Veterans Affairs, dated June 9, 1970. Second, it calls upon the government, in addition to proceeding with the implementation of these recommendations, to provide adequate increases in the allowances paid under the War Veterans Allowance Act of 1952.

• (8:40 p.m.)

I think it is only fair that we should ask ourselves why it is necessary to proceed in this manner; why we find it necessary to bring in a motion calling upon the government to implement the unanimous recommendations of one of the Standing Committees of this House, recommendations resulting from a study referred to the committee by the House, by the government itself.

The minister has referred to the outstanding work of the Veterans Affairs Committee, as have other hon. members, the endless hearings, the briefs, the hearings of witnesses, the examination of the government White Paper and the examination of the Woods report. All of this was done in a period of 10 months, and in many instances at times when Parliament was in recess.

I find it exceedingly difficult to understand why the government has not acted upon the unanimous recommendations of this committee, especially in light, notwithstanding what the minister has said, of the circumstances of which most hon. members are aware—of the sufferings of many of our veterans today who are operating under great hardship because of the consequences of inflation and the spiralling cost of living that has reduced their incomes under the War Veterans Allowance Act, as well as their pensions, to the point where they have to endure great hardships.

Many veterans unable to continue to work or to find work are forced to fall back on the government and depend upon the War Veterans Allowance Act to sustain themselves. But I ask the minister through you, Mr. Speaker, how much sustenance can a married man with dependents purchase on $175 a month, which is the maximum payable under the act even with the maximum supplementary earnings of $245 that he is entitled to have.

I ask the minister, as a family man who knows what it is to support a family, to put himself in the position of having to feed his wife and his children on $60 a week, because that is what we are asking the veterans of this country to do by maintaining the present level under the War Veterans Allowance Act. How can any Canadian expect to maintain his dignity while living on such a pittance?

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that those who are unfortunate enough to have to fall back on the War Veterans Allowance Act are being denied the dignity that should be theirs by right and by virtue of the contribution and the sacrifice they have made. Yet we are reducing them to a bare sustenance. The minister, the government, and indeed all of us should hang our heads in shame because I think it is a shame in this affluent country of ours that we should bring our veterans, who have paid such a price to sustain this country, to such a pitiful state.

We do not even pay any attention to the poverty level set down by the Economic Council of Canada in 1968. Indeed, sir, we pay our veterans less than the very minimum wage laws enacted by this Parliament. Yet the veterans of Canada have to sustain themselves with the knowledge that any promise of an increase in their allowances will only come after a review of the whole social legislation on the statute books of Canada. I hope the minister will pay heed to the pleading of members in this debate. I hope he will live up to the responsibility that is his as Minister of Veterans Affairs and that he will recognize the plight of the veterans.

I reject the view that has aready been reiterated by the minister in the speech he made tonight, subtle though it may be, that veterans allowances should somehow be lost in the general review of social legislation. I say this because when the Parliament of Canada established the very department over which the minister now has the responsibility of presiding, and when Parliament enacted the legislation on the statute books of this country to deal with the problems of veterans and to recognize the role that our veterans have played in maintaining the society we enjoy, Parliament was paying particular attention to the obligation of the whole country to our veterans. Parliament was not suggesting that we should provide for the veterans in the same context that we provide for the unemployed, for the socially indigent or for the handicapped. Parliament was recognizing the special and unique obligation that this country has to those who served Canada in war.

I believe that we are reaching the stage where we are trying to get out from under that obligation, and I think it is a bad thing for Canada. This Parliament has recognized its obligations to those in the country who have to fall back upon the protection of the minimum wage laws. It has recognized the spiralling cost of living in this country, and in so doing has said that by law no one in Canada who is within the jurisdiction of the federal government shall receive less than $1.65 an hour. Surely the government has the same obligation to the veterans of this country, recognizing the same factors that are driving up the cost of living and are depriving veterans of their income. Surely the government must recognize the toll that inflation has taken upon war veterans allowances and upon disability pensions, and should act very quickly.

Not a month has gone by since the outset of this Parliament in 1968 without my receiving an inquiry from a veteran in my constituency asking when the government is going to act upon the Woods report. Barely a month goes by without my having to explain to the veterans why the government has refused to act. It is an empty explanation and one that I could not accept; consequently, I cannot expect veterans in my constituency and in my province to accept it.

• (8:50 p.m.)

Other hon. members have referred to the plight of the Hong Kong veterans in a much more eloquent and forceful manner than I could, many of them speaking from experience. Hon. members have referred to those who have to sustain themselves on disability pensions, pensions which are theirs by right, and to the various shortcomings in the regulations governing these pensions. On that matter I will not dwell at this moment. Suffice it to say that the government has a continuing obligation to the veterans of this country. I think that should be stated over and over and over again until the government is prepared to live to up to that obligation.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McGrath: Sir, in the limited time left at my disposal I would like to refer to one matter of particular interest to my province. The people of Newfoundland, in order to perpetuate the site of an outstanding hallmark in our history, the battle of Beaumont-Hamel in the First World War, were granted the lands covering the site of that famous battle which took place on July 1, 1916, in France. By the use of our own financial resources we built an appropriate memorial and provided an appropriate place to bury our illustrious and honoured dead.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to apologize to the hon. member and bring to his attention that his time has expired. He may continue with the consent of the House. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the extended time and, realizing the nature of this debate, will not transgress upon the time of the House other than to say that when Newfoundland entered the Confederation of Canada, Canada assumed a responsibility to maintain this memorial, this part of Newfoundland in France, as a part of our war graves, as a part of our national monuments. Now people in my province are very concerned over rumours that have been going about lately concerning our park at Beaumont-Hamel in France, to the effect that the trenches are being filled in and that the area of jurisdiction is being cut down with a view to saving on administrative costs.

I hope that these rumours are without foundation in fact, and that the minister who has responsibility for this department will recognize the obligation the government of Canada has, in being the trustee of this memorial to the Newfoundland war dead, to sustain it in a manner befitting the nature of that memorial.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I wish to commence my remarks by congratulating the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall) for introducing this motion, and by congratulating the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) for the excellent and pointed amendment he made to it.

Following the Second World War there was a mood in this country in which people were determined to see that veterans, those who had fought on behalf of the nation, on behalf of the liberties we all hold so dear, would be given a fair portion of the rewards that society had to offer, and that justice would be given them in terms of opportunities and as a reward for their service. For a considerable period following the end of the war we maintained this objective in a very strong way. However, as the years went by, as the war faded into memory and as the sacrifices of the men and women who participated in that war faded into memory, it seems that government interest in the veterans took a less urgent turn.

We had all hoped that the minister would rise today and give us some specific and encouraging information on the government's approach to changes in veterans legislation. The minister had an opportunity to speak for half an hour and he made a statement. He said all the right things but, when it was all over, the minister had said nothing. That was a very great disappointment to all of us.

Because of my high regard for the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Dubé) I am prepared to accept his statement that he would like to implement the very good recommendations of the Veterans Affairs Committee. I think he is saying this with all sincerity. But if the minister feels this way, why is the legislation not before the House, or at least legislation incorporating some of the things on which we have all agreed? If the fault does not lie with the minister, surely there is an area in which it does lie, an area that has to be criticized sharply by this House. Who is responsible? The government has the power; it has the means at its disposal. We can only assume that the minister is not the only one who is holding up the legislation, and that the government has very little inclination to introduce veterans legislation. That is a sad conclusion to reach.

It must be obvious to all hon. members that, when it wants, a government can take quick action. I would like to point out some of the quick actions this government has taken. Let us take an instance in connection with the white paper on tax reform, where we had what was supposed to be a total package, somewhat analogous to the situation with respect to the recommendations of the Veterans Affairs Committee. For a long time the government took the position that no part of the white paper could be modified or changed until the finance committee had met, had made its recommendations and the government had had an opportunity to review those recommendations.

However, on a number of occasions while that committee was still sitting the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) announced very great changes in the white paper proposals, particularly with regard to the natural resource industry and more particularly with regard to the mining industry. Does this mean that mining interests in Canada have more say with, more pull over, and more

influence on the government than do the nation's veterans? That would certainly appear to be the case.

I give another example of government action. Recently the government felt compelled to introduce the War Measures Act. At the time it was introduced many hon. members insisted that the act be limited in time and that the government come to the House and introduce more specific and better legislation to deal with the events that had occurred. The government was able to promise that within 30 days it would bring legislation before the House. This is not uncomplicated legislation; I am talking about some very profound changes in the laws of the country. I am glad the government felt able to suggest it could do this within 30 days.

But surely after examination given by the Veterans Affairs Committee to the recommendations of the Woods committee, the government is in a much better position to draft new veterans legislation and put it before the House? I cannot find any possible excuse for the government's delay in changing existing veterans legislation to improve the conditions of many of the men and women who willingly offered themselves in the service of the nation.

It is an unfortunate truth that the government has not placed any urgency on this matter. One suspects that, very much like its attitude toward old age pensioners, the veterans are part of the government's fight against inflation; that the veterans, like the old age pensioners, are being held as hostages in the government's fight against inflation, a fight that it cannot win and a fight that is unjust beyond belief.

Earlier, my hon. friend from Winnipeg North Centre made a most eloquent and, as always, reasonable plea on behalf of the veterans. My hon. friend has on many occasions risen in this House on behalf of those who need the help of our nation. One wonders if, while he was speaking for those veterans, he did not have in mind a broader problem. It is interesting, when one looks back at the history of our treatment of veterans, to realize that when we helped the veterans of Canada we were also helping all people in this country. When we brought in social justice for our veterans we also extended it to other people in our society.

• (9:00 p.m.)

What we have done for veterans has often pioneered what we have done in social change. We have adopted attitudes that tended to improve the lot of the Canadian people. For example, let me point out one very important area which we could consider—the area of education. We forget that before 1945 and 1946 little assistance was given to people who wanted to go on to higher education. The idea of providing loans or grants for education was not in common currency at that time. Loans were introduced for veterans of the armed forces, and they were able to avail themselves of university educations. From there on society progressively extended help to others, and this turned out to be a most admirable approach which helped other people in society to obtain an education. Much of the vocational training program we have today has resulted from concepts and policies developed after the end of the war.

Also, let us look back on the Veterans' Land Act. This is one of the first instances in which the government became involved in publicly assisted housing. It is most unfortunate it did not do more of this. Nevertheless, thousands of veterans in this country today would not have homes if they had not been assisted under the Veterans' Land Act. That legislation has changed our concept about the public's involvement in housing. Although we have not gone as far as I should like to see us go, at least that legislation changed some of the attitudes and some of the directions in which this country was going.

When we consider the burnt-out pension and the war veterans allowance, we see the beginning of the concept of a guaranteed income. Indeed, programs that were begun for veterans have often been extended to other areas of our society. I make these points to show why I think it is important for us to support the idea of veterans benefits both for those who are veterans and for those who are not. I say this regardless of the justice of the situation. This country owes an elementary obligation to those people who served in its armed forces. There is the added point that, as I have said, what we do for our veterans today we often will do for other people tomorrow, and veterans legislation is an important indicator of social attitudes.

Mr. Nowlan: That's enough. No more.

Mr. Saltsman: Therefore, I cannot accept the arguments presented tonight by the minister. I cannot accept his reasons for delay. We are not delaying because we are so poor in this country that we can do nothing; neither are we delaying because the machinery of government is so creaky that nothing can be done. The machinery is creaky only when the government wants it to be creaky. It acts very quickly in the middle of the night when the government wants it to work that way.

I think members on all sides of the House markedly agree that there has been much too much delay in improving the lot of veterans in Canada, and that this should be corrected as quickly as possible. I was glad to hear that the minister intended making a trip to Europe in order to visit some of the monuments and pay his respect to the brave men and women who died for their country. I suggest to the minister that he could do no better in paying his respect to those brave men and women than by moving quickly and bringing in increased and much needed benefits for those veterans who are still living.

Mr. Ross Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I assure the hon. member who rose at the same time I did that I will stay and listen to his speech. I know that he has a good deal to offer the House and I would not miss his remarks for the world. I will not take too long in what I am about to say because, quite frankly, I believe everyone who has spoken this afternoon and evening is in agreement about

what should be done and there is no necessity for my talking at length.

My reason for rising tonight is that I feel, as a member of the Veterans Affairs Committee of the House of Commons, that I am under an obligation to say a few words. It is an obligation that I accept most readily, because when I accepted the committees' report as a backbench supporter of the government I did not send it here with the idea that it would not be accepted within a reasonable period of time. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, and all hon. members that those of us who are on the Liberal benches have no intention of seeing the report passed over. The minister gave us his word tonight that within a reasonable period the legislation will be introduced in the House.

Having listened to some of the remarks of my hon. friends to my left, I gained the impression that they think the angels are only to the left of me in this House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whicher: I hope that when the time comes for their being called to the happy hunting grounds, every one of them can fool the Lord and become an angel. But many of them certainly are not in that category at the moment.

An hon. Member: There speaks a Liberal.

Mr. Whicher: There are two or three who are—

Mr. Nowlan: They are in purgatory.

Mr. Whicher: —almost in that category at the moment, but they have not quite reached it. The unanimous report of the parliamentary committee was presented to the House, and we who support the government have every intention of seeing the veterans bill brought in very shortly.

Before I say any more, perhaps I ought to allude to some of the facts which have been presented to us tonight. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, all governments of Canada since 1945, including the present government, have done a most remarkable job for veterans in Canada. It is not that I think they should not have done more; we all agree that more ought to have been done.

The time has come for us to do more for veterans generally, but particularly for those who are disabled, the Hong Kong veterans, the paraplegics and others like them. Of course, they deserve more. If they do not obtain more, those of us who support the government will have something to say. As has been pointed out in this House on numerous occasions, the time has come for us to help these veterans. The government itself acknowledged this fact and intends to help them.

Let us review some of the things which have been said tonight. When the minister spoke, he said it had been his pleasure to know only one other minister of veterans affairs. Why is that? I suggest that is because apart from Canada only the French of all the so-called free nations of the world think enough of their veterans to appoint a minister of veterans affairs. So I say to Canada and to the government of Canada: For this you will be able to hold your heads very high indeed.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Whicher: The minister told the House that more than half a billion dollars was to be devoted to veterans affairs, the highest amount in our history. For this the government is to be commended. I am not saying the veteran does not deserve this; I agree that he needs more. Yet, since more than one half billion dollars is being made available to the veterans of this country I say to the government that, although more should be given, they will be able to stand up high and look the people of Canada in the eye.

The hon. member who preceded me mentioned progressive measures such as the Veterans' Land Act. Where else do they have legislation like that in the world, unless it be Russia or China, countries with life styles I know little about? I would not want to live in them. Where else do they have this type of legislation? Do they have it in the United States? Where else do they have re-establishment, educational benefits and all the other programs effected not only by this government but by all governments from 1945 until 1970? I say to my Conservative friends that when they were in power they did a very good job. Without exception, all governments have done reasonably well. The time has now come for more.

• (9:10 p.m.)

I wish to compliment the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall) for presenting his motion and bringing this matter to the attention of all hon. members. This question must be dealt with as soon as possible. I ask the hon. member in a very friendly way whether the rest of Canada has had an opportunity to share some of the great benefits which Newfoundland brought into Confederation. I ask the hon. member how much the veterans of Newfoundland were receiving before they joined Confederation? I will not give the answer, Mr. Speaker.

The plain fact is that Canada gives more to veterans than any other free nation in the world, but still not enough to demonstrate our allegiance to those people with 100 per cent disability. How many people in Canada are on 100 per cent disability pension? When listening to some hon. members to my left it seems that every veteran in Canada is on the poverty line, when in fact there are in Canada approximately 5,000 people who are 100 per cent dependent upon pensions.

Many people, including myself, are very lucky. Even though we had long service we did not receive a scratch. We do not receive a pension. For that I say, thank God! Hundreds of thousands of Canadians have given long service but have not derived one nickel from the government for that service other than what they received on

returning from the war. As far as pensions are concerned, we pay and are happy to do so. It is much better to come home with money in your pocket and be in a financial position to pay, than to have lost one or both legs or to have been blinded. We who are fortunate are happy to pay even more. We cannot accept the suggestion that all veterans in Canada are on the poverty line. I understand there are many veterans in this House. I do not know whether they can be considered to be on the poverty line. In any event, I had better skip that aspect of the subject for the moment.

I will not go any further than reiterate the facts which I have already stated. As a Liberal backbencher, I look forward to legislation being introduced in the immediate future. When I say that, I mean within the next two or three months. I assure the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe, who spoke so ably this afternoon, that if legislation is not forthcoming within a reasonable period of time I will speak out with him to bring it to the attention of the government with a very sharp barb indeed.

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall) did such an excellent job in outlining the position of the official opposition on matters dealing with veterans, in his extremely able and comprehensive speech, that it is not necessary for me to deal with the points he made. However, for a very few moments I would like to deal with the treatment this government gives veterans who receive the war veterans allowance.

I have three very strong objections to the treatment which the government is meting out to these very deserving veterans. The first is that this government has not seen fit to increase the war veterans allowance since 1966, despite the fact that during the four years since then the cost of living has increased by nearly 20 per cent. Several times each year the opposition has pressed the government strongly to increase the war veterans allowance proportionately with the cost of living. By not increasing the war veterans allowance during the past four years, the government has simply said to the veteran, "Tighten your belt. Do without more and more of the things that you need to keep body and soul together for you and your family".

I believe this is just the reverse of the way that members of the armed forces in World War I and World War II should be treated. By giving so much they literally burned themselves out during their war service. They need our assistance in civilian life. That is my first reason for strongly condemning the attitude of this government toward those receiving war veterans allowance.

My second point is that the government prohibits a single man earning more than $40 a month, or $70 a month for a married man over and above the war veterans allowance which he receives. These war veterans allowances are an absolute minimum. It is well recognized that no one could even come close to maintaining themselves on such a small pension. They are simply assistance. If a man wishes to improve the standard of living for himself and his family and works hard to earn money to supplement the allowance, that is to be admired. To allow these veterans to earn only $40 a month or $70 a month restricts very greatly their ability to maintain a decent standard of living and support their families in the way they would wish and have every right to do, particularly in view of the great service they have performed for their country.

The attitude of the government in this regard discourages initiative. It discourages a man's desire to earn as much as he can to improve the financial position of his family. I am sure all members of the House have felt that this restriction is very unfair. It should be cancelled. A man receiving war veterans allowance should be permitted to earn as much as he can by working.

• (9:20 p.m.)

The other matter to which I object very strongly is the way in which the government treats those members of the armed forces who not only receive the veterans allowance but also the old age pension. As we all know, when the old age pension is increased, as it is occasionally by even this parsimonious government, it is increased for a very good reason; it is increased because the cost of living has gone up and because the government rightly considers that those receiving the old age pension need considerably more to live on. But if a man is receiving both the old age pension and the veterans allowance, any increase in the old age pension is deducted from what he receives by way of veterans allowance. Thus, though the cost of living has increased and pensioners are getting an increase in their pension, the man who is also receiving veterans allowance gets no increase at all.

I ask those who are seated on the treasury benches tonight whether they consider that this is fair treatment of our veterans. There is silence from the treasury benches because their occupants are obviously ashamed of what the government has done in the past few years. They realize it is a disgraceful way to treat those who have served their country so well. It is high time the minister and his colleagues corrected this miscarriage of justice and allowed pensions and war veterans allowances to be increased independently of each other. When an increase in either is brought before Parliament and passed, it should be allowed in full to those pensioners who are receiving veterans allowances, because they have served their country well. Judging by the way in which the government treats those who receive veterans allowances—that is to say in a penny-pinching, miserly and completely unjustified manner—we shall have to press our case very hard if we wish to succeed.

This penny-pinching on the part of the government is in strange contrast with its actions when it comes to buying airplanes of which it has no need. It has been brought to the attention of the House and of the country that four years ago the government ordered $250 million worth of CF-5 planes to enable the armed forces of this country to play a peacekeeping role as part of the United Nations peacekeeping efforts. Two years ago, in 1968, this peacekeeping role was abandoned. But instead of cancelling the order for these planes, because they happened to

be produced in the Prime Minister's home riding in Montreal—this can be the only reason—the decision was made to keep the aircraft rolling off the assembly lines though there is not the slightest need for them in our air force. Some of them have even been sent to Europe as a public relations gesture to find out whether they could be of use there. They could not.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. I wonder whether the hon. member is not getting away from the motion which is before the House. He seems to be making a point about the defence policy of the government. I think he should return to the motion and the amendment which are before us.

Mr. Hees: I am simply using this as an example to show that the government has money available to use in any way it wishes. It has chosen to use this money to finance a make-work project in the Prime Minister's home city. I say that a far better way would be to treat those who receive war veterans allowances in a fair, decent and equitable manner. This would cost infinitely less and it would do infinitely more good. I use this illustration to show that the money is there.

The minister should persuade those of his colleagues who take a parsimonious attitude toward the veterans of this country to use some of this money immediately to increase war veterans allowances in the way they should have been increased as the cost of living has risen over the past four years. He should persuade them to allow these people to earn all they can in addition to their allowances and, in so doing, treat the veterans fairly, as they so richly deserve, on behalf of the rest of our citizens who have been able to remain free as a result of their activities.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Steven Otto (York East): Listening to this debate, Mr. Speaker, I would imagine that throughout the centuries every government has been faced with the same dilemma—every kingdom, every principality, every parliament and every minister. It is not a new story. It is said by Arrian in his record of the wars of Alexander, in his history giving an account of the anabasis, that when the great Macedonian warrior addressed his troops just before they returned home, he told them "I have provided for you and I have set up statues to those who have fallen; I have provided you with gold plate from the loot of Syria, India and Cathay." And all those things he did. But the historian went on to say that when the troops returned home they found the gold had disappeared and most of them lived thereafter in abject poverty.

Napoleon's armies fared no better, nor did the armies of Wellington. But these were old days. When we speak of those days we are talking about rewards, we are talking about some sort of compensation. This is not the issue here at all. The hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Saltsman) says there is some deep, dark plot on the part of the minister to use veterans pensions in the government's fight against inflation. That is utter nonsense; it is not the case at all.

I compliment the minister for having stayed here throughout this debate, as he should have done. We are dealing with a million people and with a question which calls for a revision of our thinking, one which calls for a new look. I must say I cannot agree at all with the Woods committee report. The trouble is that commissions, instead of taking a brand new approach to a problem, always get together and say: Let us take a look at the existing legislation. Then on the basis of the status quo they amend, they split hairs, and no new approach is ever taken.

So it is here. We have listened to speeches in this House today in the course of which members have stated they begged the government to show consideration. How dare they beg on behalf of the veterans? Who gave them a mandate to beg? When you beg, you lower a man's dignity. Nobody gave them the right to beg, and the veterans do not want them, or any hon. member, to beg the minister for anything. The veterans gave no mandate to anyone to go around with a cup for alms. This is not the issue. This is where we have gone astray, although it seems that year after year someone feels compelled to beg the government for more money. Where does one get this right? Who gave them this right? This is not a begging situation. What the veterans want is equity, not alms, not some consideration in return for having fought.

It is surprising that after the war the Liberal government took the correct attitude when it undertook to provide veterans with opportunities to go to university, to get an education, to get adequate housing, and so on. This was not a response to begging; it was not a reward for having fought. The whole principle was based upon the fact that veterans had lost time. They might have stayed here and worked and prepared themselves for university, acquired funds, a house, a car and furniture.

• (9:30 p.m.)

The compensation was this: the government recognized that they had contributed to the security of our country and, accordingly, assisted them to place themselves in a position of equality as compared with those who were not members of the armed services. That was the whole point. But when it came to pensions, the government reverted to the age old idiom of gifts. Why did they not go a little further? Why the principle of the unskilled labourer? Is there a presumption that the average veteran would not have been more successful? No, there is not. Yet this provision was passed in 1918 and has been favoured by commission after commission because it was so much easier to continue the same amount in effect than to bend some effort to make a change.

The maximum amount should be the average amount earned by all working veterans. That is the amount that would be equitable. I hope the minister is listening, because this would provide a wonderful opportunity for the government to introduce the concept of a guaranteed annual income. Here is a group asking to be given the

opportunity to be placed on the same level as other people. It is a controlled group. Nobody would dare suggest that our veterans would abuse the guaranteed annual income, because they would not be veterans if they did.

Implementation of this idea would dispense with appeal boards, various pension schemes, the onus of proof now placed on veterans, and so on. After all, who can say what in a service-connected injury? I dare anyone to define that expression. Who can judge what is going to be the reaction of a man who lives under constant stress for four or five months of the year? And in the field one is under constant stress. If medical opinion is correct, no one can predict the consequences to a man's health of a life under stress. Frustration, enforced discipline and things of that nature must have an effect on the health of a man. As a result, no one can define what is and what is not a service-connected injury.

Recently I had occasion to plead the case of a man suffering from lung cancer. It is recognized today that the inhalation of smoke affects the lungs. This man was in the REME. I know from personal experience that in these field operation units the men are working under cover since often it is cold, and exhaust fumes from vehicles are constantly being pumped into the air. For five years this man lived in an environment of pollution. Yet the board held that there was no proof his lung cancer had any connection with his service.

The guaranteed annual income would be the answer in such a case. Those who did not need the guaranteed annual income would not take it. Many of those in receipt of disability pension would be only too happy to give it up. After all, the very system we have been fighting for does enable us to make a living and to make our way in the world. As I say, if the guaranteed annual income for veterans is accepted by the government, it will not cost more money. In addition, it will dispense with all appeals, pension boards and eliminate the sort of friction that has been the experience to date.

It was said today that our veterans should be given more money as a reward for valour. Valour, Mr. Speaker, is not rewarded. No man who is courageous or valorous expects reward; he is courageous or valorous because he loves his country. He knew that on occasion he would have to shed blood and tears if he loved his country, and this is still being done to this day. So you do not reward valour.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Weatherhead: There is no point of order.

Mr. Nowlan: Just listen and see whether there is or not.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. The hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan) on a point of order.

Mr. Nowlan: Mr. Speaker, you yourself, with all the dignity of the Chair, stood when the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees) talked about aeroplanes and what might happen if government moneys had been directed toward war veterans allowances rather than aeroplanes. The hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto) is, frankly, contributing clap-trap to this debate.

Mr. Weatherhead: What is your point of order?

Mr. Nowlan: My point of order is that the motion now before the House concerns the recommendations of a committee. With all respect to the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis) and others who perhaps have lived in the sanctity of a vacuum of non-political involvement—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order.

Mr. Nowlan: —the hon. member's remarks should be directed to the motion, not to questions of valour and a minimum wage.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. The Chair is aware of what happened in the House earlier this evening. At that time the Chair gave quite a bit of leeway to the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees) and was ready to take the same position and give some leeway to the hon. member for York East (Mr. Otto). As far as the Chair is concerned, I think the House should allow the hon. member for York East to complete his remarks.

Mr. Nowlan: I will allow him to complete his remarks because I always like listening to the hon. member, except on this one point.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. I think the hon. member for Annapolis Valley should recognize that the Chair has to make a decision. The Chair has decided, having heard the remarks of the hon. member for Annapolis Valley, that perhaps the hon. member for York East should adhere more closely to the subject matter before the House. I think the hon. member for Annapolis Valley will have to accept the decision of the Chair.

Mr. Otto: Mr. Speaker, it was not I who introduced the subject of reward for valour, but an hon. member opposite. The hon. member said that veterans pensions should be increased because the valour of our veterans should be rewarded. I am pleading the other case. I am saying that our veterans are not asking for reward, they are asking for equity. This is why I approach the minister with a new concept. I suggest that he should not necessarily be tied to old ideas. There is no reason why our veterans groups have to come to Ottawa and plead their cause year after year. They should be given what they ask for as a matter of right.

I realize there are not too many members in the House who are quite as bright as the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan) thinks he is, and we have to bear with this. But with all respect, I have tried to put to the minister in this debate a different approach to the status of our veterans, to disability pensions and as to what course the House should follow.

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, believe it or not, I shall be very short. I want to remove any misconception in the mind of the hon. member for

York East (Mr. Otto) about what I think I may possess in the form of grey matter. My conception of my own grey matter is in direct ratio to what I hear from the other side, especially what I heard from the hon. member for York East. The more I heard from him, the more grey matter I realized I had. In that respect I think my grey matter does not have to take second place to his, let alone his golden words on a great philosophical point but a point that does not come close to the motion that was moved by the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall) who drew an important matter to the attention of this House.

• (9:40 p.m.)

I did not notice many of the members who were here earlier. I was here because I wanted to catch Your Honour's eye. I am not a veteran, and I speak because I am not a veteran. I was too young to serve. I found the veterans in this House this afternoon trying, as I did, to be recognized. If that is any reward I should have the Distinguished Service Medal for trying to catch Your Honour's eye. I finally have been recognized, and I do not wish to take up too much time of the House because I know many other hon. members want to contribute to this debate.

I want to say two or three serious things. This afternoon I listened to the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe and the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis), who is sitting in his seat tonight as he has sat attentively all during this debate. As the hon. member for Sarnia-Lambton (Mr. Cullen) said earlier, as well as the hon. member for Lanark-Renfrew-Carleton (Mr. McBride), I do not think any topic that has come to the floor of this House has been received with such unanimity as this one. All members are in favour of the principle of this motion. This is the reason I find myself motivated to speak.

I listened to the philosophical words of the hon. member for York East. That philosophy, in the right place and at the right time, is always illuminating. It may not be the most educational or informative, but certainly it is illuminating. It sometimes illuminates the barren spots of his grey matter. Be that as it may, because this is a non-partisan debate I will not say anything more on that subject.

I want to say one or two things in all seriousness. I am not a veteran or a member of the Veterans Affairs Committee. I have in my riding, in that part of the Atlantic area which I represent, a great number of veterans. In fact, I can stand here tonight and say that I do not know of a member in this House who represents more veterans or more legionaires than I do in my riding of Annapolis Valley. I know for a fact from my predecessor in that constituency that more veterans came to his office than to the offices of all the other members from Nova Scotia combined. I have inherited part of that legacy and part of that challenge. Perhaps I am not as capable of dealing with this matter as my predecessors seat were. For that reason, and because of the historic interest in veterans and veterans' problems, I want to say a few words. Believe me, they will be very few.

I listened to the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe and to the hon. member for Ottawa West make very constructive contributions to this debate. Many of the members who followed them were members of the Veterans Affairs Committee. I was struck by one consistent current that flowed throughout their contributions, namely, that this was a non-partisan committee. They suggested there were no politics involved and that the committee listened in a non-partisan way and with interest to the constructive comments in the Woods report and the white paper. We now have the unanimous report of that committee.

Let me put to the House one point, Mr. Speaker—and you stand far ahead of me in your contribution to the war efforts of this country. Having said that, I ask any veteran in this place or outside this chamber, how many of them landed on the Normandy beaches without partisanship.

An hon. Member: Come on, Pat.

Mr. Nowlan: I do not know who said, "Come on, Pat" but I will come on to him any time he wants me to if he will stand up and identify himself. How many of those veterans contributed their efforts to the wars of this country with a non-partisan spirit and heart? Do not get me wrong; I am not talking about partisanship in the sense of whether you belong to the great Liberal party, the great Conservative party, the great NDP or the great Créditiste party. I ask in all seriousness, through you, Mr. Speaker, whether anyone knows of a veteran who has come to him for assistance with a vacant heart, a vacant mind, a vacant soul or a vacant spine. They are not non-partisan. This clap-trap about non-partisanship is a lot of idiocy.

Who knows more about partisanship than those who contributed their full effort to the war? I say in all sincerity through you, Mr. Speaker, to the members of the Veterans Affairs Committee and to the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Dubé), whom I respect as a man who has no peer in this House as far as sincerity is concerned, that the veterans of this country are not interested in the non-partisan aspect of this House.

The motion advanced by the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe was designed to benefit the veterans of this country. I have in mind all those veterans who read this report, who read *Hansard* or sit in the galleries listening to our debates. There are never many in the gallery, because they do not want to hear about the non-partisan character of this committee or of the House of Commons. They know what their partisanship was during the war. They know where their spirits were, where their hearts were. Some of them know where their limbs are now, and some of them who are not here tonight know where their souls rest.

I suggest to you and through you, Mr. Speaker, to the members of the Veterans Affairs Committee and to the minister that we should get away from these pious platitudes about non-partisanship. Let us not waste words about whether we were partisan. Let us do as the Veter-

ans Affairs Committee did in its unanimous report, that is, become completely partisan toward the cause of veterans. That is the type of partisanship that should not take second place to any feeling in this House. That is what is lost when speaker after speaker today stood up and talked almost exclusively for five or ten minutes about the committee being non-partisan.

This House of Commons and the Parliament of Canada has put into effect the best pension plan known to man. We were non-partisan in that regard. Do we think that the veteran who wants an adjustment in his pension, or the pension of a widow or child who is dependent upon war veterans allowance, cares about whether we are Liberals, Conservatives or members of the NDP as far as partisanship is concerned? This is just flying a false flag. We are going to flounder in the swampland unless we start to accept reality and appreciate it.

I wanted to contribute to this debate because the people who fought for the rights of this institution and the freedom of speech about which we talk are the very people who will become disillusioned if this Parliament of Canada does not during this session do something concrete about veterans' problems. We must do something for them through the pension plan, war veterans allowances or the Canadian Pension Commission. This commission has worked unceasingly for veterans. It is because I feel very strongly, even as a non-veteran, that I make these suggestions.

• (9:50 p.m.)

I listened to the hon. member for York-Sunbury (Mr. MacRae) earlier this afternoon. He recited the pages of history that I used to read. He spoke about the battles he fought, about which I have read. The hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe contributed in a way that I will never understand, because I was too young. There is no deed or duty which I find more honourable to accept, and yet sometimes more difficult to discharge, than to try to help veterans who through a letter, through a personal relationship or through a phone call ask me as a member—as they ask all other members of this House—to do something for them.

Without reciting all the things I could recite about the unanimous recommendation of the committee, some parts of which are good, and parts of the white paper some of which are good and some bad, I suggest that we in this House—which is only an institution, one of many under attack today because we have lost touch with reality—say to the Minister of Veterans Affairs, with all sincerity, that if this House of Commons, being part of the Parliament of Canada, cannot in the next few days introduce on the floor of the House a bill that will put into effect all the words that have been spoken in unanimity this afternoon, we will lose faith with those who fought to protect this place.

I have heard the sincere Minister of Veterans Affairs stand up before and say many times that legislation would be introduced perhaps in the form of one bill or two bills. I do not care whether there are three bills, but let us move; let us keep faith with those who fought for us.

[Mr. Nowlan.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jean-L. Rochon (Ahuntsic): Mr. Speaker, like those who preceded me, I should like to make a few remarks, with a non-partisan mind, on the motion of the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall).

Those who risked their lives, gave their lives or lost their health on the battlefields deserve well of their country, and we who sit in this House must not forget the sacrifices which they made in order that we might live in freedom, freedom which other nations envy us and which shows us more clearly than anywhere else what democracy really is.

Mr. Speaker, the reason why I am taking part in this debate tonight is because in 1914 my father's brother set in Vimy ground the flag of the glorious 22nd; in 1944, his son landed on the beaches of Normandy. Today, he is a great disabled ex-service man. On his behalf, I should like to say that I join with the mover of this motion. I also join with those who demanded from the government the immediate adoption of adequate measures in this regard.

The hon. member for Compton (Mr. Latulippe) reminded us this afternoon of everything the Canadian government has done for our veterans, their widows and families. A few minutes ago, I was listening to the Minister of Veterans Affairs (Mr. Dubé) who spoke of the measures he intended to submit to his cabinet colleagues. I am sure he will know how to convince them to agree to what we want for those who have fought for liberty. I am also sure that in the very near future the government will do its duty towards them.

Mr. Speaker, after listening to the speeches made by those who spoke before me, I am reminded of something I read recently where the author says: "To live, to die for one's country, in blood, in mud, facing one's flag, this is beautiful, it is great, even noble, but there is something finer, greater and nobler than that and that is to live for an ideal". For us who know what freedom is, we live for an ideal: Justice and freedom. To whom do we owe it? To those who have given their life, like this cousin of mine who, for more than 20 years, has been sitting in a paraplegic chair.

On their behalf, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the mover of this motion and I am sure, as the Minister of Veterans Affairs said a moment ago, that we will know where our duty to these veterans lies.

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. It is probably obvious that there have been some discussions arising from the fact that there are two or three more members who would like to make a brief contribution to this debate. I think it might be found that there is agreement to our moving into the late show at this point—there are just two speakers at that stage—and then resume this debate for a few minutes so that those who would like to make a contribution might have an opportunity to do so. The assurance given me is that these contributions would not be lengthy. I am speaking for members of other parties and

make this suggestion in the hope that there might be unanimous consent to it.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I would agree to the proposal. It would be quite convenient to deal with the late show immediately and then proceed with the debate.

Mr. McCutcheon: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House believe this is an excellent suggestion. Perhaps we should proceed on that basis. As I understand it, there are not many more speakers and we would not be kept here too long in any event.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): As there seems to be unanimous consent, we will proceed with the adjournment motion.

• (10:00 p.m.)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

[*Translation*]

HEALTH AND WELFARE—MEASURES TO REDUCE THE COST OF HOSPITAL, MEDICAL AND DENTAL CARE

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, before we start any debate on the question I asked the other day, I would point out to you that the hon. member for Lotbinière (Mr. Fortin) stood up to be recognized while you were reading your text, if not before, because he had comments to offer—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lotbinière.

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, in my capacity as party house leader, I would like to state that we support the proposal submitted by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) requesting a continuation of the interesting discussion which started this afternoon. Besides, we consider that our rights have been encroached upon since only one speaker—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. If the hon. member wants to make representations concerning the number of members allowed to take part in a debate, he can make them discreetly, but it is nevertheless the prerogative of the Chair to decide what members will speak and when. I do not think this is a question to be discussed at present and it seems to me that we should continue the debate on the adjournment motion. Therefore I recognize the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Rondeau).

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Speaker, as recorded at page 425 of the official report of the House of Commons' debates for October 22, 1970, I asked the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) a question which reads in part as follows:

> Yesterday, the Department of National Health and Welfare published a report which says that the cost of hospital, medical and dental care has almost quadrupled in Canada between 1957 and 1969. Here is my question: Is the department now considering measures—

—to prevent the quadrupling of these costs again between 1970 and 1980 without improvement in services, or to have hospital and medical services made more accessible to the people?

In the course of my brief remarks tonight, Mr. Speaker, I would like to prove, with the help of statistics, that the erroneous policy of nationalizing medical services through Medicare was a piece of bluff and has misled the people.

The figures are as follows: In 1957, we spent $1 billion for various medical services. In 1969, these expenses rose to $3.9 billion. As for the area of personal health care, these expenses rose from $600 million in 1957 to $2.5 billion in 1969. Medical care amounted to $272 million in 1957 and to $910 million in 1969. However, between 1968 and 1969, that is to say after the introduction of the famous hospital insurance plan in some provinces, the cost for these items increased by $122 million. Moreover, the cost of drugs was $103 million in 1957 and $270 million in 1969.

In the light of these figures, we have the right to ask the Minister of National Health and Welfare what steps he intends to take in order to stop this escalation.

Mr. Speaker, if the present situation is allowed to go on, within a few years, medical costs will be beyond the reach of everybody or will take up the greater part of the provincial budgets. The population will not enjoy more services and only confusion will follow.

Almost all provincial governments have been compelled to set up medicare and without being a prophet of doom I think that before five years, in Quebec, we shall go through a recession.

There were still in Quebec—I admit it—under the former medical set up, numerous hospitals that might have been called infirmaries. But, instead of coming to the help of the medical and health services by improving what needed improvement, the federal governement levied taxes on the provinces and then forced them to establish a medical care plan if they wanted to be entitled to a reimbursement of the taxes levied for that purpose. That was the "believe or die" policy and, very soon, it will be responsible for the crisis in which the provinces will find themselves.

Because of the false socialistic principle of state medecine advocated by the present government, the following consequences will be felt: Firstly, incompetence will appear at all levels of medical practice; secondly, the real desire of attending the sick that the doctors used to have will disappear; thirdly, the costs of state medicine paid by the government but squeezed out of the taxpayer will become prohibitive; fourthly, we will see mediocrity at all levels of the medical profession; and finally the dying will await death in hospital corridors without getting first

aid, while people with imaginary diseases will fill the hospital beds which should be reserved to the sick.

Medicine will have lost its noble characteristics because instead of providing services to the individual and allowing him to choose his physician, his hospital and all other services, the state will have previously stripped the individual of his purchasing power before controlling medicine and establishing a barrier of redtape between the medical profession and the patients, making everyone dissatisfied, doctors and patients alike.

Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to reply tonight to the grievance voiced by the hon. member from Shefford (Mr. Rondeau), and I should like to thank him by the same token for his most emotional speech in this respect.

I would like to remind him that in November 1968, the Minister of National Health and Welfare convened an interprovincial conference of health ministers to consider the problem of the ever rising cost of medical care.

Following this conference, a study group was appointed whose report, in three volumes, was introduced in the House last November. As a result of this, a task force was appointed to implement the recommendations contained in this first report. Some recommendations, by the way, have already been implemented by provincial governments.

Finally, the last group was asked to make recommendations to be considered at the next federal-provincial conference of health ministers to be held in December.

However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of hon. members on some aspects of this fundamental problem.

The main reason for greater costs is the spiralling increase in wages which represent from 70 to 80 per cent of the total cost of health care in Canada. In my opinion, this is a very serious problem. We must also consider that the care provided is of a higher standard, that better prophylaxis prevents epidemics and reduces infant mortality.

Besides, physicians, nurses and health technicians are getting more advanced and more general training. The range of diagnostic tests, medication and highly specialized equipment is forever increasing.

This general expansion, which is part of the quality of care, certainly represents another major factor in the spiralling increase of health care costs in Canada.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, these are only a few examples and reality is infinitely more complex.

In any case, the members know very well that the Minister of National Health and Welfare has long realised the existence of this thorny issue and that he has taken every possible measure to solve it. The federal government and the provinces are fully aware that there is a very serious financial problem, and I can say that all levels of government are prepared to co-operate in order to remedy this unfortunate situation.

[Mr. Rondeau.]

[*English*]

• (10:10 p.m.)

NATIONAL DEFENCE—RECONSIDERATION OF CLOSING OF RIVERS AIR BASE

Mr. Craig Stewart (Marquette): Mr. Speaker, on October 23 I asked the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald, Rosedale) the following question as reported on page 513 of *Hansard*:

> Has the decision to close the Canadian Armed Forces base at Rivers, Manitoba, been reconsidered, since it is the only suitable airfield available for transporting troops in any emergency from Camp Shilo, as was shown by the extreme difficulties experienced last week in the enforced reactivating of Rivers in order to move troops to Montreal?

The minister's reply was:

> Mr. Speaker, these facts were very much taken into account when the earlier decisions were arrived at but there has been no reconsideration since the event the hon. member was referred to.

The reason, Mr. Speaker, I have brought this matter up on the adjournment debate is that the people of Rivers and the people of Western Manitoba deserve a better answer than the minister gave. In fact, there are many questions pertaining to Rivers Air Base that this government has never answered or explained. I want to state that if the government can save tax dollars by closing surplus military bases, I agree with them. However, I have never agreed with the closure of Rivers Air Base. This is one of the last bases in Canada that should be closed.

In August of this year, the government announced the closure of two Manitoba bases, Gimli and Rivers. This left two air bases in Manitoba, Canadian Forces Base Winnipeg and Canadian Forces Base Portage. Why did these two remain open and why was Rivers closed? Canadian Forces Base Winnipeg is located adjacent to the Winnipeg International Airport and, needless to say, it causes much congestion of the air lanes in that area. This congestion is increased every day. If the government wants to save the taxpayers' money, why didn't they close Winnipeg instead of Rivers? Winnipeg Air Base is located in Greater Winnipeg and this property could be sold for millions of dollars. Rivers is located in the middle of the Prairies and the government will recover little of their investment on its closure.

Military men will tell you Rivers Air Base is in better condition than most bases in Canada. It has more days on which flying can be undertaken than any base in Manitoba. It is not situated close to the commercial air routes. It has all concrete runways. The permanent married quarters at Rivers are far superior to the ones, for example, at Portage. I can give you many reasons why Rivers should never have been closed.

For the last four years, delegation after delegation from Rivers and Western Manitoba have told the government these facts. But it is obvious the government was not prepared to listen to reason. The people of Rivers are annoyed, and they should be. Two years ago the former Minister of National Defence, told the people this base would not be closed. During discussions I had last spring

with the former minister of national defence he told me the British were prepared to lease Rivers Air Base for a training school. He said the British were driving a hard bargain but he thought a lease could be worked out. I suggested the Department of Regional Economic Development should become involved in the negotiations. Perhaps with some incentive from this department a deal could be worked out with the British. If the base were closed this government would have to spend thousands of dollars in trying to locate industry for Rivers. What better industry could there have been than 1,000 British troops training in Western Manitoba? This plan would permit the present maintenance staff to be kept on at the base. The government have never given any explanation of what happened to these negotiations with the British, Mr. Speaker; it is time they did.

After the crisis we have experienced in Quebec in the past month, the government will have to review its whole military policy. Not only has it been proven we are short of troops but now, apparently, we are short of air bases.

The government announced in August that Rivers Air Base would be closed by September, 1971. I understand the control tower at Rivers was closed on October 15. Then, only three days later, when troops from Camp Shilo had to be flown to Montreal, with great difficulty the tower at Rivers was re-activated. In the period of a day, I am told, nine Hercules and two Yukon planes came into Rivers to pick up troops and their equipment. Why did Rivers Air base have to be used? It was used because it is only 30 miles from Camp Shilo, one of the largest army bases in Western Canada. In addition, Rivers air base has concrete runways capable of handling these large transport planes that are necessary to move troops quickly in times of national emergency. Why was Portage air base not used, one of the bases the government has left open in Manitoba? Mr. Speaker, I say if the truth were known the Portage base, with its asphalt runways, cannot handle the large troop planes. Only last month I was informed a Hercules plane went through the runway at CFB Portage.

These events of the past ten days again make the people of Rivers and western Manitoba ask, why were the Winnipeg and Portage bases left open and Rivers closed? Was it at the expense of our national security? Was the government playing politics when they closed Rivers? I would hate to think so.

I strongly urge the government, Mr. Speaker, to tell the people of Rivers what the future of this airbase is. The announcement of its closure was made on August 25. At that time the Department of National Defence, the Department of Regional Economic Development and the Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Richardson), who is from Manitoba, told the people of Rivers a suitable use would be found for the base and the government would assist in every way possible.

The people of Rivers have been getting the same runaround for the last four years. This community is being destroyed and many businesses have closed. Many homes are vacant and the economic prospects for this town are very gloomy. Why is it this way? Because the government will not announce what plans they have for Rivers.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I urge the government to tell the people of western Manitoba whether Rivers will be re-opened as a military base because of its strategic location. Is it to be turned over to the Department of Indian Affairs for vocational training? Is it to be turned into an industrial park so the Department of Regional Economic Expansion can locate industry there?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): As I indicated to the hon. member when he asked the question, Mr. Speaker, the decision regarding the closure of Rivers base is final. It is not being reconsidered. The facts which the member referred to in his question, and again this evening, were fully taken into account when that decision was made. There will be no change in that decision.

The Canadian Forces Base Rivers, a flying training base, is being closed for financial reasons, that is to keep within the Department of National Defence budget. The airport was not re-activated, as the hon. member suggested in his question, because it had never been de-activated. While the manning of the control tower has been discontinued, the base will not close until September of 1971. For this particular incident, the control tower was manned by base personnel without any difficulty.

It was decided to use the airport because it was still active as a Canadian Forces base. When it is phased out, troops from Shilo will be able to move through Brandon airport. I should not lecture the hon. member on the geography of his own province, but Brandon is closer to Shilo than Rivers or CFB Portage. Indeed, in terms of proximity, Brandon is far more accessible than Rivers. I suggest to the hon. member that of the many reasons which from time to time have been advanced for keeping Rivers base open, the one he has referred to, namely that it can be used to move troops, is probably the least persuasive.

• (10:20 p.m.)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Pursuant to the order made earlier this day, the House will now revert to Government Orders.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOCATED DAY, S.O. 58—VETERANS AFFAIRS—EARLY IMPLEMENTATION OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AND WAR VETERANS ALLOWANCE INCREASE

The House resumed consideration of the motion (Mr. Marshall):

That the House urges the government to implement at an early date by way of the appropriate legislative amendments the recommendations contained in the 2nd report of the Standing

Committee on Veterans Affairs dated 9 June 1970 and in addition thereto to provide for early payment of adequate increases in the allowances under the War Veterans Allowance Act 1952 as amended.

And the amendment thereto of Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).

Mr. Cliff Downey (Battle River): I am pleased Mr. Speaker, to be allowed to express my views on this most creditable and vital subject. I am sure the veterans in our society will take heart when they learn that the substance of the report of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs has come to the floor of this House for debate. I should also like to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your consideration in extending the time available for debate on the subject in order that everyone who wishes to do so will be able to express his views today. I have sat in my place for most of the day and I have been heartened by the eloquence, the emotion and the sincerity which have been evident in all corners of the House. It does seem to me that this matter should have come to the floor of the House long ago. Certainly, any further delay would be inexcusable. If this debate proves to be just another false start on the road to the ultimate legislation, the government will find itself facing the full fury of both the members of this House and of the country at large.

A great deal has been said today about the valour of our warriors in past days. The fact is that no one can say sufficient about the sacrifices of our veterans to compensate them for the suffering and the hardships they endured. We must do far more than talk, though. I think we are all agreed that we must spice our words with action. Regardless of the war in which a veteran served, the present generation owes him the same debt as did those who lived in the same era. The sacrifices made by our soldiers, sailors and airmen have preserved our society, our sovereignty and our freedom for all the generations which followed them and the debt owed to those people is therefore passed along. The responsibility to bring veterans legislation up to date has fallen squarely on those of us who sit in Parliament today and it would be irresponsible of us to pass it along to anyone else. We must deal with it now in a manner in keeping with its character as an entitlement. I say "entitlement" because I want to speak out against the government's announced intention of holding back new veterans legislation until it has prepared an omnibus paper on the whole spectrum of social welfare legislation.

There are several reasons for my objection to this approach, not the least of which is the one I have just mentioned. Veterans compensation and pensions are totally unrelated to other types of benefits under welfare programs. The veterans of this country have earned certain entitlements which are uniquely theirs. Those entitlements are fundamental to our society and to our system of government. It is shabby and unconscionable, Mr. Speaker, to ask these people to stand in line for welfare to supplement inadequate pensions or compensation, because they paid for our freedom with their health and their limbs.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel).]

Veterans benefits are not public welfare assistance and if all of the rest of my remarks become lost in the dark corners of the record, I want it to be remembered that I object most strenuously to any further delay in implementing legislation which will confer on our veterans adequate compensation, and confer it in a manner which will reflect the dignity with which they made their contributions. It is beneath our dignity as Canadians to do less than other nations are doing, and have done, for their veterans. It is beneath our dignity to strip the dignity from those who have given all they had to give and who now expect only what they have been led to expect. It is all too typical of this government to tell veterans that they will have to wait until they have been integrated into a vast bureaucratic jungle which will administer a multitude of unrelated situations, while at the same time playing down the significance of their contributions.

The hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. Scott) pointed out a few days ago that the government seemed to be preoccupied with saying to hippies, yippies, draft dodgers and deserters: "Come to the promised land; come to Canada and work against our government and institutions". It is a sad commentary on our government, indeed on all of us, when we allow such a philosophy to take root in this land, a land made secure by the blood, pain and suffering of our own young men and women of past generations. It prompts one to ask whether there is anything left in Canada that is sacred. It is incomprehensible to anyone who has contributed and is now contributing to our society how government can take our hard won freedoms and institutions so cavalierly.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. It is the duty of the Chair at this time to bring to the hon. member's attention the fact that he is getting away from the motion and the amendment thereto now before the House. I think he should try as much as possible to relate his remarks directly to the motion and the amendment.

Mr. Downey: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was only trying to impress upon the House the pressing need to give consideration to the needs of our veterans before those of other elements of society that seem to be coming to the forefront. I was going to mention U.S. draft dodgers, and I think this is pertinent to the discussion at hand. These deserters from the United States walk across an imaginary line between two countries and suddenly become something that they were not moments before they crossed the line. It is fundamental that a man cannot be expected to accept responsibility to a new society when he has demonstrated that he cannot accept responsibility to the society in which he grew up.

I contend a man owes a duty to the society that sheltered him while he was growing up. It is not enough to say that the debt has been discharged simply because an individual states that he disagrees with certain policies of his government. In a free society such as ours, there are established rules by which one must live. Without those rules, there would be chaos.

In the sort of society envisaged by most of our hippies and United States drop-outs, people who break the rules are put to death or at best sentenced to long terms of hard labour. I cannot accept lightly government policy that gives freely to such people the fruits of our labours and the benefits that we have derived from the sacrifices of our young people who accepted the responsibility of fighting to preserve our country both today and in times past.

There are elderly people in this country who are waiting to have their fixed and inadequate incomes brought into line with reality, with the present rather than the past cost of living index. There are those unable to work for a variety of reasons who must be looked after. There are also our veterans. It is cruel and inhuman for anyone to seek to sweep these human problems under the rug in order to get them out of sight and out of mind. I call on the government to deal with each of these problems separately, to stop trying to put them into a bag in the hope that when they are dumped out they will solve themselves.

Veterans legislation has always been kept apart from other legislation because it is different from anything else. It is no good for the government simply to say that all benefits are related, that no special conditions or considerations bear upon them. Veterans benefits have a special connotation. There are special considerations bearing upon them, and to ignore or deny these considerations is to do the veterans a disservice. The time to table legislation is now, not when the government has found a multitude of other problems to put together in an omnibus type of package. Our veterans are waiting for the answers and for some ray of hope. I call upon this government to use the majority it asked for and received at the last election to give our veterans the answers they want and require.

• (10:30 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, since the veterans pension program was adopted some 50 years ago, Canada has witnessed drastic changes, economic as well as social. Being aware of this, the Department of Veterans Affairs had inquiries made in an attempt to adapt, to a greater degree, the services of the department to the veterans' requirements.

In spite of those efforts to humanize the services of the department, to adapt them even more to the needs of the pensioners, the fact remains that there are still scandalous injustices within that department, not where the civil servants or the officials are concerned, but because the pensioners cannot make ends meet with the help the department gives them.

Having said this, I would like to deal with another aspect which it seems to me has been neglected. The average age of the veterans of World War I being 74, and that of the veterans of World War II being 52, one can wonder what happens to their widows since, in most cases, because of illness or disability—because they fought proudly for Canada—they die prematurely. As a result, their widows and other dependants are very often destitute.

Mr. Speaker, the motion and the amendment aim at securing the adoption of many recommendations made by study committees.

One of those recommendations had to do with the wives and other dependents of pensioners, and I would like to be allowed to discuss it very briefly.

The cost of living is increasing steadily. All agree on that. The cost of medicine, housing and food has also increased. Thus, veterans and their dependents can no longer provide for their immediate needs.

Now since pensions are not adapted to the requirements of the people who receive them, some pensioners and their dependents manage very well to live on them, while others can barely subsist.

In my opinion, the pension given to veterans is insufficient. Indeed, the department is aware of that, for on June 30, 1965, it created a relief fund. It is called a relief fund because it is meant to be used to add a supplement to the monthly pension.

This fund is first intended to help the pensioners secure decent housing. In fact, inadequate housing and medical care for veterans' dependents, mainly those affected by chronic sickness, as well as the economic and social consequences of a death, are among the reasons why veterans are asking for the department's services.

Moreover, this fund is important since the financial assistance for special needs or maintenance of income is insufficient to allow pensioners to be self-sufficient or to fit into our society.

We now deal with the basic policy of the Department of Veterans Affairs which is to make it possible for the pensioner to meet his own needs and to adapt himself to this society which he defended so gallantly.

Finally, this fund has been created to meet the department's objectives, namely to achieve close co-operation between the various welfare organizations and to help veterans' widows and dependents.

• (10:40 p.m.)

This prompts me to remind the hon. members that generally speaking pensioners' wives may not have had the chance to get an education or experience in handling domestic affairs, with the result that when the pensioner dies, the mother is left all by herself with no roof over her head and unable to earn her living because she never learned any trade and she lacks the experience and the know-how needed to handle her own affairs.

Mr. Speaker, the minister will say that hundreds of persons have been helped through this fund, and that it had quite willingly paid several million dollars. Nevertheless, I still maintain that this fund is being used unfairly and inadequately and that, actually, it merely serves as a front which is of no use to dependents or which serves as an excuse to convince the population that the department is taking good care of the dependents.

But in fact, experience and the many cases we have witnessed prove that this relief fund has not really assisted many people. I feel that is a pity because whereas pensions are intended to assist the veteran in readjusting to society, it is also necessary that, upon the veteran's death his dependents be assured of an income allowing them to continue living normally. They can certainly not be made to suffer the consequences of the war.

Mr. Speaker, I have in mind a case which came up this summer in the constituency of Lotbinière. For several months, a woman from Victoriaville, the wife of a pensioner, appealed, through myself and through other persons, to the Department of Veterans Affairs for supplementary assistance because she was unable to meet her obligations. The department referred her case from one office to another. Finally, as her debts were piling up, she did not know where to turn. Eventually, her creditors called on her and through the bailiff, seized all her furniture. Being ignorant of the law and as she was desperately waiting for help from the special relief fund of the department, she was, at a moment's notice, turned into the street. The afternoon this happened, she came to my office to ask me whether I had heard from the department. When she left my office in Victoriaville to return home, she was at her wits' end. When she got home, she saw the decorations and war souvenirs of her husband as well as her own clothes in garbage bags. She tried to open the door but it was bolted.

For over six months we had been asking for help from the relief fund. All we had were false hopes—it must be said—and that person found herself in the street. She went to the chief of police in an attempt to get some protection but with no success.

We took the matter in hand and it looks as if we shall soon find a solution.

I submit this case to my honourable colleagues not with the intention of annoying them but rather to make them realize the importance of adopting a new policy within that department in order to humanize the services and adjust them to human needs.

The most urgent problem of pensioned veterans is the financial one. When the department realizes this, it will certainly be possible for them to face life more optimistically.

I urgently ask the minister to consider increasing pensions in order to bring them more in keeping with the cost of living, so that the pensioner, instead of being disadvantaged for having risked his life for his country, may live decently.

Also, the government should have more contacts with pensioners, in order to humanize its services and to treat pensioners as human beings and not numbers. There are 945,200 pensioners in Canada. It is impossible for the department to provide a human and personal service to the veterans with the present structures. Even if the department had enough money to help veterans, it should nevertheless reform its structures and humanize its services.

As there are 832,600 veterans from the Second World War and more than 112,600 from the First World War and only 29,800 pensions are paid to veterans or their dependents, the comments I have just made are of the utmost importance. If we want to help our veterans, we must leave no stone unturned to ensure the widow, the mother, the spouse or the dependents of the pensioner the same security as any civilian would have in a similar situation.

Mr. Speaker, if our government wants to be fair, it will deal in a more human fashion with those soldiers who went abroad to fight for their country. However, if it wants merely to grant pensions as it pleases, without regard to the individual needs of each family or to maintain only statutory services provided indiscriminately, I maintain that those services shall not achieve their purpose.

We should, in my opinion, humanize these services, so that scandals and glaring injustices, such as those suffered by the widow of a veteran in Victoriaville, do not happen again.

[*English*]

Mr. Barney Danson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I rise in this debate rather belatedly. I had not intended to, but as the debate went on I could not help but be moved by many of the appeals and references that were made. It is rather interesting, because we are not a military people. This is not our tradition, and sometimes we are inclined to forget the value of the military and of those who have served. But in recent weeks I think many of us have become aware of the value and the outstanding service of the armed forces which serve in peacetime as well as in wartime.

There are times when we are really inordinately proud and grateful for the armed services, and I think the past few weeks have indicated their value to us in peacetime as well as in war. They have served with a quiet dignity, unobtrusively, in a vital role, efficient and well trained for the dreadful tasks which they have been called upon to fulfil, because of that role which is becoming traditional for them, that of peacekeepers.

I had to chuckle a bit at some of the rhetoric used in the debate. I do not mean this with disrespect, because I think back, Mr. Speaker, as you must think back 25 or 30 years to old friends who did not return, who are still there, who probably spoke of politicians who stood up in this House of Commons and chuckled and laughed at them, and probably would chuckle and laugh that you and I might be here now. They did not think of themselves as heroes. They died, sometimes heroically, sometimes otherwise. They were men, above all, who realized that war is not glorious. Some men are glorious in wartime and some are not.

I think of good Canadians, good Canadian names—I just started jotting down a few of them—who are still there: Leszinski, Sawyer, Worthington, Tessier, Rosenthal, Harris, Gugeon, Gagnon, Rayner, Stoll, Lefradi. This is a list of great Canadian names.

• (10:50 p.m.)

An hon. Member: There are others, too.

Mr. Danson: There are many others, of course. One could go on mentioning them almost forever. I wanted to join this debate in order to mention some of those names, to remember those people and to pay tribute to the troops who served not only in wartime but in peacetime.

The motion moved by my hon. friend from Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall) is a very good one and it is with considerable pride that I support it.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, even at this late hour I feel compelled to add some words to those that have been spoken today. The motion moved by my colleague, the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe (Mr. Marshall), is timely in that today has really been the first occasion upon which this House has had the opportunity of discussing veterans affairs after the report of the committee in June. This report was tabled in the House toward the latter part of that month and this subject was not discussed, and could not be discussed, on the general debate we had at the beginning of the session.

I think it is apposite that the House should be discussing today, on the first opposition allotted day, the recommendations of the committee. I had hoped to hear more discussion of the proposals in those recommendations instead of some of the very fine speeches which were made, which were really more in the nature of Remembrance Day speeches. By saying that I do not want to detract from them at all.

I want to underline one or two points that are strictly germane to the motion. First of all, in the report there is one unfortunate, shall we say, omission that has to do, not with the Hong Kong prisoners of war but with the ordinary prisoners of war. Of that group I think I am the only one who is a member of this House. Over the past several years, certainly when I was attending the committee at the time it was hearing representations with regard to the Woods committee report and on other occasions, I have made it a point to urge upon the ministry—and I was hoping during my brief tenure as head of that particular ministry several years ago to initiate the program about which I want to speak—the view that treatment services and/or the Pension Commission should organize a program of calling in all prisoners of war with respect to whom they might not have had a recent, complete medical report.

I had occasion this past summer to be involved with my regimental association. It is composed of members who served in World War I, of the 50th Battalion, and who served in World War II, of the King's Own Calgary Regiment. There I saw the changes in some of my older colleagues in that association and the changes in those of that regiment who are contemporaries of mine. One could see subtle signs, over the years, of some rather disturbing evidence of physical impairment. Some of those men were with me in prisoner of war camps and they are now suffering the accumulated results of the hardships of their experience.

It is not only about those in the army that I wish to speak. I want to talk about all those who were prisoners of war. It is fair to say that the air force prisoners far outnumbered the prisoners taken from the army—I am speaking of ground troops—yet strangely enough, a greater number of army troops have organized into associations which appeared before the committee through their duly appointed representatives. I want again to insist upon the urgency and the value of calling all these men, who are not recorded with the Pension Commission, who are not receiving pensions and who have not in recent years been in for a medical examination. This was done with regard to the Hong Kong prisoners of war. This is how that movement started.

I say without fear of equivocation that the officials of the Department of Veterans Affairs were absolutely astounded by the results of the examination. Fortunately, they did not wait for those men to come in on their hands and knees suffering from the debility they now have. This is what we should do. We can get a salutary lesson or definition of what constitutes the long-term results of privation from men who were in this position for up to five years, and others for shorter periods but who had rather more severe experiences. That is my first point.

My second point is in connection with war veterans allowance. This has been a very sore point all along the line for many Canadians who are expatriates of this country, a great many from World War I and many more from World War II. I have personal knowledge of this matter and I have also heard the officials and representatives of the Canadian Veterans Association in the United Kingdom. These Canadian veterans would qualify for allowance except that they have not resided in Canada for the minimum period. They are denied the war veterans allowance. These people are suffering financially. They do not have the means to return to Canada for one year. Some are married and some have reached the ages of 65, 70 and over.

For some unknown reason there is a bureaucratic insistence that there will be a problem with Canadian veterans residing in the United States, flocking back to Canada. There would be no such problem. Nothing could be further from the truth. In my opinion it is an academic, administrative roadblock which has been set up to deny justice to these men living in the United Kingdom.

The government is prepared to pay war veterans allowance to members of allied forces who qualify and who are living in Canada, but denies this allowance to Canadian veterans living abroad. Some of these men married and are raising their families abroad. I do not understand why the government is continuing its blind persistence in denying these men that to which they are rightfully entitled.

My last point is the same as that raised by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath). It is with regard to the Canadian parks and memorials in France

and Belgium. We hear disquieting rumours that for reasons of economy the administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs in London is being closed. Some of this administration is being transferred to the British ministry of pensions, and the parks and memorials will be transferred to the Commonwealth War Graves Commission.

I am sure Your Honour, as former chairman of the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs, knows the value of memorials such as Vimy and how these memorials depend upon inspired Canadian maintenance and pride. I do not say this because the Commonwealth War Graves Commission cannot look after cemeteries; they are doing a tremendous job. But this is a real symbol for Canadians. If there is a symbol in Europe that portrays the valour and nationhood of Canadian forces during World War I, it is the Vimy memorial; yet we are prepared to transfer it. In any event, this is what we are informed is likely to be the case. I do not think it should be transferred to the Commonwealth War Graves Commission for maintenance and care. If it costs a little more, it is worth it. I commend this motion to hon. members and to the government for early action.

• (11:00 p.m.)

Mr. Ray Perrault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak for long at this late hour. What I have to say is the reiteration of what I have said in the House before, and what others have said. I support increases in war disability pensions and improvements for veterans at the earliest possible opportunity. In this regard I welcomed the tabling, on the opening day of the new session, of a list of measures projected for the session. Item 22 was entitled "Veterans pension legislation". Should this measure be introduced tomorrow, it would come none too soon for many of the veterans in this country.

A few weeks ago I visited the Beatty Street armoury in Vancouver. This armoury has been used during the summer months, very successfully most of the time, as a hostel for transient young people. However, when I called by on a spot-check, the administration of the hostel was clearly in trouble and unable to handle a situation wherein creatures known as yippies had descended like a baleful plague. This armoury, from which young men had been sent to at least three wars to defend democracy and, indeed, to defend the right to dissent in freedom, the right to join any or no political party, was occupied by a number of these people who had draped revolutionary flags and symbols over the monuments of the minders of Canada's military dead.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. The Chair does not wish to interrupt the hon. member, but this is not a debate on the general question of veterans or the armed forces. Although as much latitude as possible has been allowed, it is the duty of the occupant of the chair to remind the hon. member that he should stay as closely as possible to the motion and the amendment which are before the House.

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

Mr. Perrault: Your Honour's remarks really bring me to the point I was about to make. When I objected to what I considered to be acts of desecration, one strapping young man met my protest with the rejoinder, "It's a free country, isn't it?" I replied, "Yes, it is a free country; free because other young men, at other times laid their lives and their careers on the line and died to keep it free." But some lived; they came home with their bodies shattered and with their hopes for a productive, happy life, blasted. These are the people we are talking about in this debate. Many of them qualified for war disability pensions, pensions whose real purchasing power has declined steadily through the months and years. We have to do something for them now, soon, and I am confident that we will.

The report of the Veterans Affairs Committee was a good report. Its suggestion that there should be changes in the adjudication and appeal procedure was advanced with clarity and logic. Changes in the basic rate of pension were also proposed. I think we can all support proposals of this kind. Specific improvements were recommended. I repeat, the report was a good report. Now let us as legislators get on with the job—because deeds, not words, count at this time.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I shall be brief because I did not intend to take part in the debate.

I have carefully gone over the motion introduced by the official opposition.

As several of the previous speakers have pointed out, this is a very important motion, Mr. Speaker. I am not a veteran but having been in close contact with many of them over the years, I have become aware of their problems and the weaknesses of the present legislation or of its application.

From 1939 to 1945, the veterans of today were asked to defend, in Canada, or elsewhere, Christianity, civilization and democracy. Considering that only 27,800 pensioners, dependents or survivors now benefit from the veterans legislation, we understand why many of them are not satisfied with its application since they could never obtain anything.

Mr. Speaker, I want to recall that during the various inquiries, veterans have asked the government to amend the legislation in order to correct injustices. The first comment which I would like to make in this respect deals with appeals. On several occasions, I have noted that the present appeals system under the Veterans Act is absolutely antiquated and unfair, and this is due solely to an arbitrary bureaucracy.

On page 10 of the brief submitted to the Standing Committee of Veterans Affairs by the War Amputes of Canada, the following can be read:

The Canadian Association of the War Amputees of Canada accepts forthwith the conclusions of the Woods committee in this connection and asks the government to establish an independent Appeal Board ... Under the procedure now applicable to the Commission, no appeal can be made in such cases. One

commissioner alone studies the applications; he then obtains the signature of the two other commissioners. If the decision is negative, it is all over!

In another brief submitted by veterans themselves in 1969, there is reference to the establishment of an appeal board, and this time, the same recommendation appears at the beginning of the report submitted to the commitee. One can read in it the following:

... an appeal body above the Pension Commission.

Having studied the Speech from the Throne, we cannot wait for the establishment of this appeal board, nor for detailed changes in the administration of the veterans legislation. I keep on quoting:

Another basic principle in pension administration is that it is not only necessary to do justice but also to give the impression that justice has been done. The Woods Committee report shows clearly that under the present system where appeals are heard by the commissioners themselves, this impression is not given. An appeal board would fill this serious gap in the legislation. The Woods Committee has spoken highly of the comments of the Royal Commission on Governmental Administration (Glassco Commission) as to the necessity of protecting the citizens against arbitrary decisions rendered against them when they cannot appeal to administrative courts—

As it is the case for veterans, Mr. Speaker.

In his letter addressed to the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis) on January 6, 1970, the chairman of the Veterans Committee of the Royal Canadian Legion was dealing with the same matter.

So, if the government has not seen fit to adopt all the recommendations contained in the briefs previously submitted by veterans associations, it should, I believe, at least accept the most urgent ones.

Before concluding, I wish to draw attention to the fact that the veterans—and God knows they are still willing to work when they are able to do so—should be able to profit from earnings gained through small jobs that they can still do in spite of the handicaps that the war has brought to them.

According to present legislation, when a veteran earns a supplementary income, his pension is discontinued so as to punish him for having had the courage to earn a few pennies.

At page 2 of the brief submitted by the war amputees of Canada in April 1969, section 2 reads as follows:

No interference and no obstacle should hamper the disabled veteran who wants to better his lot through a training course or any other apprenticeship in order to take peacetime employment, so that the money he earns through his remaining capacities should not in any way deprive him of his right to a pension. In other words, his pension is paid to him because of his disability in connection with the unskilled labour market. If he can earn his living with talents acquired through his remaining capacities, he should not suffer the smallest loss on account of it.

Mr. Speaker, it is not normal that veterans able to work because of their talents and good will should be penalized by a decrease in their pension as soon as they can earn money.

If we want to keep the promises already made to the veterans when we asked for their services from 1939 up to 1945 in order to defend Canada, it seems to me that we should not deceive them today by forcing them to remain idle and by punishing them for the money they were courageous enough to earn.

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, I should like to be the spokesman of the great number of veterans who reside in my riding. I remember that they used to invite me every year to the Remembrance Day ceremony in honour of their brothers who fell on the battlefield.

This year, this ceremony will take place on November 15.

• (11:10 p.m.)

I already know they are going to ask me to tell the government they want greater attention to the matter of the pension paid to them, which is clearly inadequate in a period of inflation.

I remember one veteran. In fact, I remember the day my brother, a soldier during the 1914-18 war, returned to Canada. The date was December 16, 1918. I was then five years old and had waited up until 1 a.m. to see him arrive. I had been making my mother tell me of what was going on, of the perils to which our soldiers were exposed. I was therefore anxious to witness the return of this man whom I barely knew since I was scarcely two years old when he had enlisted. I could hardly wait to see him with my own eyes and to hear with my own ears the tales he had to tell. My whole life was deeply influenced by those events. Since then I have always had the greatest respect for these brave young men who sacrificed the best years of their lives for the safeguard of our liberties.

We owe them a debt of deep gratitude and our most profound respect. We must pay them back not just with words but also with deeds. Effectively, we must give them the financial assistance needed to enable them to enjoy in their own right the privilege of liberty and security.

We may feel proud to say that our sons died on the field of honour. In Europe, our war cemeteries are well kept by the local populations. Last May I had the opportunity of visiting the one near Rouen, and I was quite impressed to see the great respect the people of this region have for Canadian soldiers, and the gratitude they feel for Canadian veterans who twice defended the freedom that they enjoy now.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the motion now under study and the related amendment should be supported by all members, because Canada can afford to grant greater benefits to veterans than those they enjoy now. This very evening, when I did not expect to participate in this debate, I had the visit of a veteran who told me of his problems.

I told him: Today, the opposition introduced a motion about veterans. After discussing the matter with him, I decided to come back to the House to become the spokesman for this person and for all veterans who, in 1970, truly deserve a better deal than they have been getting so far.

I sincerely hope that Parliament will act more promptly, so that the older veterans may also, in the last years of their lives, have the security and freedom for which they have so valiantly fought. I am convinced that, in this way, we shall give their children definite proof that the country truly wants to recognize the sacrifices that their parents have made to preserve freedom.

That might also serve as an example for our youth who could also be inspired by the confidence shown by the adults in their country, which they want to continue to build not for the old who are going to die tomorrow but for the young who will be happy to live there in peace, while assuring to veterans the security they need.

[*English*]

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, there appear to be no other members who wish to take part in the debate at this time. Therefore, I now move that this House do adjourn.

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

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

On motion of Mr. Gray the House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, October 28, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the House of a slight change in the business that will be called today. As the result of an agreement with the other parties, the first items of government business to be called will be orders Nos. 12, 13, 14 and 15 for the setting up of committees. It is expected that these motions will be carried without debate.

Hon. J. A. MacLean (Malpeque): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions between the House Leaders on this matter. It is agreeable to this party to proceed as stated by the Government House Leader.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, it is quite agreeable. It would be even more agreeable if the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry would put forward a motion to refer the draft agreement with the Soviet Union to the Fisheries Committee.

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

PROCLAMATION OF WAR MEASURES ACT—SECRET INFORMATION—POSSIBLE REPLACEMENT OF QUEBEC GOVERNMENT—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask for the unanimous consent of the House to move a motion under Standing Order 43 on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. A brief explanation for this request is as follows: During the debate on the motion of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to approve the proclamation of the War Measures Act and the Order in Council made under it, ministers of the Crown referred to alleged information in the possession of the government which the Prime Minister has so far refused to divulge to the House and to the people of Canada.

• (2:10 p.m.)

In recent days there have been rumours allegedly originating with persons in high places in Ottawa respecting the possible replacement of the Bourassa government of Quebec by a provisional government, rumours which the Prime Minister has refused either to confirm or deny. The result is widespread confusion about a crucial matter affecting our democratic institutions, and speculation about many well-known Canadians whose reputation is thereby damaged.

I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles):

That the matter of the secret information to which ministers of the Crown referred during the debate on Friday, October 16, and the matter of the rumours regarding a possible replacement of the Bourassa government of Quebec by a provisional government, be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs for a full and thorough inquiry and to report thereon to this House.

Mr. Speaker: As hon. members know, unanimous consent is required before such a motion can be moved.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is no unanimity.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

CANADIAN ARMED FORCES REGULAR OFFICERS

Question No. 11—**Mr. Rowland:**

1. What was the total number of persons accepted for the Canadian Armed Forces regular officers training plan in each year 1967, 1968, 1969 and 1970?

2. By province, how many candidates were accepted for each year?

3. For each year, how many of the successful applicants were (a) bilingual (b) indicated that English was their primary official language (c) indicated that French was their primary official language?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence):

1.	1967	1968	1969	1970
	554	649	552	481
2.	1967	1968	1969	1970
Nfld.	3	7	10	5
P.E.I.	6	6	2	4
N.S.	34	41	22	15
N.B.	30	21	11	8
Que.	156	171	169	144
Ont.	169	232	211	174
Man.	26	36	23	32
Sask.	30	34	30	39
Alta.	43	53	46	46
B.C.	53	39	23	14
Other	4	9	5	—

Questions

3. (a) Applicants' ability in a second language is not measured at time of enrolment.

(b)	1967	1968	1969	1970
	434	526	419	378
(c)	1967	1968	1969	1970
	120	123	133	103

CPR PENSION PLAN

Question No. 20—**Mr. Skoberg:**

1. What is the total amount of unfunded liability in the Canadian Pacific Railways' Pension Plan?

2. Has the Canadian Pacific Railways' Pension Plan been registered under the Pension Benefits Standards Act and, if not, for what reason?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): 1. It is not considered appropriate for the Government to make publice information obtained pursuant to the administration of the Pension Benefits Standards Act concerning the details of a private pension plan.

2. No. The company has claimed that the Act does not apply to its pension plan; discussions have been taking place to resolve differences of opinion and the company was given an extension of time to amend the plan to conform with requirements of the Act.

SALE OF AIRCRAFT CARRIER HMCS "BONAVENTURE"

Question No. 23—**Mr. Skoberg:**

What bids were received by Crown Assets Disposal Corporation regarding the sale of the Aircraft carrier *HMCS Bonaventure* and, in each case, what was the respective bid?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): In so far as Crown Assets Disposal Corporation is concerned: The following is the summary of bids received by the Corporation covering the sale of the HMCS *Bonaventure*:

M. W. Kennedy Ltd.	$851,700.00	
Steel Factors (724,200.00 Cdn.)	710,000.00	U.S.
Latti S.P.A. (719,225.46 Cdn.)	705,123.00	U.S.
International Iron & Metal Co.	601,190.00	
Shipbreaking Industries Ltd.	588,686.00	
N.V. Intershitra (517,468.13 Cdn.)	507,321.70	U.S.
Havant	160,000.00	
Dartmouth Salvage	166,000.00	
Peck Iron & Metal Co. (108,229.22 Cdn.)	106,107.08	U.S.
Kimola Pineridge Holdings	20,000.00	
Ann Brodie	100.00	
Kevin McDermid	5.00	
Wiltopps (Asia) Ltd.	671,555.00	
Shipowners & Shipbuilders	487,500.00	
LATE BIDS		
Marine Salvage Co. Ltd.	$630,380.80	
Hua Eng Copper & Iron	667,000.00	
Establissements Van Heyghen	360,070.00	
Petmovar S.A. Panama	200,000.00	
S.P.A. Cantieri Italy	635,000.00	
Chin HO FA Steel & Iron	612,345.60	
Chi Shun Hua Steel Co. Ltd.	475,890.00	
Kenrick George	1,000.00	

[Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale).]

DEFENCE RESEARCH BOARD—EXPENDITURES TO LABORATORIES AT SUFFIELD, ALBERTA AND SHIRLEY BAY, ONTARIO

Question No. 61—**Mr. Broadbent:**

For each fiscal year 1963/64 to 1969/70, what have been the expenditures under the Defence Research Board to laboratories at Suffield, Alberta and Shirley Bay, Ontario?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): The following figures represent the total expenditures (including operations, maintenance and capital expenditures) for the Defence Research Establishment Suffield (DRES) and the Defence Research Establishment Ottawa (DREO) and cover their programs of atomic, biological and chemical protective research, shock and blast research, research on power source items such as batteries, plastics and rubber technology, geophysics research, arctic research, vehicle mobility, etc., and, latterly, responsibility for DRB-funded research at the Communications Research Centre.

	DRES	DREO
1963-64	$3,152,000	$1,855,000
1964-65	3,219,000	1,482,000
1965-66	3,751,000	1,733,000
1966-67	4,142,000	1,965,000
1967-68	4,189,000	1,956,000
1968-69	4,271,000	2,071,000
1969-70	4,338,000	4,461,000

R.C.M.P. PENSION PLAN

Question No. 69—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

1. How many retired Royal Canadian Mounted Police personnel are receiving pensions including their basic pensions and any supplement or supplements added thereto, of amounts within each of the following brackets: (a) less than $20.00 per month (b) $20.00 to $29.99 per month (c) $30.00 to $39.99 per month (d) $40.00 to $49.99 per month (e) $50.00 to 59.99 per month (f) 60.00 to $69.99 per month (g) $70.00 to $79.99 per month (h) $80.00 to 89.99 per month (i) 90.00 to $99.99 per month (j) 100.00 to $149.99 per month (k) $150.00 to $199.99 per month (l) $200.00 to $249.99 per month (m) $250.00 to $299.99 per month (n) $300.00 per month and over.

2. How many widows of R.C.M.P. personnel or of retired R.C.M.P. personnel are receiving pensions, including their basic pensions and any supplement or supplements added thereto, of amounts within each of the brackets indicated in the above question?

3 What is the number of retired R.C.M.P. personnel and also the number of widows of R.C.M.P. personnel or of retired R.C.M.P. personnel presently residing in each province?

4. In respect of how many orphans of R.C.M.P. personnel are pensions being paid and what is the average amount thereof?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): 1. (a) Nil; (b) nil; (c) three; (d) two; (e) seven; (f) 11; (g) nine; (h) 15; (i) 30; (j) 238; (k) 363; (l) 388; (m) 257; (n) 1,097.

2. (a) nine; (b) 11; (c) nine; (d) 14; (e) 14; (f) 19; (g) 10; (h) 10; (i) 10; (j) 49; (k) 42; (l) 24; (m) seven; (n) 16.

3. Province	Retired Personnel	Widows
Newfoundland	39	3
Prince Edward Island	21	Nil
Nova Scotia	193	13
New Brunswick	78	7
Quebec	184	8
Ontario	521	63
Manitoba	122	12
Saskatchewan	148	8
Alberta	332	28
British Columbia	685	90
Northwest Territories	23	1
Outside Canada	74	11

4. One hundred and five, average $26.69.

SPECIFIC ROLES ASSIGNED TO CFB SHEARWATER

Question No. 82—**Mr. Forrestall:**

During the next three years, what are the specific roles assigned to CFB Shearwater?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): At the present time, and for the foreseeable future, the role of the Canadian Forces Base Shearwater is to provide base and airfield facilities for both fixed wing and rotary wing anti-submarine aircraft, as well as facilities for training and utility squadrons. Shearwater is also used as an alternate airfield for the long range Maritime patrol aircraft operating from CFBs Summerside and Greenwood and as a terminus for Transport Command service flights.

MARITIME COMMAND—REPLACEMENT FOR ARGUS AIRCRAFT

Question No. 124—**Mr. Forrestall:**

1. Has the government decided on the choice of equipment to replace or augment the role of the Argus Maritime Patrol aircraft and, if so, when can an announcement be expected?

2. On the basis of present technological information, what is the anticipated (a) air-frame life of the Argus (b) engine life of the Argus (c) efficient useful life of electronic equipment?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): 1. No.

2. (a) The predicted life of the Argus airframe was 11,000 hrs. However, the airframe is a fail-safe or damage tolerant structure which makes the risk of catastrophic failure of the primary structure remote. Thus the airframe life is determined by the economics of maintenance. The manufacturer has stated that appearance of cracks in the primary structure should not occur before 15,000 hrs. At the present flying rate all Argus aircraft in the fleet will have flown 15,000 hrs or more by 1975-77. (b) There is no specified life for the Argus engine. Therefore, the engine life will be determined by the economy of maintenance and the acceptability of the operational performance of the aircraft. (c) This information is classified.

SEARCH AND RESCUE—WEST COAST

Question No. 147—**Mr. Mather:**

What is the present force of ships, boats and aircraft on the Pacific Coast for air-sea rescue efforts?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): Three Buffalo aircraft, three Labrador helicopter, three 95-foot cutters, three 40-foot cutters, and three life-boats are established on the Pacific Coast for primary search and rescue duties. In addition, all other Canadian Forces aircraft and Federal Government vessels in the area may be called upon for search and rescue tasks when required.

AMOUNT OF UNION DUES SUPPORTING POLITICAL PARTIES

Question No. 165—**Mr. Robinson:**

Does the government have statistics on the amount of union dues directly or indirectly used to support political parties and, if so, for each year 1965 to 1970 inclusive, how much has been so allotted to each political party?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): No.

LEGISLATION TO OUTLAW PYRAMID SELLING SCHEMES

Question No. 198—**Mr. Robinson:**

Will the government consider the advisability of legislation to outlaw "pyramid selling" schemes of every nature and kind such as those cosmetics, household commodities, food products, supplements and land?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Careful attention will be given to this proposal in the preparation of amendments to the Combines Investigation Act which are presently being considered.

FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION BY GOVERNMENT IN LOTBINIÈRE CONSTITUENCY

Question No. 243—**Mr. Fortin:**

For each project to which the federal government has contributed financially since 1965 in the constituency of Lotbinière (a) what was the nature of the project (b) what was the amount invested by the federal government in each project (c) what was the amount invested by the provincial government in each project (d) were other contributions made and, if so, by whom and what was the amount?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): It is not feasible to provide aggregate information on expenditure disbursements or revenue collections for constituencies, counties or other comparable units. Government estimates are not prepared on this basis nor are records of expenditures kept in this way.

Information concerning expenditures could be supplied about specific projects or programs which are identified in a question. These, of course, would in some cases relate to a particular constituency or locality.

Motions for Papers

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, Notice of Motion No. 78 is acceptable to the government.

Motion No. 78—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the report of the Canadian Transport Commission concerning the investigation into the mishap on the CNR Rivers Subdivision on April 28, 1968, where three employees were killed when the engine went through the bridge.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Jerome: Notices of Motions Nos. 6, 45, 48, 98 and 131 are acceptable to the government subject to the usual reservations concerning confidential documents and the authorization of the governments concerned.

Mr. Speaker: Subject to the reservations and conditions expressed by the Parliamentary Secretary, is it the pleasure of the House that Notices of Motions Nos. 6, 45, 48, 98 and 131 be deemed to have been adopted?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

SURVEY OF NATIVE PEOPLE EMPLOYED IN MINING, NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

Motion No. 6—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the survey undertaken by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development showing the number of native people employed in mining in the Northwest Territories as referred to by the Minister of Indian Affairs in his address in Yellowknife on November 10, 1969.

Motion agreed to.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND PEOPLE OF BANKS ISLAND REGARDING OIL EXPLORATION

Motion No. 45—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and the native people of Banks Island in the Northwest Territories regarding oil exploration.

Motion agreed to.

NEW LAND-USE REGULATIONS IN CANADA'S NORTHLAND

Motion No. 48—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all representations received by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development regarding new land-use regulations in Canada's northland.

Motion agreed to.

NORTHERN COMMUNICATION CONFERENCE, YELLOWKNIFE, N.W.T., SEPTEMBER 1970

Motion No. 98—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all speeches, reports, resolutions of the northern communications conference held at Yellowknife NWT in September, 1970.

Motion agreed to

[Mr. Jerome.]

CLOSING OF DEPARTMENT VETERANS AFFAIRS OFFICE, LONDON, ENGLAND

Motion No. 131—**Mr. Marshall:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all memoranda, correspondence, etc., arising out of the proposed closing of the office of the Department of Veterans Affairs in London, England.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Jerome: Would Your Honour be good enough to call Notices of Motions Nos. 2, 22, 24, 51, 60, 77 and 114 to 130 inclusive?

REPORT ON ATTENDANCE OF INDIANS

Motion No. 2—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the report on attitudes of Indian people based mainly on a visit to the Six Nations Reserve on July 16, 1969, submitted to the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development by Berger, Tisdall, Clark and Lesley Ltd., as referred to at page 6 of the quarterly report on public relations activity, June, July, August, 1969 by the said Berger, Tisdall, Clark and Lesley Ltd.

Mr. Judd Buchanan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Skeena asked for this report during the past session. It was stated in the reply that since the writer had specifically requested that the confidentiality of the report be respected, the report should not be tabled. The government's stand on this matter has not changed since to permit the tabling of this report. I would therefore ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): The writer of the report was paid by the government to do public relations work for the department. I think the question should be put.

Mr. Speaker: Is the motion transferred for debate?

Mr. Howard (Skeena): No.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the wish of the House that I put the question? If nobody asks that it be transferred for debate I will put the motion.

Mr. MacEachen: Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

FINANCING OF PAN-AMERICAN GAMES IN WINNIPEG

Motion No. 22—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and/or any minister or department and the City of Winnipeg, including the mayor, the city clerk and the city treasurer, since January 1, 1968, dealing with the financing of the Pan-American Games in Winnipeg.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the

mayor of Winnipeg has indicated to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) that he considered those documents as confidential and, accordingly, as not to be tabled in the House.

[*English*]

In view of these circumstances, the hon. member may wish to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Orlikow: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

SUBMISSIONS TO MONTREAL MAIL TRANSPORT INQUIRY

Motion No. 24—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all memoranda, correspondence, briefs, tables and submissions presented to the Commission of Inquiry into Mail Transport in Montreal.

Mr. Barney Danson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this motion is similar to Motion No. 438 put by the hon. member last session. The stand taken by the commissioner at that time, as recorded in *Hansard* of April 29, 1970, at page 6407, has not changed. In view of these circumstances I hope the hon. member will agree to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Orlikow: No, Mr. Speaker, because my stand has not changed, either.

Mr. MacEachen: Transfer.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

REPORTS ON SOCIAL WELFARE LEGISLATION AND INCOME SECURITY

Motion No. 51—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of any reports or reviews with respect to social welfare legislation and income security prepared by or under the direction of Dr. J. W. Willard, Deputy Minister of Welfare for Canada, since June 25, 1968.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, the documents concerning the legislation on social welfare and security of income, which have been drafted by the Deputy Minister of National Health and Welfare or under his direction, are a part of the revision of the social security plan in Canada and therefore they are only for the internal use of that department.

Therefore, I would ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I cannot agree. Let us put the question.

Mr. MacEachen: Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

REPORT OF SURVEY TEAM ON CONDITIONS SURROUNDING USE OF ANIMALS FOR EXPERIMENTAL PURPOSES

Motion No. 60—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the Report of the findings of the survey team which, under the direction of Dr. H. C. Rowsell, inspected university research laboratories across the country earlier this year and made an assessment of the conditions surrounding the use of animals for experimental purposes.

Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, may I refer the hon. member to the reply given to the Notice of Motion for the Production of Papers No. 255 in the last session. The hon. member was advised that the Canadian Council on Animal Care, under the direction of Dr. H. C. Rowsell, was set up by the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. It receives support from the National Research Council and the Medical Research Council—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have to interrupt the Parliamentary Secretary. He should indicate briefly whether he is prepared to have the document tabled; he cannot make a speech.

Mr. Isabelle: Mr. Speaker, the report prepared by the Canadian Council on Animal Care is confidential. For this reason my minister regrets that he is unable to produce the information requested and would ask the hon. member to withdraw her motion.

Mrs. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I am at a loss to understand why a report about animals used for experimentation is confidential.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Obviously when we have lengthy explanations given by Parliamentary Secretaries in response to motions for the production of documents, it is natural that hon. members who have put the motions want to explain why they feel the document should be produced. I think this indicates the virtue of having very brief explanations, if indeed they are required at all.

Mr. MacEachen: Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO POLLUTION CONTROL

Motion No. 77—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence exchanged from January, 1968 to March 1970, dealing with pollution control between the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources and the following Companies: Proctor and Gamble Ltd., Lever Bros. Ltd. and The Colgate-Palmolive Company Ltd.

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, this motion is the same as motion No. 396 of the previous session which

was made an order for return on October 7, 1970, following which all relevant correspondence was tabled on October 14, 1970. In those circumstances I wonder whether the hon. member would withdraw his motion?

Mr. Skoberg: Mr. Speaker, I will look at this correspondence and see whether or not I will withdraw the motion.

Mr. Speaker: Motion stands.

STUDY ON "PROJET DE RECHERCHE AUPRÈS DU MILIEU DÉFAVORISÉ URBAIN QUÉBECOIS" 1969-70

Motion No. 114—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by Le Centre de Planification Familiale, Montreal, in the fiscal year 1969-70 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on "Projet de recherche auprès du milieu défavorisé urbain Québecois".

Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, it is an understanding in the scientific community that details pertaining to specific research projects are a matter of confidence between the researcher and the donor organization. For this reason the Department of National Health and Welfare does not make public the findings of researchers.

As the hon. member has already been provided with the list of addresses of the researchers concerned, she may wish to withdraw her motion.

Mrs. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I believe that since the Canadian public has financed these reports it has the right to see what it paid for.

Mr. MacEachen: Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

STUDY ON "PROJET DE RECHERCHE AUPRÈS DU MILIEU DÉFAVORISÉ URBAIN QUÉBECOIS"

Motion No. 115—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by Le Centre de Planification Familiale, Montreal, in the fiscal year 1970-71 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on "Projet de recherche auprès du milieu défavorisé urbain Québecois".

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, as notice of motion No. 115 applies to the document already referred to in notice No. 114, and for the same reasons, I would ask the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) to withdraw her motion.

Mrs. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, my reply is exactly the same.

[*English*]

Mr. MacEachen: Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

[Mr. Jerome.]

STUDY OF THE EFFECT OF ORAL CONTRACEPTIVES ON FOLATE METABOLISM AS RELATED TO THE OUTCOME OF SUBSEQUENT PREGNANCIES

Motion No. 116—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by St. Boniface General Hospital in the fiscal year 1969-70 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on "The Effect of Oral Contraceptives on Folate Metabolism as Related to the Outcome of Subsequent Pregnancies".

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): This notice of motion is similar to the others, Mr. Speaker, and for the same reasons, I shall ask the hon. member to withdraw her motion.

Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I would ask that notices of Motions Nos. 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129 and 130 be withdrawn for the same reasons which I gave for the preceding motions.

[*English*]

Mrs. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, would you put the question?

Mr. MacEachen: Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

[*English*]

STUDY OF THE EFFECT OF OESTROGEN—PROGESTIN COMPOUNDS ON PLATELET SURFACE REACTIONS IN WOMEN OF CHILDBEARING AGE 1968-69

Motion No. 117—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken in the fiscal year 1968-69 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on "The Effect of Oestrogen-progestin Compounds on Platelet Surface Reactions in Women of Childbearing Age".

Transferred for debate.

STUDY OF THE EFFECT OF OESTROGEN—PROGESTIN COMPOUNDS ON PLATELET SURFACE REACTIONS IN WOMEN OF CHILDBEARING AGE 1969-70

Motion No. 118—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken in the fiscal year 1969-70 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on "The Effect of Oestrogen-progestin Compounds on Platelet Surface Reactions in Women of Childbearing Age".

Transferred for debate.

STUDY OF PHYSIOLOGICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF ORAL CONTRACEPTIVE MEDICATION 1968-69

Motion No. 119—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by the Jewish General and Montreal General Hospitals in the fiscal year 1968-69 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on the "Physiological and Psychological Aspects of Oral Contraceptive Medication".

Transferred for debate.

STUDY OF PHYSIOLOGICAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ASPECTS OF ORAL CONTRACEPTIVE MEDICATION 1969-70

Motion No. 120—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by the Jewish General and Montreal General Hospitals in the fiscal year 1969-70 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on the "Physiological and Psychological Aspects of Oral Contraceptive Medication".

Transferred for debate.

STUDY "CAUSES ET CONSÉQUENCES DÉMOGRAPHIQUES ÉCONOMIQUES ET SOCIALES DE LA PRATIQUE DE LA MÉTHODE THERMIQUE DE RÉGULATION DES NAISSANCES"

Motion No. 121—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study "Causes et conséquences démographiques économiques et sociales de la pratique de la méthode thermique de régulation des naissances" funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare in the fiscal year 1969-70.

Transferred for debate.

STUDY, "EVALUATION OF RESULTS OF GENETIC COUNSELLING", 1966-67

Motion No. 122—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by the Montreal Children's Hospital (McGill) in the fiscal year 1966-67 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on the "Evaluation of Results of Genetic Counselling".

Transferred for debate.

STUDY, "EVALUATION OF RESULTS OF GENETIC COUNSELLING", 1967-68

Motion No. 123—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by the Montreal Children's Hospital (McGill) in the fiscal year 1967-68 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on the "Evaluation of Results of Genetic Counselling".

Transferred for debate.

STUDY, "EVALUATION OF RESULTS OF GENETIC COUNSELLING" 1969-70

Motion No. 124—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by the Montreal Children's Hospital (McGill) in the fiscal year 1968-68 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on the "Evaluation of Results of Genetic Counselling".

Transferred for debate.

STUDY, "EVALUATION OF RESULTS OF GENETIC COUNSELLING", 1969-70

Motion No. 125—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by the Montreal Children's Hospital (McGill) in the fiscal year 1969-70 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on the "Evaluation of Results of Genetic Counselling".

Transferred for debate.

STUDY, "AN EXPERIMENT IN COMMUNITY HEALTH CARE", 1967-68

Motion No. 126—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of a study undertaken by Toronto General Hospital (University of Toronto) in the fiscal year 1967-68 on "An Experiment in Community Health Care: The Evaluation of Voluntary Family Planning (a) the need (b) the desire; (c) the effect", funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare.

Transferred for debate.

STUDY, "AN EXPERIMENT IN COMMUNITY HEALTH CARE", 1968-69

Motion No. 127—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of a study undertaken by Toronto General Hospital (University of Toronto) in the fiscal year 1968-69 on "An Experiment in Community Health Care: The Evaluation of Voluntary Family Planning (a) the need; (b) the desire; (c) the effect", funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare.

Transferred for debate.

STUDY, THE EVALUATION OF VOLUNTARY FAMILY PLANNING, 1969-70

Motion No. 128—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of a study undertaken by Toronto General Hospital (University of Toronto) in the fiscal year 1969-70 on "An Experiment in Community Health Care: The Evaluation of Voluntary Family Planning (a) the need; (b) the desire; (c) the effect", funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare.

Transferred for debate.

STUDY OF WOMEN ATTENDING VANCOUVER FAMILY PLANNING CLINIC, 1968-69

Motion No. 129—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by the University of British Columbia in the fiscal year 1968-69 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on "Social and Medical Factors of Women Attending Vancouver Family Planning Clinic and a Group of Women not Attending a Family Planning Clinic in two areas of the City of Vancouver".

Transferred for debate.

STUDY OF WOMEN ATTENDING VANCOUVER FAMILY PLANNING CLINIC 1969-70

Motion No. 130—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study undertaken by the University of British Columbia in the fiscal year 1969-70 funded by the Department of National Health and Welfare on "Social and Medical Factors of Women Attending Vancouver Family Planning Clinic and a Group of Women not Attending a Family Planning Clinic in two areas of the City of Vancouver".

Transferred for debate.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Mr. Jerome: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the other notices of motions be allowed to stand.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: Are the other notices of motions allowed to stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Inquiries of the Ministry

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

NATIONAL SECURITY

CHARGES LAID UNDER WAR MEASURES ACT OR CRIMINAL CODE

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice who was here a moment ago and who I hoped would be able to give the information I sought from the Prime Minister yesterday. I should like to know whether the Prime Minister, the Solicitor General or the Minister of Justice can inform the House if any charges have been laid against any of the nearly 400 persons arrested under the War Measures Act regulations for any offence created by these regulations such as being a member of the FLQ? Have any charges been laid and, if so, how many?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Minister of Justice will be in the House in a moment or two and can answer the question.

Mr. Fairweather: That is very good of him.

[*Translation*]

TERRORISM IN QUEBEC—MEASURES TO IMPROVE ECONOMIC SITUATION

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Prime Minister a question.

Since the province of Quebec is in a difficult economic situation on account of recent events, is the government considering the implementation of emergency measures in order to help the government of Quebec to bring the situation back to normal?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago we announced special measures to try and correct this situation. Perhaps there will be more. I wish simply to remind the House that the government's potential role in re-activating the economy is always relatively minor. Private enterprise, all investors and corporations must continue to co-operate, and this requires a peaceful and progressive climate.

Mr. Asselin: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a supplementary question.

Can the Prime Minister tell us if, since last week's events, the Quebec government has called the attention of the federal government to urgent economic measures which should be taken jointly so as to improve the difficult economic situation now prevailing in Quebec?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, representations have certainly been made in that connection and we have also made some to the Quebec government.

Let us not forget, for instance, that under the development program for the Gaspé peninsula, the federal government, as pointed out so well by the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) this summer, is ready to contribute over $250 million. That was done on the condition, of course, that the province of Quebec carry out certain projects. It is not our fault if the previous government has not done so. I hope that the present one will be successful in that regard.

[Mr. Speaker.]

[*English*]

CHARGES LAID UNDER WAR MEASURES ACT OR CRIMINAL CODE—DETENTIONS BEYOND SEVEN DAYS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Justice this question. Of the nearly 400 persons arrested under the War Measures Act regulations, how many have been charged with an offence created by those regulations such as the offence of being a member of the FLQ, or some other offence created by those regulations?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the Leader of the Opposition for being out of the House when he asked his question. The information I have from the office of the Attorney General of Quebec as of midnight last night is that the number of persons arrested and detained is 397, the number released is 259, and the number of persons still detained is 138. None of the 138 has been charged with any offence to date.

Mr. Woolliams: Good God!

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, can the Minister of Justice give any explanation why no charges have been laid against any of the nearly 400 persons arrested under the War Measures Act regulations? Is it because it has been found impractical to prefer charges in respect of offences created by the regulations?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, I think this properly lies within the jurisdiction of the Attorney General of Quebec. I take it he will be making a statement in due course giving the explanation.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make sure I understood the minister correctly. Is he saying in respect of the 390-odd persons arrested under these regulations that no charges at all have been laid to date under either the War Measures Act regulations or the Criminal Code?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I am saying that in regard to the 138 persons still retained no charges have been laid under the War Measures Act or the Criminal Code.

Mr. Stanfield: Can the minister advise the House how many persons are being held beyond seven days at the request of the Minister of Justice of the province of Quebec without a charge being laid?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I asked for the details of that information yesterday and still have not obtained a reply. When I do I shall convey it to the House.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for York South wish to ask a supplementary?

Mr. Lewis: I do not know whether it is a supplementary or a direct question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: If the hon. member is not sure, I rather suspect it is not.

[*Translation*]

INQUIRY RESPECTING JAMES CROSS

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister.

Can he tell us today if, according to the information he has, Mr. Cross, Great Britain's commercial attaché in Montreal, is still alive?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I cannot answer that question, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

WAR MEASURES ACT—STATEMENT BY MINISTER OF JUSTICE TO PROVINCIAL ATTORNEYS GENERAL ON PURPOSE AND INTENT

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, in view of the answer of the Minister of Justice to the Leader of the Opposition to the effect that no charges have been laid, could the Minister of Justice advise the House what the terms are of the warning he mentioned he has given the Attorneys General of the various provinces and whether his law officers are instructed to interpret the legislation for those Attorneys General?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): No, Mr. Speaker. The Attorneys General of the provinces are charged with administering the regulations under the War Measures Act just as they are charged with administering the criminal law under the Criminal Code, and they rely on their own officers for that type of advice.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, may I follow up this question for a moment? As I understood the Minister of Justice, he mentioned that he had warned the Attorneys General of the various provinces concerning the interpretation of the legislation. What kind of warning did he give them?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I have already stated that in the House. I suggested that the purpose and intent, as I interpret the resolution of the House, is that the emergency to which the War Measures Act and its proclamation related had to do with the FLQ in Quebec and that any use of this proclamation or the regulations beyond that purpose might well be harmful. Those are the words I conveyed to the Attorneys General across the country.

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Justice whether the communications with the various provinces were in writing and, if so, would he table the letter setting out this most unusual course of interpreting a resolution on the basis of a discussion in the House of Commons? I would like to see the letter in question that he wrote because it would be a modern example of an unusual nature.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, whenever I can see someone personally or arrange that one of my senior officials see someone personally I choose to do that rather than send a letter. Mr. D. H. Christie, Deputy Attorney General of Canada, on my instructions visited the four western provinces and visited the Deputy Attorney General of each of these four western provinces. He met personally the Attorney General of the right hon. gentleman's province of Saskatchewan and the Attorney General of the province of Alberta. On his return he went to the four Atlantic provinces where he was able to communicate our feelings about the War Measures Act and ascertain their feelings about the type of legislation we should introduce in the House to replace the proclamation by some type of permanent legislation. We have been in touch in the same way personally with Attorneys General of Ontario and Quebec. I know the right hon. gentleman believes in this type of personal communication and this is the type that I have used.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Personal communication is designed to cover up the government's position.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Has the right hon. gentleman a supplementary question?

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I again mention that these general observations made by ministers are bound to result in answers being made.

Some hon. Members: Question!

Mr. Diefenbaker: When there are general observations made such as we have just witnessed, I ask Your Honour to call some of the ministers of the Crown to order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I again have to ask the right hon. gentleman whether he wishes to ask a supplementary question.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I am pressing that point, with great respect to you. These ministers are following the course from time to time of making gratuitous observations and then Your Honour says that we cannot answer them. I am simply raising my objection thereto. Now I will ask my question—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have to bring to the attention of hon. members that there are limitations to the question period and that we should try to get on. I have invited the right hon. gentleman to ask his supplementary question and I have noted his comments with attention, care and sympathy.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. Now, I ask the minister, is it not a fact—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: These hon. gentlemen object to anything being discussed as a fact in this House. Is it not a fact that in the regulations that have been drawn up there is not one line or one word that indicates that the Attorneys General of the several provinces shall have other than perfect freedom in interpreting the meaning of what has been drawn up by the minister and those associated with him?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have never contested that freedom. I suggested to the Attorneys General what the view of the government was with

reference to those regulations. The right hon. gentleman is perfectly right; they are free to interpret these regulations according to the advice given them by their own law officers.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Diefenbaker: May I ask this—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There seems to be agreement between the right hon. gentleman and the minister. I will take advantage of the situation to call on the hon. member for York South.

INFORMATION LEADING TO INVOKING OF WAR MEASURES ACT

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I should have claimed that mine was a supplementary question and I now regret not having done so. I wish to address my question to the right hon. Prime Minister. It arises from a statement in the letter from the premier of Quebec dated October 16 and printed as an appendix to *Hansard* of Friday, October 16. In that letter the premier of Quebec said:

> According to the information we have and which is available to you, we are facing a concerted effort to intimidate and overthrow the government and the democratic institutions of this province—

I wish to ask the Prime Minister whether the information which Mr. Bourassa says was available to him on October 16 contained information in addition to the information which he has made public and particularly whether that information contained any reference to a possible replacement of the Bourassa government by an alleged provisional government?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have given to the House repeatedly the reasons which motivated our action. I have also said that there were other bits of information.

An hon. Member: Bits, bits!

Mr. Trudeau: There were also rumours which were circulating. I said to the House that the action we took was substantiated by the three points that I have repeated to the House at least two or three times. I no not think I can go beyond that today. I would not deny that we were not aware of rumours which were circulating or of other types of information which may or not be substantiated. I am just saying that we acted on the information which is known to the House, which is known to Premier Bourassa, which is known to Mr. Drapeau and is known to ourselves as well as to all members.

Mr. Lewis: There was a phrase in the Prime Minister's statement that they had information which may or may not have been substantiated. I believe that is what I heard him say. May I ask the Prime Minister whether such information had anything at all to do with the decision to invoke the War Measures Act or whether only the information which has been made public was the basis for the invocation and, second, whether this House and the people of Canada may expect to have that additional information at any time within the next week or so when we are likely to discuss the new bill which the Minister of Justice said he would introduce in a few days?

Mr. Trudeau: I have answered repeatedly, Mr. Speaker, and I repeat again, that the information we had is available to everyone. It is a matter of a judgment made by the government of Quebec, the administration of Montreal and ourselves that there was an apprehended insurrection. This was based on knowledge of the facts that I have recited to the House, on knowledge of the facts in Quebec as they exist today and as known to anyone who knows about the province of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I will recognize the hon. member for York South on a supplementary question and then go to the hon. member for Témiscamingue.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I wish to address this question to the right hon. Prime Minister. I appreciate that the War Measures Act is worded in such a way that the mere declaration by the government that there is an apprehended insurrection makes it so, but I want to ask the Prime Minister whether the information he has given us is all the information on which he acted or did he act on any other information which he has not disclosed to us?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I acted on the information that I have been accumulating since I was three years old.

Mr. Woolliams: It took you a long time!

Mr. Speaker: Order. I believe that the hon. member for York South is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Lewis: I am, Mr. Speaker. Like all hon. members in this House, I am always touched by the kind of reply the Prime Minister gives on important matters. I appreciate that he is a genius but that he was a genius at three years old I did not know.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. May we have order, please. I believe the hon. member for York South was seeking the floor for the purpose of raising a point of order and I am wondering if this is what he wants to do.

Mr. Lewis: I have to leave the interpretation of that to Your Honour but I say to you, Sir, that when the Prime Minister is asked a question about a matter which is of great concern to all Canada for reasons that affect the War Measures Act and reasons which he says affect the future of democracy in Canada, an answer referring to information he has had since he was three years old is the kind of flighty irrelevant answer that makes his position—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order. That is obviously not a point of order and I have to make a ruling. I do not know

whether the right hon. Prime Minister wishes to rise on the same point of order or has his own, but certainly I have to rule on this one now and say it is not a point of order.

Mr. Trudeau: It was pretty much the same point of order but I might try to change it a little bit, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. Member: Sit down!

Mr. Trudeau: The hon. member has been asking me repeatedly if we acted on any other information. I told him we acted on information which I put before the House and which I have repeatedly put to the hon. member and to the rest of the House. He asked if I had any other information on which I acted. Mr. Speaker, none that is relevant to this question. I have, I repeat, accumulated information for many, many years, but I do not expect that the members of this House wish me to recite to them everything I have learned since I was, as I say, three years old.

An hon. Member: You haven't any information.

[*Translation*]

WAR MEASURES ACT—REQUEST BY QUEBEC TO CONTINUE APPLICATION

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a supplementary question to the Prime Minister.

Has the government of the province of Quebec requested the federal government to maintain the emergency measures now in force until all the FLQ cells have been dismantled and Mr. Laporte's murderers and Mr. Cross's kidnappers have been captured?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I do not believe that any request has been made in such specific terms, Mr. Speaker, but I must say that discussions are under way between the authorities of the province of Quebec and ourselves on the specific question of determining for what period of time in their estimation it will be necessary to maintain this special legislation. To my knowledge, this question has not yet been solved. It is to a large extent a matter of police requirements, as interpreted by the people's representatives, the politicians.

WAR MEASURES ACT—STATUS OF THOSE LIBERATED

Mr. Pierre De Bané (Matane): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question to the Prime Minister.

Could he favourably consider the possibility of making a statement to defend those who were freed following their arrest, so that they will understand that the temporary restriction of their freedom was necessary to cure an evil, but that they must not be ostracized by the community in which they are living solely because they were detained several hours?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can give a satisfactory answer to the hon. member, but I think that it is now sufficient to say that surely among those arrested, under special legislation the enforcement of which was necessary, as stated by the hon. member, to cure an evil, there were some perfectly innocent and honourable people, and I hope that the fact that they were arrested will not be held against them nor against those who arrested them in good faith.

Beyond that, of course, I can only repeat what the Minister of Justice stated, namely that charges will be laid against those who are deemed guilty of reprehensible action, if there is sufficient evidence.

ADOPTION OF ADDITIONAL MEASURES TO FIND JAMES CROSS

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question.

Could the Prime Minister tell us whether talks are now going on between the federal government and the Quebec government about the taking of additional measures considering the long period of time that Mr. Cross has been held, so that he could be found as soon as possible?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The whole question of delays has naturally been discussed between the governments and this is included in the facts the governments and the House will hear when we introduce the legislation aimed at replacing the one that is now in effect.

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I have another supplementary question.

Could the Prime Minister indicate if, when tabling the special bill on these measures, he is planning to bring the House up to date on this matter?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that someone on the government side, the Minister of Justice or myself perhaps, will give a full explanation on this matter and, when certain delays are incorporated into the bill, we shall have to explain to the House why we feel they are necessary.

[*English*]

WAR MEASURES ACT—DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN FEDERAL AND QUEBEC GOVERNMENTS AND MONTREAL AUTHORITIES BEFORE INVOCATION

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, in light of the Prime Minister's insistence upon the importance of the requests of the government of the province of Quebec and of the city of Montreal, could he advise the House what discussions took place between authorities of the federal government and of the two other governments immediately prior to the invocation of the War Measures Act, and were the two letters in question, which coincidentally arrived in Ottawa—

Mr. Trudeau: The two what?

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): The two letters in question which coincidentally or concurrently arrived in Ottawa—in any way prompted by a request from the federal government for such letters?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, there had been a great deal of consultation between the three levels of government in the days preceding the proclamation of the War Measures Act, and the government of Quebec, the administration in Montreal and our own government were very much concerned with the question of whether or not it would be necessary to bring new criminal powers to bear for the administration of justice in the province of Quebec. I believe it is fair to say all governments were reluctant to do so, but that the date was one which was determined by the date on those letters. It was a decision of the province of Quebec to choose that particular time and to send us the letter at that particular time. When we received it, we decided to act.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Was there any suggestion by the federal government that the letters should be sent to the government of Canada asking it to act, since the two letters seem to have arrived at about the same time?

Mr. Trudeau: That is very understandable, Mr. Speaker, since—I repeat—there was constant consultation between the two governments and the city of Montreal. There was, I repeat, a reluctance on the part of all governments, and particularly on our part, to invoke these special measures, but there was a point in time where this crisis did build up, and where the facts that I have repeated to this House became even more important. The dangers of turmoil and confusion in the province of Quebec were even greater, and it was at that point that the letters were sent and we acted.

[*Translation*]

WAR MEASURES ACT—RIGHT TO COUNSEL AFTER ARREST

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member from Lafontaine wish to ask a supplementary question?

Mr. Georges-C. Lachance (Lafontaine): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary to the Prime Minister.

I would ask him if, under the War Measures Act and the special regulations, the right of an individual arrested or jailed to be represented by counsel, as soon as possible after his arrest, has been suspended?

Mr. Lewis: The answer is yes.

[*English*]

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): The answer is yes, Mr. Speaker, even though the hon. member is asking for a legal opinion, but I was forestalled by the hon. member for York South.

[Mr. Trudeau.]

APPREHENDED INSURRECTION—INDEPENDENT COMMISSION TO ASCERTAIN FACTS AND INFORM PUBLIC

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. In view of the continuing concern in the country for a full and complete statement on the nature of the apprehended insurrection, are the Prime Minister and his government giving consideration to the establishment of an independent commission that would be able to ascertain the facts related to this apprehended insurrection on an objective basis and present them to the public in such a way as to make all the facts clear to them?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the answer is no. I repeat for the umpteenth time that the facts on which we acted are known to the people. If the politicians of distant provinces are not aware of them, perhaps they should ask their colleagues in the province of Quebec to explain them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure to whom the Prime Minister was referring in his answer. I directed the question to him because there seems to be some confusion within his own cabinet with respect to this information.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary I would like to ask the Prime Minister.

Is he aware of René Levesque's *Hallucination* program and does he intend to take it into consideration?

Mr. Trudeau: I never heard of it, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

WAR MEASURES ACT—LEGALITY OF FINGERPRINTING OF THOSE ARRESTED

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary was addressed to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice yesterday by way of notice. Since those who were arrested under the War Measures Act appear to have been fingerprinted and photographed and none of them has been charged with any offence, has the minister called to the attention of the authorities in Quebec the fact that there is no justification for such fingerprinting under the Identification of Criminals Act unless charges are laid?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the words in that statute speak for themselves, and the hon. member's submission has been transmitted.

[*Translation*]

QUEBEC STATEMENT ON ALLEGED PLOT TO ESTABLISH PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Prime Minister a question.

In this morning's *Le Devoir,* Mr. Claude Ryan directly accuses the Prime Minister and his government of making up the story of a conspiracy to overthrow Mr. Bourassa and replace him with an interim government.

Is it the intention of the Prime Minister to make a specific statement in connection with this conspiracy?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, by an extraordinary coincidence, I was just reading this story when the question was asked.

Mr. Ryan says the government panicked. I see that he himself, in his article, refers to "errand boys" and "top level sources". For Mr. Ryan to speak English is evidence enough that he himself is feeling panic.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Trudeau: I only add, Mr. Speaker, that this same journalist is urging the other journalists to identify the "top level sources" which gave them the information. I would be delighted if the journalists were to identify the "top level sources" on which they always base their false reports, but I am surprised to see that it is a journalist who is asking other journalists to disclose their sources, and I am delighted about that.

* * *

[*English*]

INDUSTRY

FINANCIAL SETTLEMENT WITH DOSCO SHAREHOLDERS—SUBMISSION TO HOUSE

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, on Friday last I directed a question to the Prime Minister which he took as notice. At that time I asked the Prime Minister whether, prior to any government financial settlement with the shareholders of DOSCO, the matter would be brought before the House for approval and whether the list of DOSCO shareholders will be made available along with the dates on which those individuals acquired their shares. I see the appropriate minister is in the House today. Could he answer that question?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I understand that an agreement has been reached between the shareholders and the Dosco Co. As far as the possibility of submitting to the House the text of that agreement is concerned, I am in touch with the Department of Justice in order to determine whether that could be done at present.

[*English*]

Mr. MacInnis: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, one wonders whether Trudeaumania has changed to Trudeauphobia. Since the Prime Minister indicated that the appropriate minister would handle this question, why has the answer not been given by the Minister of Justice who is responsible for this transfer of shares?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe.

Mr. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I raise a further point of order. Because of the roster system introduced by the Prime Minister into the House, we are required to wait for an answer until the appropriate minister is in the House. When they show up, when the two ministers are here and the wrong one answers, I think it is about time the roster system was straightened out.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO INCREASE PENSIONS

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the Prime Minister. As a result of the expression of unanimity shown in the House yesterday in supporting the need for increases to veterans, will the right hon. gentleman now act to introduce legislation on veterans pensions and social security to relieve the economic plight of disabled veterans and other sections of society?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Marshall: Also, would he please indicate when we can expect this legislation?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Veterans Affairs stated very ably yesterday the government's position in this matter.

Mr. Hees: He said it would take a very long time.

Mr. Marshall: Since the answer of the Minister of Veterans Affairs was not very clear, would the Prime Minister assure the House that this legislation will be given the highest degree of priority in view of the list of legislation now before the House?

* * *

FINANCE

PRIME INTEREST RATE—REPLY BY BANKS TO OPINION EXPRESSED BY MINISTER—PROFIT MARGIN LEGISLATION

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Have the minister's views regarding the interest rate levels of the chartered banks been directly communicated to the banks? If so, has he received a reply? If he has not directly communicated with the banks, has he received a reply from the banks regarding the opinions that he has expressed?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I answered that question yesterday. I have been directly in touch with the banks and I have not received a reply.

Any reply would, of course, take the form of action rather than the form of correspondence.

Mr. Saltsman: In view of the statement attributed to a spokesman for the Bank of Nova Scotia indicating that a reduction in lending rates would have to be matched by a corresponding cut in interest rates paid on savings deposits, which would indicate that the banks are not prepared to reduce their profit margins, does the minister intend to bring in legislation to limit the profit margins of banks?

Mr. Benson: No, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL SECURITY

WAR MEASURES ACT—PAYMENT BY QUEBEC FOR SERVICES OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

In view of the request of the Premier of Quebec for the services of the armed forces in that province, can the Prime Minister tell us whether Quebec will have to pay the total cost of operations scheduled up to April 1971, or whether the Department of National Defence or the federal government will agree to pay for the protection of one of its provinces, in this instance Quebec?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the matter is a legal one, but if I can reply, I believe the National Defense Act provides that, when a province requests the assistance of the Armed Forces in the form of civil assistance, the expenses of the operation are borne by that province.

Mr. La Salle: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

May I ask the Prime Minister whether, when it was contemplated to send the armed forces to Quebec the federal government informed the Quebec authorities that they would have to bear the cost?

Mr. Trudeau: I do not think that this question has been raised, Mr. Speaker. It may have been but, as a matter of principle, the province of Quebec is supposed to know the law also.

[*English*]

WAR MEASURES ACT—PAYMENT BY QUEBEC FOR SERVICES OF ARMED FORCES

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Justice a question to avoid any confusion, or any more confusion.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: The hon. member had better sit down then.

Mr. Stanfield: Could the minister indicate whether any charges have been laid against any of the persons who were arrested under the War Measures Act regulations but have been released? He previously told the House that no charges have been laid against those still detained. Have any charges been laid against those who were arrested and have been released?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I was going on the assumption that those who were released were released without having been charged. I will confirm that at the earliest opportunity, perhaps tomorrow, for the hon. gentleman.

WAR MEASURES ACT—VANCOUVER POLICE REFUSAL OF PERMISSION TO VIET NAM COMMITTEE TO HOLD MARCH

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Justice. As the police in Vancouver have refused permission to the Viet Nam Committee to hold a march and rally this Saturday, despite the fact that such permission has been granted twice a year on a Saturday for the past five years, will the minister inquire into the matter with a view to ascertaining if this refusal is an abuse of the present regulations under the War Measures Act?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): No, Mr. Speaker, because the inquiry should properly be addressed to the Attorney General of British Columbia.

Mrs. MacInnis: Since the minister has not yet established that personal contact with the Attorney General of British Columbia—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The right hon. member for Prince Albert.

WAR MEASURES ACT—RECEIPT BY PRIME MINISTER OF NAMES OF THOSE DETAINED OR RELEASED

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether or not he receives a list of the names of those who are being detained or have been detained and whether he also is informed from day to day of the names of those released?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): The answer is no to both questions, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, would the Prime Minister get in touch with the government of Quebec and secure this information, for I think Canadians as a whole are entitled to know more than they know at the present time?

Mr. Trudeau: There is no need to, Mr. Speaker; this is not a presidential system. I have ministers to do that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: Is that a change of policy?

Mr. Forrestall: The Prime Minister makes a joke of it, as usual.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the Prime Minister's attitude. I ask him whether or not he will get in touch with the government of Quebec in this connection. It is not a question of the presidential system, of which he, of course, has exceptional knowledge, besides having the desire to invoke it.

Mr. Trudeau: Perhaps there is a difference between my government and that of the right hon. gentleman. The difference is that I have confidence in my ministers.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. There are two minutes left before the end of the question period.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I hope the Prime Minister will not forget what he said today.

* * *

MANPOWER

[*Translation*]

QUEBEC—SUSPENSION OF RETRAINING GRANTS TO NURSING STUDENTS

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

Can he tell us why scholarships or retraining allowances to male and female student nurses in the eight CEGEP of the province of Quebec have recently been discontinued without their knowing it.

Mr. Speaker: While someone is giving consideration to this question—

[*English*]

The chair will recognize the hon. member for Fundy-Royal.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SOUTH AFRICA—CANADIAN POLICY RESPECTING COMMERCIAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has the minister's attention been drawn to the signing of a commercial agreement between Air Canada and South African Airlines at the very time the government has requested another Crown company, Polymer, to divert itself of investments in the Republic of South Africa? Can the minister help a simple-minded person like me to rationalize this conflict of policy?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it has not been the policy of the Canadian government to discourage trade or any other commercial activities between South Africa and Canada.

• (3:00 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

ELECTION EXPENSES

ESTABLISHMENT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council) moved:

That a Special Committee be established to consider the question of the limitation and control of election expenses in Canada and to report from time to time its observations and opinions thereon;

That the Committee be empowered to send for persons, papers and records; to sit during sittings and adjournments of the House; to print from day to day such papers and evidence as may be ordered by the Committee; and to delegate to subcommittees any of its powers, except the power to report directly to the House;

That the evidence adduced by the Committee during the past session in relation thereto be referred to the said Committee; and

That the members of the Committee be designated at a later date.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

AUTHORITY TO STANDING COMMITTEE TO REVIEW REPRESENTATION COMMISSIONER ACT

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council) moved:

That in relation to S-22 of the Representation Commissioner Act, Statutes of Canada, 1963, c.40, the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be empowered to review the provisions of the Representation Commissioner Act and recommend to the House any amendments, alterations or modifications thereto that to the said Committee shall appear to be necessary or desirable, and the evidence adduced by the Committee during the past session in relation thereto be referred to the said Committee.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

PROCEDURE AND ORGANIZATION

REFERENCE OF QUESTION OF BROADCASTING OF PROCEEDINGS OF HOUSE AND COMMITTEES TO STANDING COMMITTEE

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council) moved:

That the question of radio and television broadcasting of the proceedings of the House and its Committees, including the legal, procedural, and technical aspects thereof, and the question of arrangements made for reporters for the electronic media in the Parliament Buildings, and the evidence adduced by the Committee during the past session in relation thereto be referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization.

Motion agreed to.

Federal Court

REFERENCE OF QUESTION OF MEASURES TO ENSURE SECURITY OF GALLERIES TO STANDING COMMITTEE

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council) moved:

That the question of measures to be taken to ensure the security of the galleries of the House, and the evidence adduced by the Committee during the past session in relation thereto be referred to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

FEDERAL COURT

MEASURE RESPECTING CONSTITUTION, JURISDICTION, ADMINISTRATION, ETC.

The House proceeded to the consideration of Bill C-172, respecting the Federal Court of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Speaker: As hon. members know, a considerable number of motions have been proposed for consideration of the House at this time. The Chair has closely studied all these motions. I should indicate to the House that I have reservations concerning three motions about which I suggest there might be procedural difficulties, Nos. 1, 2 and 19. No. 1 stands in the name of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) and No. 2 is consequential thereon. This is the first one about which the Chair has reservations.

I am not sure whether the hon. member for Calgary North wants to deal with the matter from a procedural standpoint at this time. I suggest to him that this is an attempt to introduce an amendment of substance by way of an amendment to the interpretation clause of the bill. This is contrary to the practice of the House. This is my preliminary observation which I would like to put for the consideration of the hon. member for Calgary North. As I said, No. 2 is dependent on No. 1. If No. 1 cannot be put, then No. 2 cannot be put.

There are no objections to any of the other motions proposed by the hon. member for Calgary North or any other hon. members with the exception of No. 19 proposed by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner). It appears to be faulty in some respects, perhaps not substantially, but I do have some difficulties. For the moment, we might deal with No. 1 which stands in the name of the hon. member for Calgary North.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): I think Your Honour has raised the question as to whether amendments Nos. 1 and 2 are in order procedurally. My first point, which does not put me on stronger ground, is that these amendments were made and studied at the committee level. I will briefly state the purpose of the amendments.

The federal court has been defined in the Federal Court Act. What I have attempted to do in amendments Nos. 1 and 2 is to extend the definition of federal court.

[Mr. MacEachen.]

Basically, a federal court has the jurisdiction set out in the bill. The superior courts of the provinces, the trial courts, and the appeal courts would have concurrent jurisdiction. In other words, both those courts would have the same jurisdiction as the federal court, as defined in the act. A matter could, therefore be dealt with before a federal court in accordance with the terms and conditions of the jurisdiction or could be dealt with before a trial court. I submit this goes to the substance of the bill.

This matter was not raised in committee. There was a vote in committee and I point out to Your Honour that it was an even vote. The decision was made by the Chairman. The point I am now trying to explain is the jurisdiction of the court as we find it in the act. If that is not accepted, I bring to the attention of Your Honour that I am suggesting directly or indirectly, that the jurisdiction of the trial courts and courts of appeal do go to the very substance of the bill. This is a very important matter. Three or four witnesses called on this point supported this position. I, therefore, submit these amendments are in order.

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to the hon. member that perhaps the argument he has made was submitted in a manner that is out of order from a procedural standpoint. The hon. member stated the amendment he proposes goes to the substance of the bill. I appreciate that. This is why I am worried about the matter.

I respectfully suggest to the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) it is not good procedure to try to introduce a substantive amendment by way of modification of the interpretation clause. I doubt whether a precedent can be found in our practice. I have not been able to find one where a substantive amendment was effected by a modification of the interpretation clause. I have studied the matter very closely. I suggest with respect to the hon. member that I do not think I can vary the opinion I expressed when the matter was raised in the first instance.

Earlier this year I dealt with this matter at some length. I believe it was on May 21. There is a report of a ruling of the Chair in *Votes and Proceedings* for May 21 dealing with a similar situation. I went into the background of this matter from a procedural standpoint and at that time I reached the conclusion that this kind of amendment could not be moved. I suggest to the House that I have to reach the same conclusion at this time. There may be some other way that the amendment might have been introduced. There is still third reading stage where the matter can be debated.

The hon. member stated this proposal had been made in committee. I cannot reach the conclusion that it necessarily follows that the amendment would be in order in the House because, of course, we are not bound by rulings made in committee. The hon. member realizes this and has so indicated.

Taking all factors into consideration, I must say with great regret that I do not see how I can allow the motion to be put. No. 2 must fall on the same ground. The reservations I have about motion No. 19 might be

considered when that amendment is reached. It is my thought that perhaps this proposed motion is irrelevant in the sense that it is beyond the scope of the legislative item that it seeks to amend. I would not like to go into details of the matter at the present time, but the hon. member might give some thought to my suggestion.

• (3:10 p.m.)

There is also a difficulty relating to the recommendation. The recommendation we have received and which is part of the bill at the present time, might not cover the amendment which is proposed. Again, this difficulty, if it really exists, is one which, I think, might easily be dealt with. But we could discuss this point when motion No. 19 is reached. We now propose for the consideration of the House, motion No. 3.

Mr. Woolliams: I wonder whether I might say something at this stage on a point of order affecting a matter of procedure. The chairman of our committee on legal affairs, a committee which is, of course, subject to this House, had, at our request, called witnesses to give evidence along the very line of these amendments; in fact, 99 per cent of the time of the committee was taken up in this regard and preparations were made for very extensive arguments reflecting what the witnesses had said in relation to the amendments in question. In these circumstances I would have thought that surely, at some stage prior to this, we would have been placed in a position to discuss Your Honour's ruling, if only as a matter of courtesy to those who had spent many hours of work on the amendments without the benefit of help from a research department. Unlike the minister, who, of course, is able to rely upon a great deal of help, we had to do much of this work ourselves. In this case, it was done by a very small group. Surely, if a decision from the Chair was to be forthcoming we might have been informed by an officer of the House of Commons that these amendments were to be challenged, so that we might have been prepared to argue the matter. In this instance, with the greatest respect, Your Honour had your judgment already prepared. I was out of court before I even got in. Ought there not to be a simple procedure which would be of great assistance in connection with this new committee system, by which we could be informed beforehand?

With regard to the calling of witnesses, may I point out that on two occasions there were equal votes in committee, and each time the tie was broken by the chairman. The witnesses were called at the wish of the steering committee, not at the request of our side. Surely, after all this work, after all the printing of evidence in both languages, we should have been placed in a position where we could have had, arguments to meet the judgment which Your Honour had already prepared?

I would hope that in future movers of amendments could be notified beforehand that the Chair had taken objection to them on certain grounds. Hon. members concerned would then have an opportunity to brief themselves so as, at least, to discuss the matter intelligently with Your Honour. Alternatively, they could rise and say that having considered the arguments put forward they agreed with the ruling of the Chair. I have never encountered an experience like this. We are out of court before we start. Your Honour has a written judgment already prepared.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I suggest to the hon. member that perhaps his comments are somewhat unfair to the Chair. He knows that the Chair has to consider these questions in advance, especially when faced with a large number of motions. Even if the hon. member himself were the occupant of the chair, I am sure he would wish to give such matters advance consideration, to have some idea of the procedural position.

At the same time, I recognize the hon. member has a valid point when he suggests that he and his friends are placed in an unfortunate position when they come to the House prepared to discuss motions on which they have spent a good deal of time only to find they are ruled out of court. This is obviously unfair to the hon. member in some way. Perhaps the Chair should take into consideration the valid suggestion of the hon. member that when some doubt is felt about the validity or the acceptability of amendments from a procedural standpoint, hon. members might be given notice in advance so that they can prepare themselves accordingly. I will certainly take this under consideration and do everything that is possible to inform hon. members in advance of difficulties which may come up. We have, on occasions, followed this procedure.

Some time during last session there was one instance when a large number of motions under this standing order were proposed for the consideration of the House; hon. members more directly concerned were informed in advance that some difficulty had arisen in connection with them, and we had an opportunity to discuss these matters outside the House and then inside the House. Perhaps this is what should have been done in the present instance. I thank the hon. member for Calgary North for making his suggestion and we shall attempt to follow it as closely as we can in the future.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North) moved:

That Bill C-172, an act respecting the Federal Court of Canada, be amended by striking out clause 7 on page 5 thereof and substituting the following:

"7 (1) The Rules may provide for a rota of judges to provide for a continuity of judicial availability in any centre where the volume of work or other circumstances make such an arrangement expedient."

(2) No judge shall be required under rules made under subsection (1) to remain in any centre other than the National Capital Region for a period longer than one month, unless it becomes necessary to do so to complete the hearing of a cause or matter, or unless he consents thereto.

He said: This is an amendment which would apply to clause 7. Before beginning my argument I might read the existing clause, as follows:

A judge of the court—

Which means a judge of the Federal Court with the jurisdiction as spelled out in the act

—shall reside in the National Capital Region described in the Schedule to the National Capital Act or within twenty-five miles thereof.

The first point I wish to make is this. Under this new measure, much of the business which would normally have come before the ordinary trial courts and courts of appeal of the various provinces will now fall under the sole jurisdiction of the federal court or of the court of appeal. The minister has been gracious enough to admit this. At the present time, there is no provision under this legislation for an appeal court as such. Judges of the Exchequer Court sit for most of the time in Ottawa. All matters have to be tried in Ottawa and all applications in chambers have to be made here, usually through agents. The minister has lent an ear to representations from members of this party, members of the New Democratic Party and others and, as a result, judges nowadays do visit various centres in Canada from time to time. With that in mind, may I congratulate the minister.

• (3:20 p.m.)

I now want to refer to some of the evidence concerning the jurisdiction that the court has. During the last few weeks we have seen that Canada is made up of many regions. Every region has a different kind of environment. Every environment has to be understood by the people living in those regions. If a trial judge is able to weigh the evidence given in any matter in the light of the environment within which he was raised and understands, he can come to a more just decision.

What my amendment is asking is that judges live permanently in areas other than Ottawa, such as in Montreal, in the Maritimes, in Toronto, in Winnipeg, in Calgary, in Edmonton and in Vancouver. A court that has assumed much of the powers of the provincial courts should be accessible to the public who are seeking the remedies set out in the jurisdiction of the court. This is why I argued in the committee for concurrent jurisdiction, though I was ruled out of order.

More than that, Mr. Speaker, in view of the kind of jurisdiction the court has—and I will enlarge on this in a few moments—even one judge living in Calgary, one in Edmonton and one in Winnipeg could not possibly handle the amount of litigation that can be anticipated, since the new court has now taken over much of the role of other courts. In many of our cities there is a big backlog of cases, both civil and criminal. As far as my own home province is concerned, I do not know whether it is because of the character of the judges or our ability to get work done, there is no backlog. However, I understand that in some of the larger centres like Calgary and Toronto there is a backlog of cases.

Since I am talking about jurisdiction, let me examine what jurisdiction the court has and deal with the question why judges should sit elsewhere. I refer to page 9 of the bill, clause 17, which provides:

The Trial Division has original jurisdiction in all cases where relief is claimed against the Crown—

Pausing there, the crown is becoming a bigger body today. The state is becoming involved in more things than it did before. Since the crown is becoming involved more and more in matters that must be brought to the federal court, the backlog of cases will be tremendous. There will be a mountain of litigation that will have to be dealt with in this city. I suggest that the president of the court will be unable to cope with the work under the new act, even when his judges visit other centres. This is because of the extensive jurisdiction given to the court. The clause continues:

—and except where otherwise provided, the Trial Division has exclusive original jurisdiction in all such cases.

Subclause (2) provides:

Without restricting the generality of subsection (1), the Trial Division has exclusive jurisdiction, except where otherwise provided, in all cases in which the land,—

I pause to point out that the Crown owns a lot of land.

—goods or money of any person are in the possession of the Crown—

To come to specific cases, let us consider the expropriation of land for national parks. There is a typical example that I should like to deal with briefly. I suggest that a judge who was born, raised and educated in western Canada would have a better appreciation of people's rights as they exist in national parks in the west. I believe I am not breaking the confidence of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) when I say that he has stated that eventually he hopes, when the number of judges appointed to the court is extended, to appoint judges from western Canada on the same basis as appointments are made to the Supreme Court of Canada. I thought that this was a good idea because judges appointed from western Canada would give the court what I would call the western flavour.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The president of the court is from Saskatchewan.

Mr. Woolliams: That is true. He was the deputy minister of justice for a long time, and did become somewhat central Canada oriented. He was educated at Saskatoon university, and if I may say this through you, Mr. Speaker, the president of the court was one of the great scholars in my home province. So it is clear that the court will deal with all disputes about land in which the crown becomes involved.

I want to deal with clause 18 which provides:

The Trial Division has exclusive original jurisdiction

(a) to issue an injunction, writ of certiorari, writ of prohibition, writ of mandamus or writ of quo warranto, or grant declaratory relief, against any federal board, commission or other tribunal; and

(b) to hear and determine any application or other proceeding for relief—

If the Industrial Relations Board meets in the city of Vancouver and exceeds its jurisdiction, normally the relief of the little man, if there were no appeal from the board, would be in the form of special remedy. If the board did not exercise its jurisdiction in accordance with the law, or if its decision was against natural justice, or if it did some other act which is one of the ingredients for going forward by special remedy—the prerogative

remedies that you as a lawyer, Mr. Speaker, know so well—the person aggrieved can go to a trial judge of the high court in the province and get the order by which he was aggrieved quashed. What will be the situation if the bill were passed? The court would now have exclusive jurisdiction with regard to all of the prerogative writs and special remedies in matters pertaining to tribunals and administrative bodies that are set up by the federal government.

What size of court should we have? How will western Canada be served? How will even eastern Canada be served under this kind of legislation? This question has prompted some comment by one of the witnesses who gave evidence. I do not know who called the gentleman before the committee. I did not, and it may have been the chairman who called him before the committee, but I was quite impressed with some of the evidence he gave.

I contend that this federal court is going to be all powerful for the state. It will be too costly for the average citizen of Canada to go to the court, and the judges of the court will not be accessible to the people. As a result, justice in this country will become so costly that the average citizen of Canada who feels aggrieved by decisions handed down by government tribunals will be unable to get the kind of justice we had hoped, even the kind of justice he can obtain today.

Before I quote from the evidence, may I say that I think the government has confused the jurisdiction of the court. If I might be political for a few moments during the course of my legal argument, one thing about this government is that it is just great for chaos. Whenever we have a crisis there is chaos among the government, and then they claim to solve the crisis and become our great masters. I think this is going to be the case, too, with this bill.

Let me just read to the House what this witness said. Professor Watson studied the bill and had this to say, as reported at page 7 of minutes of proceedings and evidence No. 28:

> I think, frankly, that the idea of a federal court in Canada other than the Supreme Court of Canada is misconceived.

I contend that it is misconceived in the sense that there will be an insufficient number of judges of the federal court to serve the average Canadian. Litigation will pile up and the backlog will be worse than the backlog before the immigration appeal board, which I understand has or had 1,500 cases waiting to be dealt with.

• (3:30 p.m.)

I think the first question we have to ask ourselves with regard to this bill is, has the Exchequer Court been successful and, if so, in what way? I suggest there are a number of problems associated with the Exchequer Court and many of them relate to its remoteness from the people and from the lawyers. It is physically a remote court and it is unknown to the layman. I could not say it as well as this.

> I doubt that most laymen know that it even exists and it is not something with which most lawyers are familiar. I think it is fair to say that it is the bailiwick of a very small group of perhaps patent and tax lawyers.

The point he is making there is that it will not be accessible, and because it is not accessible, it will not be known by laymen. The remedies normally now available in our high courts and the courts of appeal in the provinces will fall within the jurisdiction of this court, so the average Canadian will suffer. Professor Watson says in volume 28, as recorded at page 8:

> It can really give this court only bits and pieces. When it gives it only bits and pieces there will only be a few types of people in a few situations who can resort to the court on any regular basis. Consequently it will remain the bailiwick of a small group of lawyers and this produces a real problem because some of the types of cases over which the court can have jurisdiction are the types of cases in which anybody in any small town or large city across Canada can become involved in, can be dragged into the Exchequer Court. He goes to his regular legal adviser and the legal adviser says, Exchequer Court?

This will be under the federal court. Mr. Watson continues:

> I do not know too much about that. And from talking to people who are experienced in litigation, what happens? The normal pattern is that the lawyer gives it a try once, gets his fingers burnt and next time he sends a pink ribbon around the material and sends it to the small group of lawyers who practice regularly before the courts.

There, he has put his finger on the difficulty, having in mind the special remedies given to this court. That is what is going to happen. Even with judges who move across the country, with one judge here and one there, the majority of cases will have to be funnelled into Ottawa. The expenses of travel, the hiring of experts and coming here on chamber applications, will be so costly that these remedies will be out of reach of the average man. That is why I say that if we are going to have this court at all, which I am against, we should have judges—this means a duplication—appointed to sit in the large centres of Canada, wherever those centres may be.

Mr. Watson then goes on in his evidence to state:

> If we look at our own history going back into English history, there are two notorious periods in English history, one when the King's Courts went out in England and deprived or fought with the local courts for jurisdiction and there were jurisdictional battles between the King's Courts and the local courts, and of course, the persons who suffered were the subjects.

He goes on to show the conflict. Unless there are judges that are accessible, and unless the members of the bar in various cities become familiar with the procedures and the jurisdiction of this court, these remedies the people should have will wither on the vine. Professor Watson then refers to analogies in the United States and Australia. My friend has talked about these. He suggests that both these countries have a federal court system, so why cannot we have a federal court system here. The fact we overlook is this. The judges of our superior court, our courts of appeal and our supreme courts, as well as the judges of this court in Canada will be appointed by the federal government, whereas in the United States and Australia the system is quite different. Again, this is a strong argument for having more judges appointed and that those judges must be placed in the various centres of Canada. Professor Watson goes on to say:

> There is no sort of reason other than a political reason for establishing the court or continuing the Exchequer Court. But

there is at least one functional argument, it seems to me, and that is the concept that advantages can be gained for the populace, for the people through having a court which is specialized in its functions, and this, of course, has been one of the arguments in favour of the Exchequer Court—

Then, he goes on to say this, and he is right:

The federal government here appoints judges to the Superior Courts of the provinces—

The federal government appoints our judges in the other courts and they are familiar with the rules that govern a writ of certiorari, mandamus, prohibition and references to boards. They know whether they can quash a matter and whether it is a judicial or administrative matter. Therefore, unless this bill provides, and I ask that this be supported, not only an increase in the number of judges but permanent resident judges of the federal court in the big cities of Canada, it will mean justice out of the reach of Canadians. Professor Watson goes on to state:

Well, of course, there are certain costs that we paid for having such a bifurcated system—

He then points out the extra costs, and I have dealt with that. I want to deal with this point as it relates to judges. He states:

Looking at the new areas into which the federal court bill would take us with regard to jurisdiction of the court, who is to be the grateful beneficiary of the investiture of the new Federal Court with concurrent jurisdiction over negotiable instruments? Is it finance companies or is it to be debtors who are going to thank the federal government for having given them another forum to which to take their disputes? Or will it be either one of them who first finds himself involved in a battle, a jurisdictional battle in the court for which he will pay to litigate to find out the answer as to whether or not the court also has jurisdiction over the surrounding matters—

Here again, one of the fights we are having today, as in other countries, involves a sufficient supply of competent judges to make certain that justice is not failed. Failed justice is no justice. It is only when it is expedited you get justice. I oppose the bill and I will have something to say about it on third reading. As bad as it is, I am really shocked that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), with his knowledge and the knowledge of his department, would require that judges must live in Ottawa or within 20 miles of Ottawa, even though they may move around. Professor Watson said:

I simply raise this question: Is the only answer to give this jurisdiction to a federal court? In other words, would it not be possible to draft, if there are problems—and I gather there are problems with regard to, for instance, the location of an action against a federal tribunal, the problem of the plaintiff moving from one province to another suing a federal administrative tribunal—

Some of these people are going to have something to say about this.

This is what the Canadian Labour Congress had to say:

Bill C-192 establishes a Federal Court of Canada to replace the Exchequer Court, and to include in the new Court a division to be known as the Court of Appeal.

The jurisdiction of the Court of Appeal is to be found in Section 28(1) which empowers the Court to "set aside a decision or order . . . made by or in the course of proceedings before a federal board, commission or other tribunal, upon the ground that the board, commission or tribunal

[Mr. Woolliams.]

(a) failed to observe a principle of natural justice or otherwise acted beyond or refused to exercise its jurisdiction;

(b) erred in law in making its decision or order, whether or not the error appears on the face of the record; or

(c) based its decision or order on an erroneous finding of facts that it made in a perverse or capricious manner or without due regard for the material before it."

We are particularly concerned about (1)(c) above because of its wide implications and the very real possibility that the Court of Appeal may be substituted for the relevant board of commission as the final decision making body.

Where will the Court of Appeal sit? Will it be sitting in western Canada? Will it be sitting in eastern Canada? Will it sit, say, in Calgary, Edmonton, Winnipeg or Vancouver?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Why not?

Mr. Woolliams: Well, it does not say so and I can see why the Canadian Labour Congress was concerned about this. The statement continues:

It is characteristic of both these Boards that they are representative of the parties of interest which appear before them, that they engage in a specialized function and that their value lies in the expertise which their members possess or acquire as a *sine qua non* of their functions. A further feature of these Boards whose importance should not be overlooked is the expectation that they will hear applications and make decisions expeditiously.

• (3:40 p.m.)

How can decisions be made expeditiously when sittings may be held once or twice a year in the large industrial centres, not only in western Canada but in eastern Canada and the Maritimes. Certainly, the judges should be stationed permanently in various places. That is why our trial courts are set up as they are. There are judges in Calgary and Edmonton, and there are county court judges in the towns and villages. Yet, under this legislation everything is to be centralized. The excuse is that a judge would be sent out here and sent out there. Then, there is the matter of the registry offices. Apparently there is to be one in Vancouver. Will there be one in all these cities, with one judge to do all the work in respect of these boards. There are over 25 different boards which I could name. I shall not take the time to do so now. I will leave that to another amendment.

On this particular amendment, I do not need, to take any more time. I ask the Minister of Justice first to consider, if he intends to force this through the House of Commons with his majority, the desirability of having more judges to take over the work of the provincial courts. Second, I would ask that those judges be stationed in all the major centres of Canada. Even then, the people in the towns and villages will suffer because it will be necessary for them to go to the various large centres in order to receive justice. Third, I would ask the Minister of Justice to look at the evidence given time and time again before the committee. Even the most favourable witnesses—lawyers—said that this is a specialized field. Very few lawyers will know how to litigate in this federal court. So, there will be specialized lawyers and specialized experts who will deny 90 per cent of the Canadians the kind of justice they already have.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, before I reply to the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) I wonder if I might raise a question of privilege at the earliest opportunity accorded me. It has been drawn to my attention—I have not had an opportunity to check the blues—that when the hon. member for Lafontaine (Mr. Lachance) asked me whether the right to counsel had been suspended under the regulations of the War Measures Act, the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) said "Yes". I did not hear the question too clearly and said, "Yes, the hon. member is right". I wish to make perfectly clear to the House—and I have asked my Parliamentary Secretary to inform the press gallery—that what I should have said is, no, that the right to counsel has not been suspended under the regulations and applies as in the ordinary law. I regret very much if I misled the House at the time.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first opportunity we have had at the report stage to deal with these motions. First of all, I should like to say how much I appreciate the co-operation of the hon. member for Calgary North and the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) in particular for allowing this bill to be brought forward. As Your Honour knows, this bill lapsed during the last session of this Parliament and, in the ordinary course of events, would have had to be re-introduced for first reading, second reading and study by the committee had it not been for the courtesy of the opposition, particularly those two members who had charge of this bill on behalf of their respective parties. I am very grateful indeed. I think it is a very good example of how co-operation in Parliament can achieve the right result without any rights being infringed.

This bill received first reading on March 2. It received a very thorough review by the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. It received the scrutiny of a good many top legal counsel throughout the country. As a matter of fact, I sent a mimeographed letter to all 14,000 members of the Canadian Bar Association, thanks to its distribution system. The Canadian Bar Association designated a committee to review the bill. Two distinguished members of the association appeared on behalf of the association, namely Gordon Henderson, Q.C. of Ottawa and Louis Philippe De Grandpré, P.C. of Montreal. I had the opportunity to appear on a panel discussion which was televised and videotaped and will be shown to all provincial subsections of the Canadian Bar Association. This panel was held in Halifax in September, during the annual convention of the Canadian Bar.

What I am saying is that the bill has received a good deal of public scrutiny from the legal profession, from those organizations accustomed to appearing before federal boards and tribunals and from private citizens generally who are interested in the administration of justice.

What the hon. member for Calgary North is attempting to do by this amendment is to replace all of clause 7. Instead of the clause, providing for the judges to reside in Ottawa and sit by way of rota from time to time throughout the country, he would revise it and provide a rota of judges who would sit in various centres and would not be required to reside in Ottawa. This matter was very thoroughly canvassed in the committee. I might say also that it was very thoroughly canvassed at the Canadian Bar Association Convention in Halifax, where certain members of the law association of British Columbia were particularly interested in what answers I could give in respect of this particular aspect of the bill.

The hon. member for Calgary North has said—he admitted this and I thank him for it—that during the past two or three years there has been a great decentralization in respect of the court. The court, under the name Exchequer Court, does go out on circuit and try to handle the business of the court as it arises throughout the country. The court has also set up registry offices in some places, some of them through the co-operation of the provinces and some of them as special registry offices. It is provided by this bill that the decentralization which has brought justice closer to the people will be given statutory form.

Clause 7 (2) of the bill provides that, notwithstanding that judges must reside within 25 miles of the national capital region, the rules may provide for a rota of judges to provide for a continuity of judicial availability in any centre where the volume of work or other circumstances make such an arrangement expedient. If an appeal or interlocutory procedure should arise in any major sector of the country the court will go out to meet the litigants and justice will be administered on the scene.

Mr. Ryan: Will or may?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): There is provision for this in the statute. The answer is "will". Now, under clause 16(3), it is provided that the place of each sitting of the court of appeal shall be arranged by the chief justice to suit, as nearly as may be, the convenience of the parties. In other words, if the parties require the court of appeal of the federal court to travel to Calgary, Edmonton, Regina, Vancouver, or Ontario, or the Maritime provinces, then if the appeal is properly triable the court of appeal will travel. There was a suggestion in the committee, and the hon. member alluded to this in his speech earlier this afternoon, that there should be resident judges of this court in various parts of the country. It has been suggested there be a resident judge of the federal court seated in British Columbia, in Alberta and so on. I rejected that idea, and I believe the majority of the legal profession agree with me, because I feel it is essential that the court reside in one locality, in this case the national capital region, as does the Supreme Court of Canada itself. I think it would be very dangerous for the court and would tend to fracture it, if the court were divided into individual resident judges sitting across the country.

• (3:50 p.m.)

I remember talking to Chief Justice Warren, who was then the chief justice of the United States Supreme Court, just before he retired and he impressed upon me the necessity of ensuring that there is harmony in the court and that the court is proceeding along the same

judicial lines. There should not be divergence among the judges in so far as it could be avoided. Every judge brings to the court his own background—his bias if you will and his own type of legal training and temperament. However, in order to have the reasonable harmony that should be expected from a group of men involved in the same venture of administering justice in Canada, there is something to be said for the give and take of daily consultation where possible. This has proven to be a necessary ingredient in every successful court.

A judge resident in British Columbia would be out of touch with brother judges. From the point of view of a lawyer who wanted to appear before the federal court, in B.C., he would appear before the one judge on every occasion, and that would limit his accessibility to the court. I hope I have convinced members of the bar in the western provinces that it would be in their interest to have a rota of judges, not that they should go judge shopping but that they should not be caught before the same judge every time they appear on a procedural matter or on the merits of a case.

There is provision in section 10 for the appointment of deputy judges. This would provide that the president of the court, or the chief justice of the court as he will now be called, if he thinks it is in the interest of the administration of justice, to appoint a deputy judge in any province. This may be a judge of a provincial superior court who could sit as a deputy resident judge when the judge of the federal court cannot appear. It is open to the chief justice of the federal court to appoint a deputy judge in Alberta, in British Columbia and so on, if there is an emergency which has to be dealt with before a circuit judge could arrive.

I envisage that some day when the business of this court is sufficient, there might be a series of circuits of this court. There might well be a western circuit of the court and, say, an Atlantic or Maritime circuit of the court. At the moment, after looking at the statistics and from what I know of the court, I do not believe that is justified.

Mr. Perry Ryan (Spadina): Would the minister permit a question?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Yes, certainly.

Mr. Ryan: What would be wrong with providing for a situation where you would have, perhaps, a court sitting permanently in these regions?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I think I answered that argument in what I just said, but I have not convinced the hon. member. To summarize, I believe that to co-ordinate the proper functioning of the court it is necessary to provide by statute that judges be on circuit, and to provide that there be a variety of judges available to any particular part of the country. In answer to the question specifically, in some areas of the country there is not enough business at the moment for a resident judge. There may be enough business for a resident judge in British Columbia, but that is not conclusive, and I believe at the moment that the people of British Columbia would be better served with a rota of judges such as is provided in the bill as it now reads.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I can state in a very few sentences that I support the amendment introduced by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams). Perhaps I might be indulged as both hon. members mention—

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Crowfoot on a point of order.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, I regret very much having to do this but I want to inform you that there is not a quorum in the House. There are no committees sitting, and I think it is the duty of the government to provide the House with a quorum if they want to proceed with this legislation.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Will the hon. minister please resume his seat. When it is brought to the Chair's attention that there is not a quorum, it is my duty to instruct the clerk to make a count and I shall ask him to do so now.

And on the count being made, more than 20 members were declared to be present.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The clerk advises me that at this moment there are 22 members in the House.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw the attention of the House to some of the Conservative members behind the curtains as well.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Greenwood.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, I was saying that I could give my reasons for speaking to the amendment very briefly and perhaps I can be allowed a few general remarks—

Mr. Bell: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, and so that there will not be a misunderstanding tomorrow in the press, I should like to point out that it is the responsibility of the government to keep a quorum in the House at all times.

Mr. Horner: When they are proceeding with legislation—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member does not have a point or order.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, on that fallacious point of order, as Members of Parliament we all have a duty to protect the quorum.

Mr. Horner: On a point of order—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Hon. members do not have a point of order and it does not accomplish anything to have repetitive speeches on a non-existent point of order.

Mr. Bell: The minister started it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Greenwood.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, in starting for the third time, I should like to indulge myself, as have the two hon. members who spoke before me, by dealing with the amendment in detail. On the whole, I think this bill does introduce important and worthwhile changes in the administration of justice so far as it affects the federal government and the federal administration. I think there are weaknesses in it, and I think that the amendments proposed should be considered seriously. I agree with the hon. member for Calgary North that the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) did pay careful attention to suggestions made in committee and many of them have been adopted, as we are glad to observe.

Dealing with this particular amendment, I may say that as I understand it, it is very simple. All it proposes is to strike out of section 7 of the bill the positive requirement that all judges of the court shall reside in the national capital region. I think this is an unduly restrictive and unnecessary provision, and that they should be allowed to reside wherever they can most conveniently reside to do the business of the court. The minister has made it clear that the businss of the court will be transacted in the different centres and not transacted entirely in Ottawa. This has been the tendency elsewhere and this bill would be quite unworkable if that practice is not carried out. In centres like British Columbia, for example, if there is sufficient business to keep judges busy most of the year, what is the sense of requiring them to live in Ottawa? The hon. minister says this will help their esprit de corps—

An hon. Member: The cocktail parties.

Mr. Brewin: —and will enable them to be more harmonious amongst themselves. But what is the difficulty, in these days when people can travel, of judges getting together from time to time in Ottawa if they need to have consultations or need to enlarge the harmony which should prevail amongst them?

• (4:00 p.m.)

In my view it is important that justice not only be done but that it be seen to have been done, and that it be as close to the people as possible. If that principle be adopted, I see no reason for adopting this residential straitjacket as to where judges should live. The insistence on this provision may even make it harder to get some qualified judges.

British Columbia is one of the more remote provinces, but nevertheless will be intimately concerned with the administration of this bill. Many of the subjects under its jurisdiction are particularly important to that province, and it may be that some respected judge, well qualified judge, will say, "I am going to be sitting in B.C. for a large part of the year, but I will be forced to move my residence to Ottawa. I don't want that, and therefore I won't accept appointment to the court."

For these reasons, because where possible justice should be administered locally, because judges should be available locally, because the bill imposes an unnecessary restriction and in effect may disqualify some highly qualified people, I hope the minister will even now agree to reconsider this matter and not complicate the legislation with restrictive provisions about where people have to live. It may be regretted in future if this is insisted upon. The minister says that the chief justice of the Court can appoint deputy judges. Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about deputy judges. We are talking about four permanent members of the court. If the court is to be properly decentralized, there is no place for the sort of restrictive provision that the amendment seeks to strike out.

Mr. S. Perry Ryan (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I should just like to add a few words in support of the member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) and the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin). I am convinced, from my own experience as a practising lawyer, that it will cost more to litigate in federal courts if, for the most part, they are set up in Ottawa. I see no reason why judges cannot be posted permanently to the larger centres in Canada. We have the banks and life insurance companies here in Ottawa establishing branches out from the centre, and they have no problem doing business all across the country.

I am further impelled to support the amendment by the fact that I am a member for the metropolitan area of Toronto. I believe the House knows very well that a major portion of the business of this court will originate in the city of Toronto where we have a great deal of land still held under the Veterans Land Act, and a lot of agreements for sale may be the subject of litigation. Also in Toronto we have a very large port, which will have its problems. We have one airport now, and we are likely to have another one, even though I do not quite know when. In this respect, a great many problems could arise in the near future and those concerned with them would require access to this court. I see no harm whatever in making this residential provision read "may" and not "must." I ask the minister to reconsider the rather narrow Ottawa view in this section.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, this bill had a pretty thorough going over in committee, as pointed out by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) and by the minister. I am not entirely opposed to the committee system, but sometimes a committee becomes pre-occupied with the opinions of experts. There is no doubt that the opinions so far voiced before the committee have been largely those of lawyers, members of the bar, jurists and college professors. I would just like, therefore, to give what I would call a layman's opinion.

It seems to me that in this age of the rapid adoption of socialistic measures in Canada, where every day we are coming more and more under the decisions of tribunals of one form or another—what the lawyers would call quasi-judicial bodies—there is a great need for some court of this sort. I think there are many provisions in this bill with which I can agree.

Perhaps some of the provisions in the bill are long overdue and, projecting into the future, no doubt federal courts will become more important. But from the point of view of the ordinary voter, the man in the street, I can foresee some dangers. We have had the prerogatives of the Crown, writs of habeas corpus, writs of certiorari, writs of mandamus—some of these for 700 years—and perhaps because of human nature we have had to preserve these extraordinary rights. Because all courts are made up of human beings, there must be procedures for appeal. But it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if we are to put all our eggs in one basket, if we are to give any one federally appointed court sole jurisdiction in these matters, at a time when governments at all levels can interfere deeply with the private fortunes, property and affairs of each single individual in Canada, I for one would at least like to have the assurance that this court does not become a faceless monster in the capital city.

I go along with the idea that we need to have appeals, and that we do need a strong federal court to deal with many of these matters. But I do not think it is necessary to panic the Canadian people and this House into accepting the opinions of legal experts. That is why I do not hesitate to stand here for a few moments to give my opinion. Today, the War Measures Act gives us a very good basis for my argument. Habeas corpus has been suspended indefinitely, or we have a six and a half month moratorium on it, and if you trust our government, our Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and our Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), which undoubtedly many of us do, you can say that our future and our security are in good hands. But, Mr. Speaker, governments change rapidly these days—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I know the hon. member will move very quickly to make his remarks relevant to the motion before the House. I think that at this stage of our proceedings it behooves all hon. members, and the Chair, to keep the debate confined within the terms of relevancy.

Mr. Bigg: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how I can be more relevant than to bring to your attention, and to the attention of all hon. members, that this bill and any amendments made to it affect the lives of all hon. members and of all members of the Canadian public. I do not see anything that could be much more relevant. There is a need for those of us who are not experts in the law, who are not completely enmeshed in professional attitudes, to express our views.

For instance, this bill provides that all the judges shall reside in Ottawa where they will be out of touch with the people. Unless they are strange men, after 15 or 20 years of living in the rarified atmosphere surrounding the higher echelons of the civil service, circulating among judges of the Supreme Court and other judges of their own rank, they will probably lose that touch with the little people which is very essential in order to make decisions on such matters as the expropriation of land, as well as the settling of labour and other disputes. It may be true that one of the national parks needs homesteads, or that a game preserve or community pasture should be made out of it. It is, nevertheless, important for us in a democratic society to have full confidence in any judge before whom we may appear. He must remain aware of the sentiments and attitudes which have developed over the ownership of a piece of land. He must also know that the attitudes of those who live in western Canada will be different from the attitudes of those who live in the maritimes, or Newfoundland. I must support what a previous speaker said when he entered a plea in this regard. It is not good enough for justice to be done; we must know that it has been done and feel it has been done. I cannot go along with the assurance of the Minister of Justice. I am opposed to passing Bill C-172 in its unamended form.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Prominent members of our community do not agree entirely with the minister's views. I do not wish to go into details and take up the time of the House. Prominent men, no matter whether or not they are learned members of one of our committees, may not be able to influence the actions of the government. Evidence of this is to be found in the way the government has reacted to committee reports, and especially to the report of the Committee on Veterans Affairs. That report does not seem to have influenced the Treasury Board or the members of the front benches. I think all members of the House ought to take a little more interest in this matter. It is a very important one since it deals, as I said, not only with the prerogatives of the Crown, but with our ancient personal rights and remedies.

At the risk of boring hon. members may I allude to some Latin words. I am one of those who does not understand Latin very well, yet I believe the most important phrase for us to consider at present is habeas corpus.

An hon. Member: You have the body.

Mr. Bigg: At present a person's very right to appear among his friends and, in some cases, to be represented by legal counsel is threatened to the Nth degree. I heard the Minister of Justice himself assure us just a few moments ago that a man detained under the War Measures Act is not denied access to counsel. I will not put words into his mouth or suggest anything devious in his assurance, but that assurance does not spell out exactly how the man is to get in touch with counsel. Is he denied this right for a possible 90 days, as set out in the War Measures Act, or is it to be for some shorter period of time?

Mr. Gibson: The government is bringing in a measure next week.

Mr. Bigg: Next week is not good enough. I am talking about our present rights; I am talking about the continuous whittling down of our rights as individuals. I do not think it is good enough when members of the House are given the assurance that everything is well, that the matter is in the government's hands and, perhaps, that "We are doing the right thing." We are dealing with a right, Mr. Speaker, which has stood in British countries for at least 750 years, that is the right to appear before one's peers within 24 hours. We have a right to appear before a magistrate, who usually is a simple man of the people or a justice of the peace, who is usually a local man who has reached some small prominence among his friends and whose integrity is beyond dispute. A man has a right to appear in front of the justice of the peace and this will assure his relatives and friends that he is not being held without cause. We have a right to know that there has in fact been some infringement of the law, or that the man is suspected of infringing the law, and that is why his personal liberty has been taken away. An accused man must be brought before the magistrate or justice of the peace at the first opportunity and allowed, with the help of counsel, to give his account to the officers of the Crown.

Another Latin term I wish to refer to is certiorari. Perhaps not all of us understand that Latin term. In my lay opinion, certiorari refers to nothing less than one's rights to have his case reviewed and corrected. When you think that justice has not been done, you may take your case from the lower court to a higher court and be assured that you have been dealt with in the way you are entitled to be dealt with and that, if you have been convicted, the conviction and the punishment is as set out in the statutes.

A writ of mandamus is an order from a judge to perform an act under the provisions of the Law. Speaking in connection with this bill, I do not know why county judges or district court judges, or judges of the Supreme Court of Alberta, are not to be allowed to deal with these very important prerogatives after this bill passes. I know that by far the greatest portion of litigation is involved with habeas corpus proceedings, where those are applicable. These proceedings apply to people who are caught speeding, or to petty thieves, and so on. Yet, when you come to this larger field where you are dealing with expropriation proceedings, in which federal boards with their impersonal—

Mr. Gibson: Is the hon. member talking about expropriation?

Mr. Bigg: Yes.

Mr. Gibson: It will be speeded up under this bill.

Mr. Bigg: It might be speeded up under the bill if the government accedes to requests that have been put forward in committee and in the House. We must appoint enough federal judges to handle the workload. There is no reason why the government cannot appoint enough judges to handle it. These proceedings should be decentralized and handled expeditiously at the local level. So far, these local judges have not been subject to the central authority of one Court. I am not trying to talk about the horrors of centralization and how far that centralization ought to go. I think it can go too far. Looking at the matter from a layman's point of view, it seems to me that what has been attempted is this; the central authority seeks to absorb all the rights and prerogatives which heretofore were enjoyed by provincial law officers. The administrations of justice has been on a decentralized basis in this country, and has given very satisfactory service.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, may I rise on a point of order that has to do with a matter of procedure. I have talked to my good friend, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and I assume that the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) will go along with my suggestion. I suggest that instead of voting individually on these amendments, we could vote on them all at one time. While I am on my feet, may I suggest that since Motions No. 4 and 5 standing in my name are closely related, they could be debated and voted on together.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the hon. member for Calgary North. I take it there is consent that the vote on those motions is to be taken at the same time.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, we agree with that. I think the hon. member for Calgary North may have been looking at yesterday's *Votes and Proceedings*. Is he not speaking of motions Nos. 5 and 6? The hon. member for Greenwood has motion No. 4 tucked in there.

Mr. Woolliams: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am afraid I was looking at Tuesday's copy.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Will the minister please resume his seat. Perhaps we should deal with the matter of the voting first and then deal with the second matter. Is it agreed that the votes, where they are so indicated, will be taken at the termination of this stage of the proceedings?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps the hon. member for Calgary North was referring to the two motions standing in his name, Nos. 5 and 6.

Mr. Woolliams: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The hon. member for Greenwood is the mover of motion No. 4. Motions Nos. 5 and 6 being debated and voted on together would be satisfactory to us.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Is the House ready for the question? Subject to the agreement of the House

to defer all votes until the termination of these proceedings, I will put the question on Nos. 5 and 6. The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) moves:

That Bill C-172, An Act respecting the Federal Court of Canada, be amended by striking out lines 1 and 2 on page 18 thereof and substituting the following:

'28. (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other Act, the Court'

The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) also moves:

That Bill C-172, An Act respecting the Federal Court of Canada, be amended by striking out paragraph (c) of subclause (1) of clause 28 on page 18 thereof and substituting the following:

'(c) based its decision or order on an erroneous finding of fact that it made in a perverse or capricious manner.'

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour will please say, yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say, nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Under the standing order and the agreement just made, the vote on these motions will be deferred until the termination of the proceedings at this stage.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The following motion is proposed by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin):

That Bill C-172, respecting the Federal Court of Canada, be amended by striking out clause 18.

Mr. Lewis: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In order to save the time of the House, I suggest that motions Nos. 4, 7 and 9 be considered together as they all relate one to the other. These three motions can be debated at the same time. If there is a vote, they will be voted on together. I believe the minister agrees with this suggestion.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): That is so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House has heard the hon. member for York South. Is it agreed that motions 4, 7 and 9 be considered together?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I will not put motion No. 7. The following motion is proposed by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin).

That Bill C-172, respecting the Federal Court of Canada, be amended by striking out subclause (1) of clause 28 and substituting the following therefor:

"The Court of Appeal has jurisdiction under this section to hear and determine an application to review and set aside a decision or order made by or in the course of proceedings before a federal board, commission or other tribunal upon the ground that the board, commission or tribunal

(a) failed to observe a principle of natural justice or otherwise acted beyond or refused to exercise its jurisdiction;

(b) erred in law in making its decision or order, whether or not the error appears on the face of the record; or

(c) based its decision or order on an erroneous finding of fact that it made in a perverse or capricious manner or without due regard for the material before it;"—

The following motion No. 9 is proposed by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin):

That Bill C-172, respecting the Federal Court of Canada, be amended by striking out subclause (3) of clause 28 and substituting the following therefor:

"The Court of Appeal shall have exclusive jurisdiction (a) to use an injunction, writ of certiorari, writ of prohibition, writ of mandamus or writ of quo warranto, or great declaratory relief, against any federal board, commission or other tribunal; and (b) to hear and determine any application or other proceeding for relief in the nature of relief contemplated by paragraph (a) including any proceeding brought against the Attorney General of Canada, to obtain relief against a federal board, commission or other tribunal;"—

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Before dealing with these motions and the reasons for them, Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that there is a misprint in motion No. 9. At the present time it reads, "to use an injunction,". It should read, "The Court of Appeal shall have exclusive jurisdiction (a) to issue an injunction," the word "use" should read "issue".

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In view of the hon. member's remarks is it the wish of the House to amend the motion by changing the word "use" to the word "issue"?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, the proposal that motions Nos. 4, 7 and 9 be discussed together is entirely satisfactory to me because they all concern the same thing. If No. 4 is rejected, there is no point in Nos. 7 and 9. If No. 4 is accepted, then Nos. 7 and 9 or some variation of them would necessarily follow. The purpose of these amendments is not to disturb the bill in any way or to deal too much with its substance, but to make it more efficient for one of its main purposes.

I have listened to the minister explain this bill on a number of occasions. As I understand, one of the main purposes of this bill is to remove the supervisory jurisdiction of the provincial courts over the federal tribunals set up under Statutes of Parliament and transfer them to the federal court. That is an important objective of the bill and one with which I heartily sympathize. However, I suggest the way this has been done is highly confusing. The amendment I propose is necessary to eradicate the confusion.

I wish to draw the attention of hon. members to (clause) 18 which I propose be deleted. (clause) 18 reads:

The Trial Division has exclusive original jurisdiction

(a) to issue an injunction, writ of certiorari, writ of prohibition, writ of mandamus or wirt of quo warranto, or grant declaratory relief, against any federal board, commission or other tribunal; and

(b) to hear and determine any application or other proceeding for relief in the nature of relief contemplated by paragraph (a), including any proceeding brought against the Attorney General of Canada, to obtain relief against a federal board, commission or other tribunal.

This confers a jurisdiction under the various forms of the old prerogative writs and other remedies by which the courts habitually check the excesses, errors of jurisdiction, errors of law and failures to carry out the jurisdiction conferred on them by various boards and tribunals. This gives exclusive jurisdiction to the trial division.

Clause 28 of the bill deals with part of the same subject matter. It is confusing and difficult. Clause 18 transfers a very wide jurisdiction in general terms to the trial division. Clause 28 deals with the jurisdiction of the court of appeal which is the second jurisdiction. I think all hon. members understand that this new federal court will operate in two divisions, the trial division and the court of appeal.

In Clause 18, there is a transfer of the supervisory jurisdiction in rather broad terms of the trial division. Clause 28 provides:

Notwithstanding section 18 or the provisions of any other Act, the Court of Appeal has jurisdiction to hear and determine an application to review and set aside a decision or order, other than a decision or order of an administrative nature not required by law to be made on a judicial or quasi-judicial basis,—

This applies to certain circumstances set out in paragraphs (a), (b) and (c), and is just another way of expressing virtually the same supervisory jurisdiction over commissions and tribunals. The clause confers jurisdiction in slightly limiting language on the court of appeal. I say "slightly limiting" because it may not include all of the matters covered in section 18. However, it certainly covers a great many of them. It raises the difficult legal question of when the order is of an administrative nature rather than on a judicial or quasi-judicial basis. When this is the fact, the review provided by the bill is then to be handled by the court of appeal for the reasons set out. I make no complaint of the reasons. They are fairly extensive and satisfactory. Clause 28(3) reads:

Where the Court of Appeal has jurisdiction under this section to hear and determine an application to review and set aside a decision or order, the Trial Division has no jurisdiction to entertain any proceeding in respect of that decision or order.

In clause 18, complete jurisdiction appears to be given to the trial division. In certain cases, other than a decision of an administration which is not judicial or quasi-judicial, the power of review is given to the court of appeal under more limited circumstances. When the court of appeal is given jurisdiction it is explicitly by subclause (3).

It is my submission, and this has been expressed by Mr. Gordon Henderson of Ottawa who was referred to by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), that this will be confusing in practice. Indeed, it sounds confusing in theory when trying to explain it. Any experienced lawyer will agree that there is no more complex matter than determining whether the functions of a particular tribunal are to be exercised in an administrative or judicial or quasi-judicial manner. Litigants will seek to check this very healthy and important jurisdiction. They will check on the powers exercised by all of the administrative tribunals that enter into a thousand different fields in our system. Litigants will be uncertain whether they should apply to the trial division of the court or whether they should apply to the court of appeal. Those of us who are often in the courts know how frequently people are told: You are in the trial division but you ought to be in the court of appeal, or: You are in the court of appeal but you should have appeared first of all in the trial division before coming to the court of appeal.

• (4:30 p.m.)

The amendment I propose is simple. It is that total jurisdiction in respect of this matter be conferred upon the court of appeal. Not only would this avoid confusion and apply a more straightforward remedy but, I suggest, such a step would be good in itself. Why should not this supervisory jurisdiction, instead of being dealt with by overburdened members of the trial division, be dealt with the appellate division? For one thing, this would minimize the number of appeals arising from these matters; it would cut down the time and the expense which are involved. Second, it would mean that the total supervisory jurisdiction would be exercised by one court, presumably in accordance with one method of approach. The minister keeps telling us how important it is to have harmony and judicial co-operation. He sees this as being necessary, but here he is providing for a system under which jurisdiction is divided.

I could go on to speak at greater length about this subject, Mr. Speaker. As I say, the proposal I made has been approved by highly experienced counsel. It is a simplifying proposal; it is a proposal which would make the act work better; it is a proposal which, above all, and this is of the utmost importance, would give the supervisory jurisdiction which is so essential to the proper administration of justice in a modern state, to the appellate branch of the new court which is to be set up. The minister and his deputy tried to explain to the committee why this proposal was not acceptable. I must say my conclusion was that it could not be accepted because it had not originally been thought of by them. It has now been thought of, and unless the minister can give us some good reasons, reasons which so far have not been apparent, for rejecting it, a proposal which is devoid of any political intent, a proposal which is, I believe, perfectly sound and in accordance with the best advice we have received from the profession, I shall continue to hold that opinion.

If it is not accepted, I believe there will be confusion, unnecessary expense, delay and an unsatisfactory state of affairs in this key sector. No part of the jurisdiction of this federal court would be more important than the duty of supervising the innumerable boards, tribunals, commissions and so on which relate to the rights of Canadians. For these reasons, I urge the House to take this particular amendment seriously. I know that under our system if the minister frowns, his frown is likely to prevail over all the impassioned pleas that I or other hon.

members may make from this side of the House. Nevertheless, I do urge that this amendment if adopted will constitute a real improvement; it is the kind of amendment which ought to be accepted if this House is to function usefully.

Mr. Woolliams: I wonder whether the hon. member would be prepared to answer a question before I make a few remarks on this subject.

Mr. Brewin: I will do my best.

Mr. Woolliams: My question is this. If we delete 18—I may say at the outset that I agree with the hon. member—and leave in section 28, the section dealing with the appeal court, then the special remedies which are dealt with in 18 would still be available in any trial court with reference, say, to a case in which a board exceeded its jurisdiction or acted without jurisdiction—

Mr. Brewin: I think the hon. member is absolutely right. If a thing is a nullity, the trial court must treat it as a nullity in law. I imagine the hon. member has observed amendment nine which proposes that the use of special writs, if I may call them that, to deal with these matters should be within the jurisdiction of the court of appeal exclusively. This does not mean that if some matter came before the trial division, and it was a nullity through lack of jurisdiction, it would not be their duty so to declare it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to put a question to the member who spoke before me.

By his motion he would have the act respecting the Federal Court of Canada amended by striking out subclause (3) according to which the Court of Appeal would have exclusive jurisdiction to use a writ of certiorari. I should like to ask him, since Quebec legislators have amalgamated writs of prohibition and certiorari in the new Civil Code, which has led to a new procedure entitled "Proceedings to obtain relief against the decisions of tribunals falling under the powers of supervision and control of the Superior Court", whether the studies made by the Quebec government and the resulting new procedures have not been useless, since federal legislators now seem to retain the writ of certiorari, for which proceedings have been slightly modified, in spite of the abolition of the writ of prohibition.

I should like to ask the hon. member whether he does not agree that, should his amendment be adopted, this would lead to jurisdictional as well as constitutional conflicts?

[*English*]

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I want to say at the outset that I agree with the position taken by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member; perhaps I misunderstood, but did the hon. member for Greenwood wish to reply to that question which, after all, was directed to him.

Mr. Brewin: The question was directed to me, Mr. Speaker, but I should like to be a little better advised before I reply to it. I am not sure I grasped its full significance.

Mr. Woolliams: Before I start, what amendments are we taking together?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Four, seven and nine.

Mr. Woolliams: The confusion arose, Mr. Speaker, because when I was working last night I was using Tuesday's order paper and today the numbers seem to have been changed for some unknown reason; I do not know what happened.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The new amendments were put in.

Mr. Woolliams: Oh, the other amendments came in. First of all, with reference to amendment No. 4, I agree with the hon. member. I believe there is confusion as between Clause 18 of the act which deals with the powers of the trial division in reference to the special remedies and section 28 which deals with the powers of the court of appeal. In fact, if hon. members look at Clause 28 with special attention to paragraphs (a), (b) and (c), they will find that some of the grounds for appeal shown there are identical to the ingredients which are necessary in order to get a writ of certiorari, or an order to quash the decision of a board which has exceeded its jurisdiction or which has failed to observe the principles of natural justice.

I was interested to read a letter from a lawyer who has done some work on this subject. I should like to quote from this letter, but before doing so I will say this: when the Minister was talking about having received advice from the Canadian Bar Association I checked the reports again, particularly the evidence of Mr. Henderson, and he made it very clear that though he was a member of the Canadian Bar Association, and, maybe, an executive of the association, he was not actually presenting a brief on behalf of the Canadian Bar Association. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) can say that he sent out this bill, formerly C-192 and now C-172, to some 400-odd lawyers, but the point I wish to make is this: with the greatest respect, there are very few lawyers who are really interested in the litigation which goes on in the Exchequer Court or, particularly, the litigation which may go on in the federal court and the new appeal court. When the minister says that he has the support of the Canadian Bar, let me tell him that I have attended several meetings of local Bar Associations and they were pretty upset about this bill. I do not want the Minister of Justice to leave with the media of communication to the public the impression that he has the Canadian Bar or the lawyers of Canada behind him.

• (4:40 p.m.)

If this bill goes through without the adoption of some of the amendments put down, particularly the amendment I am talking to now, No. 4, and some others, there will be much confusion. If the lawyers, of Canada went along with the Minister of Justice on this, it must have been out of an unusual affection they had for him because of certain things that happen to them from time to time. I do not believe for one moment that he has the majority of lawyers supporting him on this kind of legislation.

Let me come directly to amendment No. 4 which seeks to remove clause 18 from the bill. Amendment No. 7 seeks to strike out subclause (1) of clause 28, which provides:

> Notwithstanding section 18 or the provision of any other act, the Court of Appeal has jurisdiction to hear and determine an application to review and set aside a decision or order, other than a decision or order of an administrative nature not required by law to be made on a judicial or quasi-judicial basis, made by or in the course of proceedings before a federal board, commission or other tribunal, upon the ground that the board, commission or tribunal
>
> (a) failed to observe a principle of natural justice or otherwise acted beyond or refused to exercise its jurisdiction;
>
> (b) erred in law in making its decision or order, whether or not the error appears on the face of the record; or
>
> (c) based its decision or order on an erroneous finding of fact that it made in a perverse or capricious manner or without regard for the material before it

I ask the Minister of Justice seriously to consider the first point so ably made by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin). Take the case where a board failed to observe the principles of natural justice. Normally, there is the right to move by means of special writ or order to quash the decision of the board. I ask, what is the difference between the powers given to the trial division and the powers given to the appeal court?

I should like to put on the record what Mr. Campbell said about this. I think every member of the committee received a copy of his letter, though he did not actually appear before the committee. Mr. Campbell is a member of the firm of Campbell, Godfrey and Lewtas of Toronto, and in his letter he said:

> Section 18 gives the trial division exclusive original jurisdiction to grant extraordinary remedies against federal tribunals.

Pausing there, there are many tribunals. Let me quote the letter dated May 28, 1970 addressed to me as a Member of Parliament, a letter that I know other members received too. May I also refer to a memorandum prepared by the Dalhousie University Faculty of Law. I support the argument of the hon. member for Greenwood because this bill to establish the federal court confuses the law.

Take, for example, the act setting up the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Under that act, a person has the right to sue the CBC in the superior court of a province. I know this from experience, though of course not personal experience. Certain procedures for appeals are laid down for many other crown corporations and boards. In other words, there is a double conflict of jurisdiction. Clause 18 provides that special remedies will be used by a judge of the trial division; clause 28 provides for appeals to the new appeal court, which is the same right of appeal given under a writ of certiorari. In the case of some other boards, there is no right of appeal at all. So if you could ever have more legal chaos than that, I would like to know what it is.

The memorandum prepared by the Dalhousie University Faculty of Law has this to say about clause 29:

> Section 29 raises the further question of the federal boards, commissions or other tribunals from which an appeal is not provided, for the true intention of section 29 seems to be that it is only to them that the "setting aside" procedure of section 28 is to apply.

So, even they are confused on that matter.

> Putting the many crown companies to one side—which is not to imply that they do not create substantial problems for the individual-government relationship—here, with no pretensions to completeness, are some federal statutes that establish tribunals of one sort or another from which an appeal is provided:

The following acts establish tribunals from which an appeal is provided: Agricultural Products Board Act; Anti-dumping Act; Atomic Energy Control Act; Combines Investigation Act; Fisheries Research Board Act; Historic Sites and Monuments Act; Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act; Merchant Seamen Compensation Act; National Design Council Act; National Film Act; Parole Act; Public Service Staff Relations Act; War Veterans Allowance Act. Those are the acts that do not provide a procedure for appeal.

I should like to hear the Minister of Justice explain to the House what is going to happen in the cases I have just cited. I could go on to list a group of others that provide a procedure for appeal, but I will not take the time to do so. Indeed, they may be covered under the bill.

Let me return to what Mr. Campbell said. If ever there was legal chaos in a bill, it is in this Bill C-172. Mr. Campbell writes:

> Section 18 gives the Trial Division exclusive original jurisdiction to grant extraordinary remedies against federal tribunals. Section 28 (3) provides that if the Court of Appeal has jurisdiction under section 28 to review a decision, the Trial Division has no jurisdiction to entertain any proceeding in respect of that decision.

Pausing there, it has generally been the rule of law, as I understand it—I think the hon. member for Greenwood will agree with my interpretation—that in cases where a right of appeal is laid down the courts are always reluctant to entertain any application for special remedy, be it by certiorari, prohibition or mandamus. I believe that is good law and I do not think there will be any quarrel with that statement. The court says: "You have chosen your remedy; do not try two or three".

Mr. Campbell continues:

> It seems to me that the language of section 28(1) is broad enough to give the court jurisdiction to review any decision which could be attacked by the common law writ of certiorari.

So, in other words, clause 18 is entirely superfluous. What Mr. Campbell is saying is that, by providing for the special remedies as well as for an appeal under certain conditions, the situation has been remedied. As I say, I cannot believe that the top men in the Canadian Bar Association who have done quite a lot of work on this legislation would go along with a minister of justice who would contend there was not a lot of confusion surrounding clauses 18 and 28. In effect, I think that if you leave Section 28—I go further than the hon. member for Greenwood—and wipe out Section 18 you have done away with special remedies. I have not always agreed with that hon. member but I do in this regard. Certain boards have an informality and a lot of lawyers appreciate this because they do not like administrative law boards.

• (4:50 p.m.)

When we are dealing with labour disputes, I can understand this position on the part of unions. They get a decision from the board. I do not think they want the evidence reviewed. Why should the evidence be reviewed through an appeal method when, basically, you have this kind of law? If you take a question of fact before a Court of Appeal you do not get very far. The appeal has to involve at least a question of mixed law and fact. I can understand why a lot of people are going to be upset when they find out what really is taking place. The letter then states:

> Therefore, it would follow that the effect of Section 28(3) is to virtually divest the Trial Division of any jurisdiction in the field of extraordinary remedies. It may be suggested that the remedies of injunction and prohibition are sometimes sought before an order or decision is made and that such relief is not available before the review tribunal established by Section 28.

In other words, there may be times when these special remedies would be requested before the final judgment of the court and before you got to the appeal court. Of course, that occurs in a lot of cases. I have never yet heard anyone define the difference between an administrative or a judicial act. There have been a lot of cases recently which seem to establish that you can only quash where there has actually been some judicial act.

Let me digress for a moment. After a criminal charge has been laid you may, as a result of something that has happened, want to quash that charge by certiorari. The courts have said very clearly the laying of a charge is an administrative act because it really has not yet involved a judicial process. So, the fellow pleads guilty or not guilty. Some courts have said that is still administrative and remains so until somebody gets up and says, for example, my name is John Brown. You then ask that the proceedings be stopped. At this time you really just get into a judicial act. This procedure is very complicated and this bill complicates it even further. That is why I support the suggestion that clauses 18 and 28 cannot stand together since they are somewhat contradictory. The letter then goes on:

> It may be suggested that the remedies of injunction and prohibition are sometimes sought before an order or decision is made and that such relief is not available before the review tribunal established by Section 28. If that is so and if that is the only area of jurisdiction to be left in the Trial Division I would hope that Section 18 might be clarified in that regard.

There has been no attempt made to clarify it. The letter then goes on:

> Section 28(1) vests the Court of Appeal with power to "hear and determine an application to review and set aside a decision or order". That power seems to be enlarged by Section 52(d) which gives the Court the additional power to refer the matter back to the tribunal with appropriate directions. In my view Section 28 should define the complete power of the Court of Appeal in an application to review.
>
> There are many federal tribunals which are not required to give reasons for their decisions. If a tribunal does not give reasons a Court on an application to review may find it impossible to determine whether or not an error of law has been made. It is logical that the distinction between error of law on the face of the record and not on the face of the record be abolished. However, to be an effective ground to review one cannot deal with errors of law not on the face of the record without giving some direction with respect to the content of the record and the proof of proceedings before a tribunal.
>
> In reviewing Section 28 one must bear in mind that there are tribunals which fall within the scope of that section which are not obliged to keep a transcript of evidence or to give reasons for decision.

What happens then? The writer then states:

> I am not suggesting that there need be a statutory requirement that all tribunals must secure the services of a court reporter at all times. I am concerned, however, that Section 28 be effective and workable as against all tribunals falling within its scope.
>
> Section 28(1)(c) includes as its ground for setting aside a decision an erroneous finding of fact that is perverse or capricious. I am concerned that the following words "or without due regard for the material before it" could be construed so as to give a court unreasonably wide powers to review findings of fact made by tribunals. It is desirable that decisions be quashed if they depend on findings of fact which are capricious or perverse. If it is intended that the "due regard" referred to in Section 28(1)(c) is a requirement only that the board look at all the material, that is another way of saying that the board must not behave capriciously or perversely. If the "due regard" gives the court the power to weigh the evidence and consider that a decision should be set aside because in the opinion of the court the balance of the evidence leads to a certain conclusion, the court is then given extraordinarily wide powers of review.

His point is that if that really is the purpose of the act it means that these powers would merely become superfluous. The court could always say that was a wrong finding of fact and order a trial *de novo* to rehear the whole case. The letter then states:

> The whole question of boards taking into account policy matters and matters of which the board has general knowledge creates a problem for a review tribunal. It is obvious that boards must act on certain considerations not established in the evidence.

The minister may not have admitted this at the time of the committee hearings, but it may be that this provision alters the whole trend of administrative law back to a judicial process. In other words, these boards are just rubber stamps and when they have completed their work you can go before the federal appeal board. Let me ask again, how many judges are we going to need to cope with all the administrative tribunal reviews?

An hon. Member: A thousand.

Mr. Woolliams: Somebody suggests a thousand, but my mathematics have never been as good as my understanding of certain phases of the law. To quote again from the letter:

When those occasions occur a court sitting in review will have difficulty determining whether the tribunal paid "due regard" to the material or whether the tribunal made an error in law. I would hope that a requirement could be imposed that tribunals taking into account matters outside the record would be obliged to disclose that fact on the record and to give a right to make argument and to call evidence with respect to those considerations to persons directly affected by any order.

In other words, that is the advantage of administrative boards. They are not a court of record in the sense that the evidence is reported. They listen to some evidence and they may take cognizance of facts that are not in the evidence. You go to the appeal court for review and ask it to consider something that is not in documentary form. This is beyond me and I do not understand it. I think this whole bill was an exercise by a group of academics who never practised very much.

I think the House should consider very seriously my amendments and those of the hon. member for Greenwood. We are on all fours and if we accept his perhaps mine become superfluous. Perhaps I might say that on looking at the situation, the amendment moved by the hon. member for Greenwood to wipe out clause 18 completely, when read with the other amendments, is superior to the two I drafted in my attempt to doctor up the bill.

The letter then states:

I assume, from a reading of Sections 18 and 28(3) that the intention of Parliament is to remove motions to quash decisions of Federal Tribunals from provincial courts. I am not sure that the intention has been achieved.

There is another question I should like to ask and I would like to hear the Minister of Justice answer when I sit down. I might as well finish what I have to say.

If there is a federal tribunal which has exceeded its jurisdiction or not carried out the principles of natural justice or any of those other matters which are related to the extraordinary remedies, would a person still be able to go to the trial division of a superior court and have that decision quashed as the section is now drawn? If we accept the amendment of the hon. member for Greenwood would a person have that option? I do not think this is clear. I think if you look at the law, after listening very carefully to the hon. member for Greenwood, that person could take this position. These writs are so fundamental I still think you could go to the trial court and I do not think this federal legislation could stop you. I do not know the answer to that. I think we often pass a lot of things when we do not know what we are doing, and then an entirely different interpretation is put on them outside this chamber. Perhaps that is helpful to the Canadian people. Here we are in a vacuum.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired. I point out to him that I have taken into account the interruption at the beginning of his speech. I would not wish to create a precedent by giving the hon. member three times his allotted time, but is there consent of the House that he continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Woolliams: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I can appreciate that you would not want to listen to this argument three times. I say, with tongue in cheek and with the greatest respect, that I would not want to give it three times. The letter continues:

Although section 18 at first glance gives the Trial Division of the Federal Court exclusive original jurisdiction within these areas, that jurisdiction is largely removed by section 28(3). Section 28 does not indicate that the Court of Appeal has "exclusive jurisdiction" but only that the availability of its jurisdiction prohibits the Trial Division of the Federal Court from entertaining any proceeding. Thus I am concerned that it may not be clear as to whether the Trial Division of a Provincial Court retains jurisdiction within these areas.

This is a very learned counsel who has done a lot of work and who has done a lot of thinking. I am speaking of one of the 400 to whom the minister wrote. He has asked the question about which I am concerned and has put it very clearly and precisely. He states:

While the intention of section 29 is laudible and applications for review are undesirable if appeal proceedings are available, some special thought might be given to those occasions when the appeal is to the Governor-in-Council or the Treasury Board.

What happens there? This is another point with which the faculty of Dalhousie University deals.

If the subject of the appeal is a pure question of law I wonder if those bodies are best equipped to cope with the problem.

May I pause here. If we have a right of appeal to the new federal appeal court, do we then go on to the Supreme Court of Canada? We have always had the right, without leave, to go to the Supreme Court of Canada on special remedies or on questions of law. Why is the Supreme Court of Canada being cut off? Is it because that court has overruled some of the decisions in respect of expropriation made by the former court?

An hon. Member: They have not been cut off.

Mr. Woolliams: An hon. member says they have not been cut off. There is an amendment here on that aspect and I will ask my question when it is being considered. I appreciate that the Minister of Justice has a body of law officers behind him and there may be a reason for this. The letter further states:

To the extent, of course, that the matter in appeal involves matters of policy obviously the Court must not have the power to interfere.

We are concerned also about the procedure established in 28(2) for bringing an application for review. I note that the application can be made by the Attorney General of Canada. I presume it is intended that that would occur only if the Government of Canada is a party affected by the decision. I wonder if for purposes of this section the Attorney General of Canada represents all other Ministers of the Crown.

I do not know the answer to this. It certainly was never answered for the committee.

> The time for application is ten days after a person directly affected has given notice of the order or decision of the board.

Now, dealing for a moment with the court's jurisdiction, here is another problem in respect of clause 28 and the right of appeal. If Mr. A and Mr. B are involved in a three car accident with the RCMP, so, the Crown is involved. The courts of Alberta can try the case as between A and B. The trial court in Alberta may say that B is at fault and A is awarded the damages, but it cannot deal with C's problem so the case goes to this new court and the court of appeal which finds that B is not at all at fault but C was. Who decides that conflict? We have one court saying that B is to blame and the other court saying that C is to blame.

Then, there is another problem. There may be a three-party contract; the Crown, A, as one party and B and C as the people. The provincial court may argue that B is in breach and the federal court may say no, it is A or it is C. Who determines that? I do not know the answers. This is what I call legal chaos. The conflict between clause 18 and clause 28 is equally chaotic. Again the letter states:

> Obviously there are occasions in which persons directly affected by an order or decision do not appear before the board. In that event the board will not communicate the decision to them. If the board does not so communicate then that person's right of appeal runs indefinitely. It is unreasonable that a right of appeal should be an indefinite one as it seems unreasonable to require a board to communicate its decision to all persons directly affected by it. We know, for example, that all persons employed in an industry are directly affected by an application for certification made by a trade union. In my view it is not now and should not be in the future the practice of the board to communicate to each employee separately.
>
> The objection would to a large extent be removed if the requirement that the communication by the board be removed and if the ten days run from the time when the substance of the order or decision is brought to the attention of the person affected by it.

So, in conclusion, in support of the amendment, I say I think clause 18 should be abolished. First of all, I believe we would be usurping the rights of every Canadian by having that Clause in the bill. It defines the special remedies under special conditions by a special court, and this is far too costly and not acceptable to Canadians. Secondly, if these special remedies are to be handled by a federal court—and it looks to me with the majority the government has that this is what we will have—then I would have to go along with the hon. member for Greenwood who suggests that it would be far better to have them handled by the court of appeal the minister is creating. However, I am not convinced in my mind—and I do not think that anyone who has ever studied the bill and who has done any litigation is convinced—that this will cure the legal chaos.

Mr. David Lewis (York South): I shall not be very long, Mr. Speaker. I sympathize with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) because I feel that in these days, when things are happening in Canada, a technical debate on a legal problem is a little difficult. I wish to appeal to the minister to accept my friend's amendment. I rise because I want to put the argument to him in perhaps a slightly different way, although essentially I will be saying the same things that have already been said. As have the hon. member for Greenwood and I am sure the hon. member for Calgary North, I have had some considerable experience before the courts on applications for special remedies in connection with decisions, particularly, of labour boards. I am very concerned about the difficulties which the presence of both clauses 18 and 28 will create for the ordinary trade union, the ordinary citizen of the country and the lawyer who must guide them as to what steps to take.

The minister no doubt will correct me if I am wrong. However, as I read the two clauses it would seem that the drafters of the bill have attempted to do the following things. First, they have given the trial division exclusive jurisdiction to deal with applications for any of the special remedies such as injunction, certiorari, prohibition, mandamus and so on. Under section 28, they have given the court of appeal what is in effect a right to hear an application, an appeal. I know it is called a review of the order but, in effect, it is a right of appeal to the court of appeal from an order of a tribunal. Secondly, what they have attempted to do, if I understand the two sections correctly, is to leave to the trial division exclusive jurisdiction in respect of the special remedies only in administrative matters, while judicial or quasi-judicial decisions, are left—in effect a right of appeal—to the appeal division of the federal court.

• (5:10 p.m.)

If I understand it correctly, and I will try to indicate why I think it may be correct, I may say that just stating it that way shows what confusion will be created in fact. Why the minister and his advisers should want to create it, God knows. What the bill does is give the trial division exclusive jurisdiction to issue these special remedies. What happens in fact is, if a party, aggrieved by a board, commission or tribunal, feels he ought to go to court, under section 18 he can go to the trial division and ask for an order of certiorari to quash the decision of the board or other tribunal. So far as there may be an argument on that application for certiorari, it will be precisely that the board or commission has "failed to observe a principle of natural justice"—reading from section 28—or has "acted beyond or refused to exercise its jurisdiction". Those are the only grounds. Perhaps the tribunal may have erred in law because there was an error on the face of the record.

It may be that the act under which the board, commission or tribunal under which jurisdiction is established, has a primitive clause trying to oust the jurisdiction of the court. In that case Mr. Justice Roach, as he then was, in a case involving Canadian General Electric was right: if there is a primitive clause in the act, then the court's jurisdiction is ousted with respect to error, unless that error is on the face of the record.

The point I am trying to make is that when you go to court for a writ of certiorari or prohibition particularly,

whatever court it may be, what you are really saying to the court and the only thing you can say to the court is: the board or commission has acted outside its jurisdiction or has not observed the principle of natural justice so that in section 18, although you refer merely to the prerogative writs, you are including the grounds in section 28. Unless I am very much mistaken, to speak in good Oxonian English which the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) will understand, there "ain't any other grounds you can ask for"—certainly not when the act gives the board or commission the authority. Then, the only ground on which you can go to court to say the decision is wrong is if you can persuade the court that the board has gone outside its jurisdiction and failed to observe the principle of natural justice or that there is an error on the face of the record. Roughly those are the only grounds. In section 18 you are embodying the grounds set out in section 28 and why do that?

Then, you go to section 28 subsections (1) and (3). Subsection (1) reads:

> Notwithstanding section 18 or the provisions of any other Act, the Court of Appeal has jurisdiction to hear and determine an application to review and set aside a decision or order, other than a decision or order of an administrative nature not required by law to be made on a judicial or quasi judicial basis...

When you read that in connection with section 28, subsection (3), which states that where the court of appeal has jurisdiction under this section the trial division has no jurisdiction, you put the two together and what have you got? It is a little doubtful what exactly you have got but as far as I can make out, what you are saying is in the case of no judicial or quasi-judicial decisions or errors of a board or commission, only the court of appeal has jurisdiction. In the case of an administrative matters only the trial division has jurisdiction.

Then, you get into the question of what is the line between an administrative and judicial or quasi-judicial decision where the cases, and there are many of them, show that under the common law courts have been very reluctant to interfere with an administrative decision. So, what would you have? I say seriously to the minister that you leave the trial division only with the administrative decisions. If you read the two sections together, that is all they can mean, to deal with administrative decisions by way of special remedies or special writs. In fact the courts hesitate to interfere with administrative decisions. That is all I want to say on this point, but I want to raise one other point briefly.

It seems to me that my hon. friend's suggestion ought to commend itself to the minister and his advisers. What the hon. member for Greenwood says is that since it is frequently difficult to draw the line between administrative decisions and decisions that are quasi judicial—and the extent to which you should interfere with an administrative decision is an important question—you refer all these questions to the appeal division of the federal court. The appeal division can then establish the jurisprudence as to where the line is drawn and as to how far it will go to interfere with administrative decisions which have not a judicial or quasi-judicial character, and as to how it will deal with the latter, judicial and quasi-judicial.

It seems to me that you also obviate the procedural nightmare for the client and the lawyer of deciding whether their application will be an application for a writ or an application for review. In the one case, it is an application to the trial division and in the other case it is an application to the court of appeal. In many cases I can see where a lawyer and his client will appear in trial court thinking it has jurisdiction and the trial court will decide it does not have jurisdiction but the court of appeal does. Alternatively, they may go to the court of appeal and be told it is an administrative matter and they should go to the trial division.

Why should Canadians be put to that kind of trouble? What purpose is there in it? What is lost by taking my hon. friend's very sensible, agreeable proposition? Combine the two, go before one tribunal and the question of whether it is administrative or quasi-judicial is out of the window: the tribunal has jurisdiction to deal with it.

As my hon. friend says quite properly, when you consider amendment No. 9, you not only give the appeal court the right to review under subsection (1) but you also give the appeal court the right to issue special remedies of certiorari and the other special remedies that are there. That makes sense. I want to say that the hon. member for Greenwood and I have always had a little disagreement on this point, a perfectly legitimate disagreement. I have very grave concern about an automatic right of review of a quasi-judicial or judicial decision of a board, commission or tribunal. I have not the same confidence in the greater infallibility of the court as compared with the potential infallibility of a board, commission or tribunal.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Mr. Brewin: Neither do I.

Mr. Lewis: My hon. friend says that neither does he. Therefore, I have as much confidence in a competent board, tribunal or commission as I have in the courts, and this automatic right of appeal in clause 28 bothers me. But if it is going to be there, then I appeal to the minister that it be there on the sensible basis that my hon. friend proposes, so that you do not have a man, a woman, a union, or an organization of any other kind having to decide whether to go to one court or another and then, coming to one court, being dumped back to the other court or being pushed up to the Court of Appeal. I do not think there is any sense in that, and I do not really understand why the minister insists upon it.

The other very brief point I want to make is to repeat and emphasize a point which the hon. member for Greenwood has already made, namely, that if you accept his proposal you would obviate the possibility of more litigation than is desirable. It is always desirable to have less rather than more courts, and less rather than more actions and steps in one case, because if you have more

than is absolutely necessary you increase the costs of those concerned.

If you leave clause 18 as it is, there will be cases where you go to the trial division and then, in certain cases, there will be an appeal to the court of appeal of the Federal Court, and also in certain cases a further appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada. If you take my hon. friend's sensible and common sense suggestion, which I urgently ask the minister to consider, you obviate one of the courts in a case that goes higher. You simply have two courts that you can be before. You are before the court of appeal, and if there is an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada you are before that court, and no more, whereas in the other case you have the three steps.

To summarize, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to the minister that if he does not want to accept my hon. friend's proposal now, he should take it under advisement for reconsideration, and spend a little more time on it. I have a little experience in this field. I just do not see why the minister is obstinate about retaining the step before the trial division of this court. There is no reason why the court of appeal could not deal with the special remedies as well as with the applications for review. This would obviate the difficulties which the hon. member for Greenwood indicated, and which I have repeated, with the possibility of three courts instead of two in certain cases. In that way you make life much more liveable for the people and the organizations that feel aggrieved by a decision of a board, tribunal or commission. If the minister has any doubts in his mind as to his present position, no doubt forced upon him by his advisers, just as all ministers have wrong positions forced on them by their advisers, perhaps he will take this evening to think it over and see if he could not agree with this very sensible proposal advanced by my colleague.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, this is a very technical branch of the law indeed, and I have enjoyed the submissions that have been made, submissions that were also made, I might say, before the committee.

These three clauses, Nos. 18, 28 and 29, governing the review and appeal procedures available before the court in its two divisions over federal boards, tribunals and commissions, really set the preliminary stages for a code of public administrative law in this country. They are very important. They are very complicated even for lawyers because, as the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) stated, this branch of public administrative law is one with which not too many lawyers are familiar, but with which more and more lawyers should be familiar. I believe those sensitive relationships between the citizen and the state, with which this bill tries to deal in opening more avenues for appeal and recourse for the citizen and for private individuals against the decisions of boards, tribunals and commissions, should receive more judicial attention in this country than they have received to the present.

[Mr. Lewis.]

These three clauses in particular I hope will provide an infrastructure, or underpinning for the development of public administrative law in Canada, particularly since there is now only qualified appeal and appeal by leave to the Supreme Court. But by creating a federal court of appeal we make sure there is no longer the necessity for a petition of appeal to the Supreme Court. Whereas last year one judge of the Supreme Court could hear an appeal from that court on matters that might have dealt with freight rates, or very important labour matters, or matters coming before the National Energy Board, tariff matters, and other matters involving a wide variety of subjects falling within the jurisdiction of this parliament, now it takes three judges.

If this bill goes through we will have a method whereby the highest court in the country will not be dealing with merely factual matters arising from automobile accidents but with matters of constitutional law, with administrative law, with questions involving the provinces, and the interpretation of federal and provincial statutes.

Clauses 18, 28 and 29 are clauses to which the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) addresses himself, and I am grateful to him for having suggested that the House, on report stage, deal with them at the one time. I would like to point out that these three clauses received more attention from me and the members of my department, and from the legal profession in the replies we received to our requests for comments on the bill, than did any other clauses. The hon. member for Greenwood is quite right when he underlines the importance of the clauses with which we are dealing.

These three clauses provide the avenues of appeal and review from federal boards, tribunals and commissions. Under clause 18 the traditional common law prerogative writs, now left to the jurisdiction of the provincial superior courts across Canada arising out of their common law jurisdiction, are transferred to the federal court in its trial division, by reason of the statutory transfer found in clause 18. Those prerogative writs as they stand, and as they have been judicially interpreted, now would be referred to the federal court in so far as they relate to proceedings before federal tribunals, federal boards and federal commissions. So those common law writs, prerogative writs would, within the envelope of the current jurisprudence, be now interpreted before the federal court.

Clause 28 opens up a new statutory process of review. It is not a process of appeal because under clause 28 the court merely has jurisdiction to set aside or to turn back. It does not have the power to substitute its own view of the facts or its own judgment for that of a commission, board or tribunal. It is a referral back, or an order for re-hearing.

Mr. Lewis: Or a quashing.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Or a quashing. The court of appeal in the federal court does have the power

under clause 28 in respect to those decisions or orders of commissions and boards that are not of an administrative nature, or are not required by law to be made under the judicial or quasi-judicial basis, to review them when one of three things must happen.

These are where a board has:

—failed to observe a principle of natural justice or otherwise acted beyond or refused to exercise its jurisdiction;

Natural justice, as hon. members know, is the right to be heard, the right to receive notice, the right to cross-examine the other party, the right to have the opportunity to force production of documents, and the right to have the reasons for judgment, although that has sometimes been refused in some of the federal Boards with which hon. members are familiar.

Mr. Lewis: And that is the ground for writs of certiorari.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I will go into that in a moment.

The second thing which could happen is if a board:

—erred in law in making its decision or order, whether or not the error appears on the face of the record;

And the third thing that could happen is where a board:

—based its decision or order on an erroneous finding of fact that it made in a perverse or capricious manner or without regard for the material before it.

While it is true that the grounds for review may have been duplicated in some respects, may I suggest to hon. members that the grounds with respect to the prerogative writs under clause 18 contain some differences. First of all, it is clear that an error in law can be attacked, whether or not it appears on the face of the judgment, whether or not, in other words, reasons are given for judgment. In other words, it is apparent, under section 28(1) (b), that no federal tribunal can avoid a review process merely by refusing to give reasons for judgment. The case law on the prerogative writs is not entirely clear on the point, as I think my hon. friend for York South said.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Mr. Lewis: I agree.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Paragraph (c) goes far beyond what the prerogative writs allow at the moment, particularly when they ensure that the federal board has at least to pay some regard to the evidence before it.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, will the minister permit a question.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, may I develop what I am saying. This is a rather complicated thought process and I am trying to point out distinctions as between clauses.

Finally, under clause 29 the present avenues of appeal that may be found under various statutes, whether those statutes be the Tariff Board Act, the Broadcasting Act, the Railway Act, the National Energy Board Act or the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act, are preserved. An appeal that may lie from any one of these boards by way of petition for leave to the Supreme Court of Canada is now preserved, with the intermediate step of the federal board of appeal being added. In other words, the statutory appeal right, by adding an intermediate step, is preserved in all statutes. In most of these statutes an appeal lies from a federal board or tribunal on a matter of law or a matter of jurisdiction and, in some statutes, on a matter of mixed law and fact. Thus the three review and appeal procedures found under clauses 18, 28 and 29 are alternative and cumulative.

Mr. Lewis: Would the minister mind explaining again how he reads clause 29?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Yes, Mr. Speaker. If there is an appeal available from a board or commission under any statute currently in force, then that appeal is preserved; but there is an intermediate appeal to the federal court of appeal and thence to the Supreme Court of Canada. I think if you read clause 29 and then read section 31 which deals with appeals to the Supreme Court of Canada, this will be made clear.

Mr. Lewis: I do not see where the federal court of appeal comes in. I do not see where there is an intermediate step to the federal court of appeal. Does not clause 29 specifically say that where you have a right of appeal under another statute, then the right of review is removed?

Mr. Woolliams: That is right.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I do not read it that way. Let me say that clauses 18, 28 and 29 are not mutually exclusive provisions. They are alternative and cumulative. I think the opening words in clause 28 and the opening words in clause 29 make that quite clear. They say that a man who feels aggrieved or some entity that feels aggrieved may choose to proceed under clauses 18, 28 or 29, or under all at the same time, if that is open. That is the purpose of this; we hope that it will be so.

Why do we include all three clauses? Why should there not be some simplification? We want to make it perfectly clear, first of all, that we seek to preserve prerogative rights as they now exist, merely transferring them to the jurisdiction of the federal court instead of leaving them with the superior courts. The reason for that is this: one of the complaints of having multiple jurisdiction is that a federal board, such as the Canada Labour Relations Board, for example, could, under the present situation be deliberately harassed by a number of jurisdictions. Somebody who wants to attack a decision of the Canada

Labour Relations Board by a prerogative writ that is available in any one of the ten jurisdictions in Canada, can do so anywhere at the same time, and that is particularly so if the board is dealing with a matter involving a national employment situation. The same applies to the railway boards and broadcasting boards. I want to make it clear here that the attack open under prerogative writs is still available as they exist under common law, but that they will be now handled in one jurisdiction.

Mr. Woolliams: That will be pretty slow.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): It is also clear that clause 28 is limited to quasi-judicial or judicial matters. The hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) was perfectly right when he said that administrative decisions of boards would not be reviewable under clause 28. They still could be reviewable in so far as they are reviewable today in virtue of clause 18 under prerogative writs. In other words, clause 28 is not self-sufficient; it has to be completed by clause 18. If we are dealing with administrative matters, they can ordinarily be attacked by prerogative writs. In addition, there are certain matters of declaratory relief in special circumstances involving mandamus, where you are asking for a declaratory form of relief that would not be available under clause 28 as it is drawn but which would be available under the prerogative writ of mandamus, as available under clause 18. These are reasons for leaving prerogative writs intact, despite the provision of a new statutory method of review under clause 28.

Why was clause 28 limited to matters of a judicial or quasi-judicial nature? It was so limited because we wanted to make it perfectly clear that it is not the function nor will it be the function of the federal court, which is a continuation of the Exchequer Court, to substitute its judgment for Parliament's judgment on policy matters. These boards have been properly set up by Parliament and have been given powers delegated to them by Parliament to administer the policy set by Parliament. Under the Broadcasting Act the CRTC is given the power of interpreting and administering the Canadian Broadcasting policy; under the Railway Act, the Canadian Transport Commission is given power—and certainly this is so under the declaratory section and section 2—to administer the national transportation policy. It is not the function of a court, nor should it be the function of a court in my opinion, to substitute a judicial judgment for an administrative judgment in the exercise of administering that policy. But if the board assumes a judicial or quasi-judicial function and if it is deciding rights between parties or rights of the citizen as against the state, then it ought to be bound by principles of natural justice, to stay within its jurisdiction, to be compelled to exercise its jurisdiction and to be compelled to pay some regard to the facts before it. So, the distinction in clause 28 is between administrative matters on the one hand and judicial questions on the other, and is to ensure that the court is reviewing judicial and quasi-judicial matters only. It is not to be allowed to be used as a vehicle for substituting judicial policy for administrative policy, a policy that is given to that board by the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. Brewin: We certainly agree with that.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): That being so, the final clause is clause 29, which is still available. Under the statutes and the cases we do not want to abrogate a statutory right of appeal, whether that be taken under the Broadcasting Act, the Immigration Act or what have you. Thus those avenues of appeal are preserved.

If I may now talk to the specific amendment No. 4 proposed by the hon. member for Greenwood, it seems that he is proposing that we strike out clause 18. I believe that would lead to an unsatisfactory situation. We have studied this carefully. Of course, I will sleep on it one more night but, as I say, we studied this carefully and we feel it is necessary to include the clause in order to unify the jurisdiction over prerogative writs in one court instead of having them under ten courts. We believe that there are declaratory judgments available under prerogatory writs, particularly mandamus, preserved under clause 18 but not covered in clause 28.

We also believe that there must be some way of attacking unsound administrative judgments for which a remedy may still exist under clause 18, but not properly under clause 28.

We want to make it clear that in setting up these separate sections the prerogative writs are to remain intact and are merely transferred from one set of courts to one federal court.

The hon. member's second amendment, motion No. 7, I believe, would delete certain qualifying words. As I understand it, the words to be deleted in subclause (1) of clause 28 are, "decision or order, other than a decision or order of an administrative nature not required by law to be made on a judicial or quasi-judicial basis." I think I dealt with that.

Mr. Brewin: I think the law defines that.

• (5:40 p.m.)

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I think that is right. As a matter of fact, the definition of board or commission is wide enough to include a minister.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Does it also include ex-ministers who happen to be named Pickersgill?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Obviously an administrative decision made by a minister properly within his jurisdiction should not be caught under clause 28.

The final amendment of the hon. member for Greenwood with which we are dealing, No. 9, proposes that the jurisdiction conferred on the trial division of the federal court by clause 18 be conferred instead on the court of

appeal. I listened very carefully to the argument of the hon. member for Greenwood and his colleague the hon. member for York South. We felt that since the prerogative writs were traditionally exercised before one judge, they ought to remain before one judge.

We felt that on the review procedure which dealt with questions of jurisdiction, law, the facts and whether due regard had been given to the facts would be more appropriately dealt with by a three-man court of appeal. I suppose one of the reasons was cosmetic. If there is a five-man Canadian Transport Commission, or a three-man committee, and a number of members who comprise the CRTC, it is better psychologically to have a three-man court sit in judgment over a three, five or seven-man board. In terms of credibility, I think there is something to that. The hon. member for York South will say, "Fine. Why not have that same credibility exercised by way of prerogative writ?"

Mr. Lewis: You read my mind.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I did not read your mind. That is difficult. I read your smile.

Mr. Lewis: My smile will tell you more than my mind.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): In any event, the officials have given close attention to this. Their experience in this branch of the law is considerable, as I think my friends opposite will concede. Apparently 45 per cent to 50 per cent of the cases before this court involve the government of Canada. We responded to comments received from Members of the Bar. Two or three amendments were accepted in committee. As a result of further consultation, I will be making one or two technical amendments here. I will sleep on this. For the moment I want to preserve our position and I suggest that we reject the amendment.

Mr. Lewis: Just don't have insomnia.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The question is on motion No. 4. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Pursuant to Standing Order 75(11) the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred. The House will now proceed to motion No. 7.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think by agreement there may have been an order of the House that motion Nos. 4, 7 and 9 be taken together and that one vote would cover the three motions.

Mr. Brewin: That is correct. That is quite satisfactory.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Is it agreed that the vote on motion Nos. 4, 7 and 9 be deferred?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The following motion No. 5, is proposed by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams):

That Bill C-172, respecting the Federal Court of Canada, be amended by striking out lines 1 and 2 on page 18 thereof and substituting the following:

"28(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other Act, the Court"—

Mr. Woolliams: Motion Nos. 5 and 6 are to be taken together, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The following motion, No. 6, is proposed by the hon. member for Calgary North:

That Bill C-172, respecting the Federal Court of Canada, be amended by striking out paragraph (c) of subclause (1) of clause 28 on page 18 thereof and substituting the following:

"(c) based its decision or order on an erroneous finding of fact that it made in a perverse or capricious manner."

Mr. Woolliams: Before speaking on motion Nos. 5 and 6, I wish to withdraw motion No. 10. As Mr. Speaker did not permit motion Nos. 1 and 2, it is not necessary to have No. 10. It only dealt with the appeal. This applies to appeals in the courts of appeal of the various provinces. With the consent of the House, I will withdraw motion No. 10.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Does the House give unanimous consent to the hon. member to withdraw motion No. 10?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): I will be very brief in my remarks with regard to motion Nos. 5 and 6. My reason is that I hope the amendments of the

hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) are voted on first. If they are defeated, I will then ask that motion Nos. 5 and 6 be put because they are better than nothing. The amendments of the hon. member for Greenwood would cure the situation more effectively. Motion Nos. 5 and 6, are just a little cake, not the whole cake.

I do not want to repeat my argument regarding the duplication of Clauses 18, 28 and 29. I have already tried to point out some of the difficulties. I ask that my argument in reference to the amendments of the hon. member for Greenwood be incorporated into my argument with reference to motions Nos. 5 and 6. I see that the Minister of Justice is surprised at my brevity.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I agree with everything the hon. member has said, Mr. Speaker.

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

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The question is on motion No. 5. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): All those in favour will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

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

Some hon. Members: Nay.

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

And more than five members having risen:

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Pursuant to Standing Order 75(11) the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred. The House will now proceed to motion No. 6.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think there is agreement that motions Nos. 5 and 6 are to be taken together.

Mr. Woolliams: Motion Nos. 5 and 6 are together, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Is it agreed that the vote on motions Nos. 5 and 6 be deferred?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The following motion, No. 8 is proposed by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner):

That Bill C-172, respecting the Federal Court of Canada, be amended by (a) striking out line 26 on page 18 and substituting the following:

"party directly affected by the decision or"; and

(b) striking out line 31 on page 18 and substituting the following:

"General of Canada or to that party by".

• (5:50 p.m.)

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): This amendment proposes to change the word "person" to the word "party" in lines 26 and 31 on page 18. It is made for the purpose of clarification only and I do not believe it changes the substance or principle. We want to make it perfectly clear that it is only a party to the action, or a party to proceedings before a board, who would have the right to be a party in review proceedings. If this were not the case, a person who had no original interest in an action could at any time enter to review the decision or ruling and no final decision would ever be reached concerning a ruling by a board or tribunal.

Mr. Lewis: Such a pleasure to hear the minister make a sensible suggestion and I hasten to support it.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice) moved:

That Bill C-172, an act respecting the Federal Court of Canada, be amended by striking out lines 21 and 22 on page 19 and substituting the following:

"where provision is expressly made by an Act of the Parliament of Canada for an appeal as such to the"

He said: Mr. Speaker, this is simply a technical change.

Motion No. 11 agreed to.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice) moved:

That Bill C-172, an act respecting the Federal Court of Canada, be amended by striking out line 26 on page 20 and substituting the following:

"Federal Court of Appeal, whether or not leave to appeal to the Supreme Court has been refused by the Federal Court of Appeal."

He said: I will explain this, if I may, Mr. Speaker. This amendment is to make it clear that we want to avoid any suggestion that refusal of leave to appeal by the court of appeal would in any way preclude the Supreme Court of Canada from extending the right of appeal.

Motion No. 12 agreed to.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The House will now consider motion No. 13 in the name of the hon. member for Calgary North.

Mr. Woolliams: Could we go on with motions 14 and 15? I just want to check this out for a minute or two.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Does the House agree to stand consideration of motion 13 and proceed with the consideration of motions 14 and 15?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): We will turn now to motion No. 14 in the name of the hon. member for Greenwood.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood) moved:

That Bill C-172, an act respecting the Federal Court of Canada, be amended by striking out the words "or to federal-provincial relations," in subclause (2) of clause 41 at page 23.

Federal Court

He said: Mr. Speaker, we have made very good progress in the consideration of the report stage of this bill. The Minister of Justice has suggested to me that I might call it six o'clock, and I am very pleased to do so.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Does the House agree to call it six o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): It being six o'clock, the House will adjourn until two o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

At six o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to standing order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, October 29, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. MacDONALD (EGMONT)—INFORMATION LEADING TO INVOKING OF WAR MEASURES ACT

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege of which I have given you notice in accordance with paragraph 17(2) of our Standing Orders. It is one which affects the rights and privileges of all members of this House. It has to do with conflicting and misleading statements made by the Prime Minister and other members of the government with respect to the factors indicating a state of apprehended insurrection in the province of Quebec which necessitated the invocation of the War Measures Act. If it is the view of the House that there is in fact a prima facie case of privilege, I shall move that the question of an apprehended state of insurrection in Quebec and other matters related to the War Measures Act be referred to a special joint committee of both Houses of Parliament for a comprehensive inquiry, with a report to be made to both Houses with all possible dispatch.

The question relates to the information which led the government to invoke the War Measures Act. Replying to a question by the hon. member for York South, the Prime Minister stated, as reported in *Hansard* of October 28 at page 654:

> I am just saying that we acted on the information which is known to the House, which is known to Premier Bourassa, which is known to Mr. Drapeau and is known to ourselves as well as to all members.

A little later he said:

> I have answered repeatedly, Mr. Speaker, and I repeat again, that the information we had is available to everyone.

In an attempt to resolve the substantial difficulty which has arisen, particularly during the past few days, in connection with this matter, I asked the Prime Minister yesterday afternoon whether, having regard to the apparent state of confusion existing in the country with respect to the information which had been given, he or the government would consider setting up an independent commission to ascertain the facts. The Prime Minister replied as follows:

> I repeat for the umpteenth time that the facts on which we acted are known to the people.

He added that the only people who were confused were some politicians.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the same day as the Prime Minister gave that answer to the House, one of his own ministers stated in the city of Montreal, as reported in this morning's press, that a large amount of the intelligence gathered on the current Quebec crisis would "probably never be made public." The statement is attributed to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien). The report continues:

> A lot of information we have on hand comes from informants, some of them highly placed. It would endanger their situation as well.
>
> We have good and sufficient reasons for invoking the War Measures Act. There are other reasons as well, and we will probably never be able to make them public.

If this had been the only such statement or innuendo made during recent days in connection with the grave steps taken by the government, one might be willing to overlook it as a ministerial slip. But members of this House as well as the people of this country have been faced over succeeding days with comment after comment from minister after minister indicating that there was, in fact, a large amount of information which could not be made public at this time. Indeed, in his opening statement on the question of the invoking of the War Measures Act the Minister of Justice said, as reported on page 212 of *Hansard* of October 16:

> As I said earlier, this has to be a question of judgment based on the information available to members of the cabinet. Needless to say, some of that information, because of the current state of affairs, is not information which necessarily can be made public.

• (2:10 p.m.)

Later in the same speech the Minister of Justice said, as reported at page 215:

> It is my hope that some day the full details of the intelligence upon which the government acted can be made public—

We in this House, Mr. Speaker, are charged quite literally with the basic institutions of law and order in this country. We have in some measure been asked by the government to give our support to the invoking of the most serious form of legislation possible affecting the ordinary rights, privileges and responsibilities that are exercised in this country. But in terms of why it was necessary to take this action and why the House should give its support, we have been treated over succeeding days to conflicting information and rumour both inside the House and outside.

For example, just the other day, not in this House but on a well-documented radio program, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) introduced into a most critical municipal election campaign suggestions concerning one legitimate political party in the city of Montreal.

There have also in recent days been rumours circulated in this House in regard to the kind of opposition—the kind of parallel power, to use the Prime Minister's

term—that might be endangering the government of the province of Quebec. Suggestions are even being raised that perhaps some of that power lay within the government of Quebec itself.

The War Measures Act has been in effect now for 13 days and has substantially affected the freedom and the entrusted rights of all Canadians. To this date we have not received a clear statement from the government of this country or from the Prime Minister as to the necessity for the step that has been taken.

I believe—and in this respect I plead with the Prime Minister—that in order to do justice to the people of this country it is imperative that the kind of misleading and conflicting statements that are being made both inside and outside the House cease. In addition, to clarify matters the Prime Minister should offer to the House at this time a statement fully clarifying the confusion that exists, not just among politicians at far ends of the country but within the government itself.

If the Prime Minister is not able to make this statement, I trust he will realize that it is certainly in the best interests of the country to establish some form of independent body, whether it be a joint committee of the two Houses of Parliament, as I have suggested, or a commission as suggested by a number of eminent persons in this country during recent days. Without that kind of information we will be increasingly treated to questions of privilege and to confusion which can but demoralize and greatly exacerbate tensions that presently exist in this country.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member has given the Chair the notice required under the Standing Orders, and I have given some serious thought to the most important problem raised in the hon. member's suggested question of privilege. As he and all hon. members realize, the decision that has to be made by the Chair now is not whether this is an urgent matter, whether it is an important matter, or whether or not it should be discussed by the House; the problem I have to determine and the decision that has to be made is whether there is here a question of privilege.

I have had opportunity on a number of occasions to indicate what, in my view, a question of privilege consists of. I have serious doubts whether, even in view of the serious conditions outlined by the hon. member, there is a question of privilege or that a question of privilege should be the vehicle used by the House for the consideration of the matter raised by the hon. member. As I read his motion, I have the distinct impression it is a rather substantive motion. What he proposes is really not so much that conflicting statements be studied but that this whole matter be considered by a special joint committee of both Houses of Parliament. He proposes a comprehensive inquiry by way of a joint committee or perhaps in some other way. That, in my view, is not really a question of privilege.

There are a number of precedents which indicate that in circumstances such as those indicated by the hon. member for Egmont there is no justification on the part of the Chair to rule that there is a prima facie case of privilege. I refer hon. members particularly to Citation 113 of Beauchesne's fourth edition.

My conclusion must be that the hon. member's proposal is, rather, a substantive motion and that perhaps he will find some other way to have his proposal considered by the House. I suggest it cannot be done by way of a question of privilege at this time.

[Mr. MacDonald (Egmont).]

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

TRANSPORT

WESTERN ONTARIO—ELIMINATION OF PASSENGER TRAIN SERVICE—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. W. M. Howe (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43 I ask the unanimous consent of the House to propose a motion in the following case of urgent and pressing necessity. I refer to the decision of the Canadian Transport Commission cutting off over 400 miles of passenger train service in western Ontario, ending a vital service of over 80 years duration and reducing development possibilities. The final train will be on November 1.

Therefore, if the House gives unanimous consent, I intend to move that the whole question be re-examined by the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications in order to bring in amendments to the Railway Act involving reduction or discontinuance of rail service as suggested by the studies being conducted by the CTC and the provincial government of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion proposed by the hon. member for Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo. This motion is proposed under the terms of Standing Order 43 which requires unanimous consent of the House. Is there unanimous consent?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will have heard the same nays I heard. In the circumstances the motion cannot be put.

* * *

GRAIN

TABLING OF PROPOSAL FOR PRODUCTION AND RECEIPTS POLICY

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table under Standing Order 41(2) copies in both official languages of a proposal for a production and grains receipts policy for the western grains industry.

FINANCE

TABLING OF TARIFF BOARD REPORT ON KNITTED OUTER GARMENTS

Mr. P. M. Mahoney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Finance, in accordance with Section 6 of the Tariff Board Act I should like to table copies in both English and French of the report of the Tariff Board respecting knitted outer garments, Reference No. 145, together with a transcript of the proceedings at the public hearings held by the board. Any interested parties who wish to comment on this report should submit their views promptly to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

* * *

[*Translation*]

ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES READJUSTMENT ACT

MEASURE TO CHANGE NAME OF CONSTITUENCY

Mr. Gérald Laniel (Beauharnois) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-178, respecting the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

• (2:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

NATIONAL SECURITY

WAR MEASURES ACT—DETENTIONS BEYOND SEVEN DAYS —ACCESS TO COUNSEL—INDEPENDENT COMMISSION

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Justice whether he can now tell the House how many of the 138 persons detained under the War Measures Act regulations have been detained for longer than seven days at the request of the Minister of Justice of Quebec?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I was talking to the Attorney General of Quebec about 25 minutes ago. Because of other pressing matters he tells me he has not been able to compile the statistics but hopes to get them to me later in the afternoon. I apologize to the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Stanfield: In view of complaints from the Quebec Bar that access to counsel has been denied prisoners held under the war measures regulations and in view of the sort of suspicions this kind of complaint engenders, will the Minister of Justice assure the House that the government will take steps promptly to guarantee that prisoners have access to counsel? I remind the minister that his government has the responsibility to ensure this in that it is his government that issued the regulations that permitted this to happen.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I shall repeat what I said. It is true that the regulations issued

from this government, but the administration of justice under the regulations, as is the case under the Criminal Code, devolves upon the responsibility of the Attorney General of Quebec. It was to the Attorney General of Quebec that the Bar of Quebec made its submissions, and I feel he is perfectly capable of responding to those submissions and handling the situation as justice demands.

An hon. Member: They felt there was no use sending them to you.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, may I remind the Minister of Justice that it is his government which is responsible for this situation and that the responsibility cannot be sloughed off on the government of Quebec.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I therefore ask the minister whether the government will appoint a commission, as was done even in wartime by a previous Liberal government—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: —to examine into possible abuses regarding searches, arrests and detentions in all parts of the country? Will the ministers of this government accept their responsibility, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The government is accepting its responsibility fully, but we understand how a federal state operates a little better than the Leader of the Opposition does.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): A commission along the lines—

An hon. Member: Heil Hitler!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): —referred to by the Leader of the Opposition has already been appointed by the Attorney General of Quebec.

Mr. Stanfield: What about the other provinces?

Mr. Speaker: The right hon. member for Prince Albert on a supplementary.

INFORMATION LEADING TO INVOKING OF WAR MEASURES ACT

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): I do not know whether this is exactly a supplementary, Your Honour, but it arises out of the motion proposed by the hon. member for Egmont. It has to do with information which has been denied the House of Commons. I ask the Prime Minister whether he has seen the report of the interview of the mayor of Montreal who was quoted as saying that the revolution was started and would have proceeded when the War Measures Act was brought into effect and, furthermore, that the provisional government that was to be set up by some "well-meaning" people in

Quebec would not have been formed with the idea of turning over powers to revolutionaries. Then, he is quoted as saying that conversations were held on this question not only in Montreal but in other parts of the province. I ask the Prime Minister whether it is a fact that the circumstances outlined by Mayor Drapeau, on which this House has received no information, are in accordance with the facts?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): He is asking if facts are in accordance with facts, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: This is a serious matter.

Mr. Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): You are Prime Minister; try to act like one!

Mr. Diefenbaker: The Prime Minister should cease to suffer from a dyspeptic annoyance with Parliament.

I ask him, was there such an arrangement among various people to form a provisional government in Quebec, and was it a fact that a revolution would have taken place within a matter of a very few hours apparently unless the War Measures Act were brought in? Can he tell us the truth for once in this House?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Diefenbaker: Silence is golden, but is the Prime Minister not going to tell the House the truth?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: He is silent.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

WAR MEASURES ACT—SUGGESTED EARLY REVOCATION IF DETENTIONS CONTINUE WITHOUT CHARGE

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): I wish to address a supplementary question to the Minister of Justice, but perhaps it could also be addressed to the Prime Minister. If the situation outlined continues whereby under the regulations passed under the War Measures Act people are being held without any charges against them and without the opportunity to consult their counsel, will the government give consideration to an early measure revoking the application of the War Measures Act?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): That is a hypothetical question, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary to the Minister of Justice.

Has anyone told him that Michel Chartrand is being kept in jail to teach French and religion?

INFORMATION LEADING TO INVOKING OF WAR MEASURES ACT

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a supplementary question to the Prime Minister.

For the benefit of hon. members, may I ask if the rumour about the formation of a provisional government was one of the valid arguments to justify the government's action in the crisis we are facing?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, with all the patience of which I am capable, I shall repeat that the reasons why the government took its decision were stated in the House by myself many times. I want to point out that members of the opposition knew those reasons when 190 of them supported the government resolution against a dozen or so. It is for those same reasons that the people have given us their support ever since.

That other reasons may be bandied about as rumours or fantasies, or that the former Leader of the Opposition may himself have some information that is unknown to us, that is a question that some may wish to raise in the House. For our part, we have based our decision on the facts known to the people, of which we have informed the House, and which the opposition accepted when it voted in favour of our resolution. Those are the facts that remain.

Now, if the hon. members of the opposition wish to spread rumours, be they true or false or pure fantasy—

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Korchinski: Four ministers said there were more.

[*Translation*]

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a supplementary question.

As I referred to that rumour—since I believe that the establishment of a provisional government is but a rumour—and as the Prime Minister replied that in any case a rumour may be allowed to exist, can he assert that he considers the possibility of a provisional government nothing more than a rumour?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I replied to that question only the other day. I have several times given the three reasons for our move, the third being not only the disappearance of dynamite and arms but also the state of confusion and the forecasting of violence in the province of Quebec. Of course this state of confusion is interpreted by each in his own way. All I want to point out is that for the past few days it has not been the government but rather the opposition and the press gallery that have been launching other rumours. Let them take the responsibility for these and check their accuracy—

[*English*]

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, can the right hon. gentleman advise whether, before the imposition of the War Measures Act, he was categorically

advised by the Prime Minister of Quebec and/or the mayor of Montreal that such a plan did exist for a provisional government to take over the province of Quebec, and did he believe these statements if they were made to him?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I have stated the positions on which this government acted. They included advice from the government of Quebec and from the authorities of Montreal. Whether they believed these rumours or not is a matter for them to tell the House.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: I am telling the House—

An hon. Member: You are evading the truth.

Mr. Trudeau: I am telling the House we did not act on anything else than what is before the House. I am not saying we did not have any other information, but I am saying that if hon. members opposite want to use this information, let them take the credit for it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for York South have a supplementary question?

Mr. Lewis: No, I have not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for York South was deprived yesterday when he considered what he wanted to ask not to be a supplementary and it turned out afterwards that in my estimation it was. In light of yesterday's experience I feel sure that his question today is not supplementary, so I will recognize the hon. member for Portneuf.

[*Translation*]

WAR MEASURES ACT—AUTHORITY OF QUEBEC OMBUDSMAN

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Justice.

Could he tell us whether the ombudsman, or the protector of Quebec citizens, is subject to the regulations under the War Measures Act, or whether he can waive them, so that political prisoners may freely communicate with him?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I did not understand the question.

Mr. Godin: Can the Minister of Justice tell us whether the ombudsman, or protector of Quebec citizens, is subject to the regulations under the War Measures Act, or whether he can waive them, so that political prisoners may freely communicate with him?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is asking the Minister of Justice for a legal opinion. I do not feel that this question, as put, is in order.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*English*]

INFORMATION LEADING TO INVOKING OF WAR MEASURES ACT—STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. In light of his repeated statement this afternoon, can he indicate why it has been necessary for members of his government to make statements outside the House, and occasionally within it, indicating there is other important information which in effect motivated the government to make the decision it did in respect of the War Measures Act?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member will recognize that couched in those terms this is an argument. Perhaps he would like to rephrase the question. He asked why is it necessary for members of the government to make statements. Perhaps that question should be rephrased.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I will simply ask the Prime Minister whether it is government policy for ministers to make statements with respect to other reasons concerning the apprehended insurrection in the province of Quebec?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker.

EXTENT OF SEARCH FOR KIDNAPPERS AND ASSASSINS—PARTICIPATION BY INTERPOL

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask either the Minister of Justice or the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Attorney General—

Mr. Woolliams: The Solicitor General.

Mr. Korchinski: I am sorry, the Solicitor General—whether in fact the search for the abductors and assassins is confined to the province of Quebec under the direction of the Attorney General of that province or has extended to other provinces, and whether at this particular time, in view of the fact that it is now some three weeks since the original abduction took place, Interpol has been asked to participate in the search for some of these people who may have gone to other countries?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, that is such a detailed question that I think the Solicitor General ought to answer it. I will take it as notice for him.

QUEBEC—LOCATING OF STOLEN DYNAMITE AND GUNS

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, in view of the Prime Minister's statement and the statement of the Minister of Justice, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice whether the quantity of dynamite and the number of guns that were stolen have been found?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the police report to the Solicitor General, and I will take this question as notice for him.

Inquiries of the Ministry

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

FOREIGN TAKEOVERS—LEGISLATION TO AMEND COMBINES INVESTIGATION ACT—POLICY STATEMENT

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have got a little weary of non-answers so I want to ask some questions on another subject.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): What about non-questions?

Mr. Lewis: They were not non-questions; they were non-answers. I would like to ask the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs a question arising out of the latest figures of domestic and foreign takeovers, which show that in 1969 there was a larger number of foreign takeovers than in 1968, which in turn had shown double the number of several preceding years. In view of this situation I want to ask him when we may expect his promised legislation on the Combines Act, and whether that legislation will deal with foreign takeovers in a distinct way from domestic takeovers?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the legislation will be read the first time as soon as it is ready. Of course it would be improper for me to answer the second part of the question at this time.

Mr. Lewis: "As soon as it is ready" does not give very much information. May I ask the minister whether the legislation is ready or almost ready and whether we may expect it very soon?

Mr. Basford: I am working very hard on it, Mr. Speaker, and I have indicated a number of times that I hope to have it introduced as soon as possible.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of National Revenue I wish to direct a supplementary question to the right hon. Prime Minister. Can the Prime Minister tell us when we may expect the government statement of policy on foreign ownership in Canada, whether it is to be delayed some months or whether we can expect it in a few days or weeks?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Certainly not in a few days and more likely months than weeks, Mr. Speaker.

TAKEOVER OF CANADIAN FUNERAL FIRMS BY UNITED STATES CORPORATIONS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In view of the fact that, in the interim since I asked a question about this matter on April 7, some 23 Canadian funeral firms have been taken over by two United States corporations, will the government look into this matter in the hope that Canadians may at least be buried by Canadians?

Mr. Hees: Stan, you are dead right.

[Mr. Turner.]

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate the hon. member's concern with the ownership of funeral parlours.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Basford: The government, through the Director of Investigation and Research in my department, has been examining the situation for quite some time.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): As a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, may I ask if this investigation will be completed in time for the burial of the government in 1972?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

[*Translation*]

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

AID TO VICTIMS OF CRIME

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Justice.

On May 15 and 21, 1969, in answer to a question that I had put to him, he indicated that he would study the advisability of establishing a commission to compensate victims of criminal acts. He said also, as is reported in *Hansard,* that he would submit this question to the commissioners responsible for the uniformity of law and to the provincial Attorneys General.

Could he say whether these discussions are completed and if he intends to inform the House forthwith about the state of the question, in the light of the events taking place in Quebec?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the hon. member for giving me notice of his question. I discussed this matter with the ten Attorneys General of Canada in Halifax, in July last. I submitted the question to the commissioners responsible for the uniformity of law in the province of Prince Edward Island in August and September, and I can provide the hon. member, by letter or orally, with a more detailed report.

* * *

[*English*]

FINANCE

SUGGESTED REPEGGING OF CANADIAN DOLLAR

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Will the minister consult with his colleague the Minister of Finance with a view to making an immediate annoucement with respect to the repegging of the Canadian dollar at an appropriate figure? I ask this question because of the immediate dangers facing secondary industry in Ontario and Quebec, where thousands of jobs—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Minister of Finance.

Mr. Nesbitt: Your Honour, with respect, I directed the question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure the Minister of Finance would like to know at what level the hon. member would like to have the dollar pegged.

* * *

LABOUR RELATIONS

GENERAL MOTORS STRIKE—ACTION TO EXPEDITE SETTLEMENT

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour concerning the 24,500 Canadian auto workers now engaged in a strike against General Motors of Canada. Could the Minister indicate to the House what steps his department has taken to expedite the early settlement of this strike which is now well into its sixth week, or is the matter being left entirely to the United States union, management and government to negotiate terms and conditions for Canadian workers?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): No, Mr. Speaker, the problem is left precisely where it should be, in the hands of the Department of Labour of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Mazankowski: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Labour. Since the lengthy duration of this strike is now resulting in serious adverse economic conditions throughout the whole country, is the minister not giving any consideration to intervening with the object of bringing about an early settlement?

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, I have been taught for many years in the House of Commons to respect the constitution, and this matter falls entirely within the ambit of the Department of Labour of the province of Ontario.

* * *

URBAN AFFAIRS

TRANSPORTATION PROGRAMS

Mr. S. Perry Ryan (Spadina): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the minister responsible for housing and urban affairs. In response to the Speech from the Throne the minister has put considerable emphasis on the problem of urban transportation. Is the minister in a position to tell the House if his department is presently working with the provinces in order to develop new programs for urban transportation and, if so, when will they be announced?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, first may I point out that, as indicated by the Speech from the Throne, it is not a department that is contemplated but a ministry system. I think it has been indicated also in the Speech from the Throne and in my subsequent remarks that all matters relevant to urban problems will be discussed with the provinces.

Inquiries of the Ministry

HOUSING

PROVISION OF ACCOMMODATION FOR THOSE BELOW POVERTY LINE

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): Mr. Speaker, would the minister in charge of housing indicate whether any consideration is being given to mounting a more concentrated effort on housing for those below the poverty line?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, we have increased our attention to that sector of the market very dramatically during the last two years, having in fact made commitments to housing starts for low income people equal to the total production in that area during the previous history of the National Housing Act.

* * *

INDIAN AFFAIRS

CONVERSION OF COQUALEETZA HOSPITAL INTO COMMUNITY CENTRE

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare which is being asked by a lot of people outside the House. Why have the minister and the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development not been able to put their heads together and come up with a plan for turning the old Coqualeetza Indian hospital into an Indian community centre? Can he give any indication when they may be able to get together and bring this project into being?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am not sure that the first part of the question is in order but perhaps the minister might wish to reply to the second part of the hon. member's question.

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I have to advise the hon. member that the Minister for Indian Affairs and Northern Development and myself have got together on this question on several occasions. Within the last ten days we got together with the Indian people concerned and are working out the details of the transfer now with Indian Affairs so that this facility can be made available for the Indians.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, can the hon. gentleman explain why the feasibility study of the Coqualeetza hospital languished in somebody's department without coming to the attention of the appropriate officials for a long period of time?

Mr. Munro: Mr. Speaker, I would advise the hon. member for Skeena that I do not agree with his statement of facts at all. I do not think it languished. I think it was analysed quite completely so that we could realistically discuss it with the Indian people.

Inquiries of the Ministry

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

APPROPRIATENESS OF PROGRAM "AVALANCHE" SUBSTITUTED FOR FILM, "THE LEGACY OF LENIN"

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I wished to direct a question to the Secretary of State who was due to be in the House today but in his absence I shall direct it to the acting minister. Would the acting minister ask the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation why it was, when choosing a replacement for the film, "The Legacy of Lenin", which was due to appear on Tuesday night, they chose the program "Avalanche" inasmuch as in the middle of that program one full minute was devoted to the making of home-made bombs out of paint cans and sticks of dynamite? Does the minister not consider that this was a particularly inappropriate time for such instructions to be given to the Canadian people?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) I will take notice of the question which will be answered later.

* * *

[*English*]

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

INCREASED RECRUITMENT OF FRENCH-SPEAKING CANADIANS

Mr. C. Terrence Murphy (Sault Ste. Marie): Mr. Speaker, my question should properly be put to the Solicitor General but in his absence I shall address it to the right hon. Prime Minister. Is any action being taken to step up recruitment of French-speaking Canadians for service in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have some doubt that the question is one which can be asked at this time. I recognize that the matter is one of importance but I would think this is the kind of question which could be considered at the time of adjournment. I do not want to be unfair to the hon. member and if the minister responsible would like to reply in due course perhaps he could do so.

* * *

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

NUTRITIONAL VALUE OF ENRICHED BREAD—INDICATION ON WRAPPERS

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Have any of his officials initiated steps to find out the nutritional value of the widely advertised enriched bread?

Mr. Speaker: I would think that this is a question which could be placed on the order paper. It is difficult for the Chair to determine which questions can be answered immediately but the recourse of hon. members, of course, is to return at the time of adjournment if there is urgency and if in the opinion of hon. members my judgment is wrong. If there is urgency, perhaps the minister might like to answer.

Mr. Hales: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I might rephrase my question and ask the minister whether he or his department is giving consideration to the placing on the wrappers of enriched bread the nutritional value—the mineral content and vitamins?

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me that even the redrafted question should normally be placed on the order paper.

Mr. Baldwin: Try it on some of the government backbenchers.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

DAIRYING—POLICY RESPECTING REDUCTION OF GRANTS

Mr. Adrien Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, in spite of the present situation mankind will still have to be fed. For this reason I wish to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

In the light of the decision of Common Market countries to vote a budget of $3,600 million for subsidies to agricultural producers in those countries in order to increase production and assist farmers, will the Minister of Agriculture tell the House whether he will maintain his policy aimed at reducing the subsidies which are being paid to Canadian industrial milk producers at the present time?

[*English*]

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, there have been some very useful discussions going on between the provincial governments as well as the provincial milk marketing agencies and the Canadian Dairy Commission. I hope that within a reasonably short time we will be able to make an announcement on new agreements reached that will further the income potential of the dairy producers.

* * *

HEALTH

PREMARITAL TESTS FOR VENEREAL DISEASE

Hon. J. W. Monteith (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask a question of the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Is the minister considering urging every province in Canada to introduce tests for venereal disease on a premarital basis, as is done in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba? I ask this question as a result of statements attributed to Dr. Stanley Acres of the department in last night's Ottawa *Citizen*.

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. member will allow me to take this question as notice.

GRAIN

WHEAT—PRICES OF GRADES IN SALES

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Manpower and Immigration whether he is prepared to provide the House with information indicating the price that was paid for grades one, two, three and four of wheat since the $1.60 a bushel is about 50 cents lower than the price which two years ago the farmers themselves and the farm organizations rejected and asked for at least a dollar more on domestic sales of wheat?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I am always delighted to provide information to the House but I am afraid I do not understand the hon. member's reference to $1.60 in his question.

Mr. Korchinski: Mr. Speaker, at $160 million for 98 million bushels of wheat, a rough calculation is $1.60 a bushel.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to comment on the hon. member's quick mathematics, but now that he has referred, I take it, to the Chinese sale and has given the quantity and totals I can only say that the question of exact prices in transactions of that sort is considered by the Wheat Board to be confidential commercial information.

Mr. Hees: I have a supplementary question for the minister responsible for the Wheat Board. Does the professor not think it is about time he returned to take a refresher course at college?

* * *

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

CORNWALL—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON STUDIES AND PROGRAMS

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): I have a question for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Will the minister give consideration to making a statement on motions outlining the results of studies made by the federal government and the government of Ontario into the heavy unemployment in the Cornwall area and an early start on various programs under the provisions of the DREA legislation?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, we are actively dealing with employment conditions in the Cornwall area.

* * *

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

ESTABLISHMENT OF FUR FARM RESEARCH CENTRE

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey-Simcoe): I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has any progress been made in the establishment of the fur farm research centre in the vicinity of Ottawa? If so, what is the target date for its completion?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): I will attempt to get more detailed information on this question and reply to the hon. member very soon.

* * *

FISHERIES

LIMITING OF HERRING CATCHES BY INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): My question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. In view of the decline in available protein foods for human consumption, has any effort been made by the minister or officials of his department to secure through international means agreement to limit the catches of herring now being processed as fishmeal among countries that are members of the International Commission for the North Atlantic Fisheries?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, some discussions along those lines are already under way.

[*Later:*]

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. In view of the research being carried out by Canada, the United States and the U.S.S.R. regarding the herring fishery on the east coast of Canada, can the minister indicate whether the Canadian government is proposing a quota system to limit catches of herring, especially by the Republic of Germany, the biggest offender on the east coast?

Mr. Davis: As the hon. member knows, Mr. Speaker, we are now carrying out investigations to determine what the herring stock is and how it moves nationally and internationally. When we have this information we will move toward a sustained yield fishery as rapidly as we can.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

INFILTRATION BY FLQ OF STRATEGIC PLACES

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): I have a question for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. Further to the minister's statement of October 16 with respect to infiltration into strategic places in Quebec by the FLQ and the Senate debate yesterday, does the minister think that the reason the kidnappers have not been apprehended is because of this infiltration? Does he agree that the said strategic places are correctly identified as the press, radio, CBC and education?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is asking a question in a form difficult to accept from the point of view of the Chair. The minister is being asked to express an opinion.

Mr. Bell: May I rephrase my question? Are these strategic places mentioned by the minister on October 16 as identified in the Senate, namely, the CBC, radio, press and education?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I do not think that I identified the places. If some did, they could give some explanations to the hon. member.

* * *

[*English*]

GRAIN

PROPOSAL FOR PRODUCTION AND RECEIPTS POLICY

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): I wish to direct my question to the minister in charge of the Wheat Board. In light of the document the minister tabled earlier today, has the government decided to implement any of the proposals in the document, or is it to be considered as a white paper and that they are proposals only?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, my purpose in tabling the document was to allow the producer organizations a further opportunity for discussion. As the document reveals, there are a good number of details in the program to be settled. As we go forward, we hope the discussions with producer organizations, the various provincial Ministers of Agriculture and others will lead to completion of the details of the program.

* * *

HEALTH

MEDICARE—DISCUSSION OF COST SHARING FOR PARAMEDICAL SERVICES AT CONFERENCE WITH PROVINCIAL MINISTERS

Mr. Len Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo): I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Will the minister advise the House if in his forthcoming meetings with his provincial counterparts he will be discussing the whole subject of cost-sharing for paramedical services under medicare?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I am advised, Mr. Speaker, that this matter will be raised by the provincial ministers for discussion at that conference. Whether it will cover the entire range of paramedical services is not known at this time, but certainly many aspects of it.

Mr. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo): A supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I appreciate the fact that the hon. member wants to ask a supplementary. I have intervened during the last two or three questions to suggest that we should not have supplementaries because there are only four or five minutes remaining in the question period. Perhaps the hon. member can ask his supplementary and I will then return to the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre who was denied a supplementary a few moments ago. We will try to get on as quickly as we can.

Mr. Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo): Will the minister advise the House which services will be discussed?

Mr. Munro: I would advise the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, that the agenda is still in a tentative stage. We are trying to arrive at some agreement with the provinces as to what items will be discussed. It seems quite definite that this area will be discussed, with special emphasis, no doubt, on optometry.

* * *

GRAIN

PROPOSAL FOR PRODUCTION AND RECEIPTS POLICY

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Does the minister in charge of the Wheat Board have in mind any scheduled time for discussions on the document he tabled today? What is the latest date for his making an announcement to the House on the decisions the government has made?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): I cannot set forth a precise timetable, but we do consider the matter of some urgency and we will find it very important to move toward the legislative stage on these proposals, many of which require legislation to put them into force.

BARLEY—AMOUNT OF FINAL PAYMENT TO FARMERS

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): I have a question for the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. On October 6 I ask the minister if he would consider the possibility of forecasting the final payment for barley in view of the concern in western Canada as to how and when the farmers should market this product. I appreciate the concern of the minister at that time. He promised me he would study the matter to see whether he could ascertain a reliable forecast as to what the final payment would be. Is he now in a position to give the House the benefit of his wisdom in that regard?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): What I indicated was that I would be willing to look at the question to see whether in fact an earlier date could be selected for any such forecast. I am sorry to say I am no farther ahead at this stage.

Mr. Horner: A supplementary question—

Mr. Speaker: Order. As there are only two or three minutes remaining in the question period, I wonder whether the hon. member would mind if other members were permitted to ask questions?

NATIONAL SECURITY

WAR MEASURES ACT—STATUS OF ARMED DEER HUNTERS

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Darmouth-Halifax East): My question is for the Solicitor General. In his absence I direct it to one of the ministers of the Crown so that perhaps something will be done. On Monday the deer hunting season in Quebec opens for the first time in three years. I am concerned about the safety of non-residents of that province, including Americans, who enter that province for the purpose of deer hunting with all the necessary arms. What is the status of these people under the War Measures Act?

FEDERAL INITIATIVES FOLLOWING EVIDENCE OF MR. SAULNIER BEFORE COMMITTEE

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): My question is directed to the Minister of Justice. It is prompted by the answers of the minister to some earlier exchanges. In view of the fact that the minister understands the federal system and discharges his duties, can he inform the House whether he was one of the ministers who reviewed the evidence of Mr. Saulnier in light of the recommendation in the first report of the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts which was tabled in this House on December 5, 1969, for further study and consideration, as stated in the last sentence of the report? What federal initiatives, if any, were taken between the time of the tabling of the report with Mr. Saulnier's evidence and the opening of the letters by the minister or the Prime Minister which were received from Mr. Bourassa and Mr. Drapeau one year later?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): It is true that evidence was reviewed, Mr. Speaker, but as I have stated in the House on other occasions, the primary responsibility for prosecutions at that time lay with either the police of Montreal or the Attorney General of Quebec. They saw fit not to prosecute.

KIDNAPPING OF JAMES CROSS—OFFERING OF REWARD BY PRIVATE INTERESTS—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): I wish to ask the Minister of Justice whether the matter of the reward offered by two private enterprises in connection with the Cross case was discussed with the government prior to the offer? In light of that and of other recent events, is the government now reconsidering the matter of a reward in this matter?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): I will take the question as notice, Mr. Speaker. The last time the question was asked it was directed to the Solicitor General who stated he would report to the House in due course. I think I ought to leave it that way.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS RESPECTING NEWS PROGRAMS

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): I have a question I should like to direct to the Minister of Regional

Economic Expansion in the absence of the Secretary of State. Would he ask his colleague to inquire of the CBC, both French and English networks, whether any special instructions have been issued during the past two weeks concerning the delivery of news on either network, and whether, should such instructions have been issued, the minister would make a statement concerning them in the House?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I shall refer the matter to the Secretary of State.

* * *

SOCIAL SECURITY

ISSUING OF INSURANCE CARDS TO NON-CANADIANS

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Labour.

Could he inform the House whether the Unemployment Insurance Commission has the authority to issue social insurance cards to individuals who are not recognized as Canadians, such as American Army deserters, or to other classes of individuals who have entered Canada illegally?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member's question could be placed on the order paper.

* * *

[*English*]

NATURAL RESOURCES

SHUTTING OFF OF NELSON RIVER FLOW—PROTECTION OF AQUATIC ENVIRONMENT

Mr. Gerald Richard Cobbe (Portage): I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. Is it a fact that the total flow of the Nelson River, Manitoba, was shut off as of yesterday and, if so, was his department notified of this action?

Mr. Speaker: The question is asked in terms which are perhaps not entirely correct from a procedural standpoint, but I suggest the minister should be allowed to reply.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Officials of my department have been in touch with the Department of Mines and Natural Resources in Manitoba and with the Manitoba Hydro Electric Commission. We have drawn their attention to section 20 of the Fisheries Act and we have asked that a minimum flow be allowed to go down the river so as to protect the aquatic environment there.

* * *

POST OFFICE

PLANS FOR DEPARTMENTAL REORGANIZATION

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Com-

munications and Postmaster General. In December 1969, the minister tabled a study entitled "A Blueprint for Change", and in tabling this document he stated that a white paper revealing the government's plans for a thorough reorganization of the department would be released at an early date. Can the hon. gentleman advise the House when this white paper will be tabled in view of continuing widespread concern with regard to postal services in Canada?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications): I suggest the hon. member should put that question to my colleague who is in charge of postal operations.

An hon. Member: Aren't you glad?

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Might I be permitted to ask the Leader of the House what the business is likely to be during the coming week?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): The following is a tentative outline of government business for the coming week. We shall continue today with government order No. 11, the Federal Court bill, and when that is completed we shall resume debate on government order No. 9, Bill C-4 with respect to the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act. When that is finished we shall take up government order No. 10, Bill C-5, with respect to Deuterium of Canada Limited.

On Monday, we shall probably consider government order 18, Bill C-174 establishing the tax review board, and follow that with government order No. 21, Bill C-177 respecting co-operative associations. It is expected that next Thursday will be an opposition day under the auspices, I believe, of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. Baldwin: Is it the intention of the government to bring in, and commence debate on, a bill to replace the War Measures Act within the next week?

Mr. MacEachen: I stated that this was a tentative outline; it may be we shall be in a position next week to interrupt this business and deal with the measure the hon. member has mentioned.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

FEDERAL COURT

MEASURE RESPECTING CONSTITUTION, JURISDICTION, ADMINISTRATION, ETC.

The House resumed from Wednesday, October 28, consideration of Bill C-172, respecting the Federal Court of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

[Mr. Southam.]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. As hon. members know, there was a discussion yesterday in the House in connection with two of the motions which were under consideration. They were submitted for the consideration of the House in the name of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams). The suggestion was made by the Chair that there was some procedural difficulty with regard to these amendments. The Chair also indicated to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) that motion No. 19 also appeared to be out of order. No argument was submitted at the time and I said I would be prepared, when we reached that item, to hear arguments either for or against the acceptability of that amendment.

Since then there have been discussions with the hon. member for Calgary North, the Minister of Justice and other hon. members. It was felt that, bearing in mind the work which had gone on during the committee stage, when this bill was under consideration, it might be the desire of the House to have a debate on the motions which were considered out of order by the Chair, that is, motions Nos. 1 and 2. For this purpose these motions would eventually be put to the House.

For the moment, my understanding is that when the House adjourned yesterday we had begun consideration of motion No. 14 in the name of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) who had the floor. Perhaps, after we have completed consideration of this particular motion, we might return to motions Nos. 1 and 2 in the name of the hon. member for Calgary North.

Mr. Woolliams: I should just like to say that I appreciate the Chair taking this course; I assume the House has agreed to it. We on this side certainly agree to a discussion of the motion in the name of the Minister of Justice to which Your Honour referred.

Mr. Speaker: The Chair put it in this way—that I assumed this was the wish of the House. I take it that it is, and that is why I indicated the motions would be put in due course. But for the moment, the hon. member for Greenwood has the floor.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, the amendment in my name, motion No. 14, proposes to strike out of clause 41 the words which are found in 41(2)—"or to federal-provincial relations."

Members of the House who are interested in this matter know that section 41 as a whole deals with the disclosure of documents in proceedings before the federal court which is to be established. The amendment I propose is not a sweeping one, but it does involve an important matter of principle. It represents an effort to break down to some extent the iron curtain of secrecy unnecessarily thrown around public documents. In explaining it I should like, first of all, to refer to 41(1). This is a section which enables a Minister of the Crown—how can I talk above all this noise?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps I should try to assist the hon. member for Greenwood. It is very difficult for him to make his argument, and I might say it is difficult for the Chair to hear him above the conversa-

tions which are going on in the House at the present time.

Mr. Brewin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was saying that the purpose of section 41 is to deal with the provision of public documents in the federal court. It states that a minister of the crown may make an affidavit that on the grounds of public interest a document should be withheld from production and discovery, or be subject to such restriction as is deemed appropriate. Then, if the minister makes the affidavit under the general provisions of subsection (1), the court is given the authority to examine the document and to make an order for its discovery and production to the parties as well as to the court if it thinks it appropriate so to do.

• (3:10 p.m.)

I was involved in some controversy with the Minister of Justice over the legal background to this matter. My view is that this clause is a very appropriate one because it reflects what is the most up-to-date view of the law at the present time, namely that the court has the authority, when an objection is made that the document is one of public interest and should not be produced, to look at the document and to determine for itself, without relying merely on the minister's affidavit, whether or not it should be produced. So far so good; I think subsection (1) is useful and worth while.

Coming to subsection (2), it provides as follows:

> When a Minister of the Crown certifies to any court by affidavit that the production or discovery of a document or its contents would be injurious to international relations, national defence or security, or to federal-provincial relations, or that it would disclose a confidence of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, discovery and production shall be refused without any examination of the document by the court.

The effect of this provision is that when a minister of the crown, who in this sort of case acts, I imagine, 99 times out of 100 on the advice of his officials, says that a document should not be produced, the court is then deprived of the opportunity of looking at it in order to determine whether the claim is or is not well founded. It is my submission that while this may be perfectly justifiable with regard to documents that the minister thinks are injurious to international relations, national defence or security, of that would disclose a confidence of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, it is little short of ridiculous to say that a document ought not to be produced, and not only that but that even the court must not look at the document to see whether it ought to be produced in the interests of the litigants involved, merely because it would be injurious to federal-provincial relations.

Surely, there is nothing secret about relations between the federal government and the provinces or between departments of the federal government and departments of the provincial governments. Surely we, the public of Canada, have the right to say not necessarily that a document should be produced, but at least that it be produced to the extent that the court, which surely can be trusted in these matters, should have the right to look at it and decide whether or not it should be produced. This absolute prohibition that lies at the discretion of the minister, unexaminable by the courts, I do not think should exist. The purpose of my amendment is to strike out the words "Federal-Provincial Relations".

The habit of claiming secrecy with regard to official documents has reached proportions that are far too broad in this country. It is often claimed as a matter of course without reference to the facts at all. It is some protection of the public interest and the private interests of litigants whose future and fortunes may depend upon the production of a certain document if the court is able under subsection (1) to look at the document and to declare: "In our view the document ought to be produced; the affidavit does not satisfy us that there is any reason for not producing a document that perhaps is important to the litigation in question".

It is my submission, as I said in opening, that we should lift the iron curtain of secrecy surrounding these documents, at least to the extent I have stated, rather than rely upon the mere formal affidavit by a minister of the crown that the document concerns federal-provincial relations as the reason for restricting the administration of justice. It is a problem of balance between the administration of justice and the rights of litigants on the one hand, and the public interest on the other hand.

In my submission this particular clause goes far beyond any reasonable balance by giving the minister absolute discretion to say that federal-provincial relations are affected by a given document. After all, practically every subject of concern to government affects federal-provincial relations in some way. This provision gives the minister carte blanche to refuse production without the court even being permitted to inquire whether there is justification for that refusal. I submit that it is part and parcel of the over-secretive philosophy which is only too popular among bureaucracies. I invite the minister to look once more at this clause and to accept this very reasonable amendment.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, in order to address myself properly to the amendment moved by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), I think I should outline briefly to the House the purpose of clause 41. I did this in the committee, but now we are before the full House at the report stage it might help to state the position of the government with regard to this clause.

Clause 41 is an attempt to codify the principles relating to the production and discovery of documents in a court. I might say that clause 41 is not limited to the federal court but applies as against the crown in right of Canada in any court, including the provincial courts. Its purpose is to codify those principles where it appears that the production or discovery of documents may adversely affect some important public interest.

The state of the law in Canada at the moment is not clear. The hon. member for Greenwood and I have differed on other occasions as to what the law is. It is clear

that for a good time in the United Kingdom—and our case law and public administration law derives in some respect from the English law—the law was settled by the case of *Duncan v. Cammell Laird Company,* found in 1942 Appeal Cases, 624. This case was interpreted by the courts to mean that the executive had virtually complete control over the production of documents in the hands of the government as against the courts or against parties before the courts who might demand that production. It allowed a minister of the Crown to protect absolutely by affidavit any document the discovery of which, in the view of the minister, would affect the public interest, including the workings or operations of the public service. Indeed, the *Cammell Laird* case was thought by many people to have deprived the courts of any role at all in an area where a document might be in the hands of a minister acting within his ministerial responsibility.

Recently the House of Lords in the *Conway v. Rimmer* case, reported in 1968 Appeal Cases, 910, dealt with the question of the production of police reports in an action for malicious prosecution. In this case before the House of Lords two years ago a review of the rather broadly stated principle in the *Cammell Laird* case was undertaken by the House of Lords, and it is now clear that the courts should have some role in determining and weighing the various public interests that may be involved, when and if a minister of the Crown seeks to prevent production of a document on a court order.

Subclause (1) of clause 41 attempts to state the general principles that are laid down in the *Cammell Laird* case as interpreted by the *Conway v. Rimmer* case; but we have specifically stated that, in attempting to weigh the public interest in deciding whether the minister should have the power to withhold the production of a document by entering his affidavit, or conversely whether the court should have power to order production and discovery, the court should place—to use the words of the subclause—"such restrictions or conditions as it deems appropriate" upon the production.

It may well be, as hon. members recognize, that production may be valid in the interests of the parties concerned but perhaps invalid so far as the interests of the world at large are concerned. There are restrictions, but the general rule is as set out in clause 41(1), that the court has power to order production. Clause 41(2) sets restrictions against that ability of the court to order production or discovery of documents, and it reads this way:

• (3:20 p.m.)

When a minister of the Crown certifies to any court by affidavit that the production or discovery of a document or its contents would be injurious to international relations, national defence or security, or to federal-provincial relations, or that it would disclose a confidence of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, discovery and production shall be refused without any examination of the document by the court.

There are four specific areas of exclusion and I take it that the hon. member takes no objection to three of those areas of exclusion. He recognizes that the confidence of the cabinet or the Privy Council ought to remain a confidence. I think he accepts the fact that if a minister is to certify that the international relations of Canada would be injuriously affected, that again would govern. I take it that in the realm of national defence or security he again agrees that if the minister certifies it would be injurious to national defence or security the affidavit would bind the court and the production of the document would be refused.

The point of his amendment is, should that exclusion include a document when a minister says its production would be injurious to federal-provincial relations. That is the purpose of the amendment. I find it difficult to see how, where, in a federal state, the relationship between federal and provincial governments and executives, is in a state of uncertainty and flux, and involves delicate matters of policy affecting the unity of the country, differ in terms of principle from the other exclusions. I think we must recognize that it may not always be in the interests of the country that correspondence, say between first ministers or between other ministers of government departments, should be produced.

Mr. Brewin: Could I ask the minister a question?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I will answer the question at the end, if I may. I would, therefore, submit that the exclusion of federal-provincial relations is a proper inclusion. Putting it the other way, the exclusion of federal-provincial relations is a proper inclusion in subclause (2).

I think I should make it clear that subclause (2) operates only where a minister of the Crown certifies that in fact that particular document ought not to be produced. There is no automatic exclusion under clause 41(2). There is no automatic exclusion of any document simply because it falls within one of the listed headings set forth in the subclause. It may be that in the normal case documents involving the relationships between federal and provincial governments would be produced, as they are often produced in this House on Notices of Motions for production of papers, with the consent of the province being obtained. For these reasons I urge that the House reject the amendment.

Mr. Brewin: Would the minister accept a question? Does the minister not consider that in those, I would think fairly rare cases, where a document relating to federal provincial relations is of such a confidential nature the minister does not want to produce it, it would be perfectly reasonable to leave that situation under the provisions of subclause (1)? The minister could make his affidavit and the court would have the responsibility of looking at the document, rather than give this blanket power to the minister under subclause (2).

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The hon. member takes a view different from mine as to who is best able to judge whether federal-provincial relations might be affected by the production of a document. I submit that a

minister responsible to Parliament should take that responsibility and it should not be left to a judge.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): At the outset, I should like to agree with the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) on this particular point. I am not concerned about the exclusion of the other two or three types of documents, that is those relating to international relations, national defence or security, but I am concerned with federal-provincial relations. I appreciate the argument of the Minister of Justice that the executive would have knowledge as to what might affect federal-provincial relationships. Surely, if there were any question of confidentiality, then in the usual course of the production of documents, as stated by the hon. member for Greenwood, the production of documents could be held in camera by the court. Let me deal with some examples.

We are moving into a new field. Let us take for example the National Energy Board which has authority over pipelines which have become more important with the development of our country. Natural gas, coal, and no doubt wheat in the very near future, will be moved by pipelines. This often involves federal-provincial relations. It may be that litigation involving a citizen and the Crown might require a document, the production of which the lawyer representing the citizen felt to be necessary. If for some reason the executive felt there might be some injury to federal-provincial relationships as a result of the production of such a document, surely during argument it could be presented to the judge for examination. I have absolute confidence that if a judge were asked to keep the document confidential there would be no disclosure. I do not think we should give the minister this kind of power. This seems to be a catchall clause for anything the Crown does not want produced.

What a citizen is litigating with the Crown he is fighting a very powerful organization. He is fighting all the brains of the law officers of the Crown.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Thank you.

Mr. Woolliams: They are well briefed and they know how to win cases. They know what evidence is necessary and what evidence is not necessary. I have found, through my experience in tax cases, and I know my friend the Minister of Justice has had this experience as well in tax cases and expropriation cases, that these Crown officers do not like to disclose many of the cards they are holding.

I am concerned that this expression "federal-provincial relations" will mean that many documents, if not all documents, falling under that category will be excluded. The pertinent part reads:

> When a Minister of the Crown certifies to any court by affidavit that the production or discovery of a document or its contents would be injurious to...federal-provincial relations... shall be refused—

In other words, this shall be left solely to the discretion of the Crown or the minister. This gives the state too much power. I am thinking of pipelines and litigation with regard to railways and national parks, which certainly involve federal-provincial relations when deals are made. I have had a little discomfort in that field and I do not intend to get into that.

On these grounds, I support clause 41(2) if the minister would withdraw that part, as suggested by the hon. member for Greenwood in his amendment No. 14. I would ask the minister to reconsider it. Surely, he is one man who I think, because he is a young minister with aims and objectives, would endeavour to appoint top men to the judiciary. He has shown his ability in that regard. Surely a judge should have the right to make this decision rather than to leave it to an executive of this powerful state.

Mr. Steven Otto (York East): Mr. Speaker, this discussion so far has been on a very legalistic plane. It seems that we should consider what we are legislating here. I was quite surprised to hear the minister give the impression that our law now stems from the precedents he quoted. Normally, legislation does not follow the courts, the courts follow the legislation.

The arguments presented by the minister about the sensitivity and the very delicate nature, in a federal state such as this, of federal-provincial relations were interesting, I think, in so far as security is concerned, they rank equally to international affairs in some cases. Certainly in the situation which exists today, there is a great deal of discussion between the province and the federal government. It is not always advisable that all these discussions should be made public. We then get into a certain phase of this argument on the amendment which is this.

• (3:30 p.m.)

The hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) wants the court to decide whether or not a document is or should be considered privileged. We in this House of Commons do not have this privilege at all because the parliamentary system is based on the idea of ministerial responsibility, and the government falls or stands with the ministers' decisions. So here, we are faced with a situation in which this House can be, and often is, refused information of this same nature by the minister because it is confidential. The courts, on the other hand, would be in a much better position because at any time they could have all or any documents. If we were to follow the course suggested, we would have to reconsider the whole idea of parliamentary government. I am not suggesting for a moment that we should stay with the exact system we have now, but if there is to be a change then we should not limit our consideration to just what is contained in the amendment but should broaden it to cover the whole field.

I put this to the hon. member for Greenwood. Let us suppose that the amendment carried. Then, if there should be no disagreement between the minister and the courts there would be no problem. But let us suppose there is disagreement. Then the minister, a minister of the Crown representing the people who elected this government, is in a secondary position to the court.

Mr. Brewin: So he should be.

Mr. Otto: The court might say that it does not believe the document has anything to do with federal-provincial relations. So, we would be placing the judiciary in a legislative position. In this case, it would be deciding what should be the policy of the government. Let us go further and suppose there is correspondence between a provincial government and the federal government which, at the instigation of the province, is meant to be kept secret. This government, in effect, says to the province that it has a certain relationship with the province and if the province desires information or correspondence between the two of them to be kept secret, this desire will be honoured. As a result of this understanding there is much more correspondence and freedom of expression.

However, if the provinces have requested secrecy and the government should be forced to disclose the information or documents to a court, the court might decide there should be no secrecy. Then, what is the situation in respect of the pledge that has been given? In other words, the consequence of this amendment obviously would be that communications between provincial governments and the federal government would be couched in such careful terms, in the knowledge that they might become public, that provincial-federal discussions would be meaningless. I, therefore, say that the hon. member for Greenwood should reconsider his position and I support the government's position on this amendment.

Mr. Brewin: I have no intention of reconsidering my position.

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make clear that I support the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin). I believe the arguments of the hon. member and of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) are strong and valid arguments. I should like to add briefly to them. We are dealing with justice. People go to court presumably in the hope that they will receive justice. I cannot see anyone being satisfied if, when he goes to court, he cannot obtain a document and therefore cannot present his full case to the judge. I believe it is invidious to give anyone the power to withhold information, because it might make a few red faces in Ottawa or in the provincial capitals, which might make a great deal of difference to a person's case. This strikes at the very notion of justice.

I agree that we would not want our courts to become circuses such as happens too often in the United States. There should be a power to turn down mischievous requests. In any event judges probably have this power. I say that this Parliament would be committing a wrongful act if it were to give this power to any minister of justice, because it strikes at the very heart of justice itself.

Now, let me give a few specific examples of how I believe litigants could be placed in a very invidious position in respect of the conduct of their cases. My honourable and learned friend from Calgary North has mentioned the dealings of pipeline companies whose pipelines extend across provincial boundaries. Such companies are under the jurisdiction of at least one national body and presumably, because the provinces have the natural resources which are being dealt with and carried in the pipeline, there is a flow of information back and forth between the federal and provincial governments.

There might be a situation where someone, whose case depends very much on some federal or provincial decisions, might wish to obtain such decisions so that he could present them to the court. His request could be turned down by the Minister of Justice, and that would make a mockery of his case. As a matter of fact, he could have initiated a case, spent thousands and thousands of dollars in retaining lawyers and obtaining documents, only to find when he got into court that his whole case collapsed because the Minister of Justice sitting in Ottawa refused to produce the document on which his case was based. I say that should not happen. As I say, I can see it happening in many cases involving business because in matters of trade the federal government has a responsibility under the constitution.

We have mentioned the situation in respect of the movement of natural resources, which are a provincial responsibility, across provincial boundaries. Let us take the illustration further and relate it to what everybody is talking about in Canada today, the tragic events in the province of Quebec. There may be situations in which people will decide to take action against someone in an effort to obtain redress for the loss of their civil liberties. I suppose under other parts of this subclause the minister could deal with such people peremptorily and knock out their case by refusing to disclose documents on the ground that they would be injurious to national defence or security. There seem to be a strange variety of crimes being committed in Canada these days under both headings.

In any event, I believe I am making my point concerning the power of the minister. I am not referring to this minister because I do not want to be in an *ad hominem* position in this argument. I am just saying that a minister of justice, to preserve the political applomb of himself and his associates or some friend in some provincial capital, could use his power and any ideal of justice would become very secondary. I think it is invidious and insidious.

I certainly support the hon. member for Greenwood in his efforts to knock out this provision. I hope the Minister of Justice, who does listen to reasoned argument and who is a first-rate fellow to deal with, even at this stage will change his mind and instruct his parliamentary secretary to say, "yes, you fellows on the other side have made your point and we accept the argument".

• (3:40 p.m.)

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Pembina): I support the amendment moved by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), which was supported also by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) and the hon. member for

Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave). Although this subclause appears to be a very minor one and only deals with a technicality, it strikes me that it gets to the very root of justice itself. Apparently, in relation to subclause (2), we are only worried as to who should make the decision, but I do not think that is all that is involved. As I understand it, the whole purpose of the bill is to try to get our administrative law out of the morass in which it has been, so we are setting up a federal court, presumably with judges who will be well schooled in the administrative law and also well able to defend, where necessary, the rights of the Crown. They are appointed and maintained by the Crown. We expect them also to keep a very objective view throughout any litigation although they are on the side of the Crown.

No doubt in most of these cases, success will depend on whether or not certain documents are produced. In subclause (2) we are asked to broaden the circumstances in which certain documents are not disclosed. If taken to its logical conclusion, this means the almost complete exclusion of the documents if the judge gives a very technical or very literal interpretation to the law. Although we know that the best judges will be appointed, there will be a continual pressure put on them to remain objective when the litigant is fighting the Crown, of whom the judge is a servant.

I am well aware of how injurious certain documents might be in matters of international relations and I agree that they should be screened out if their disclosure interferes with the security and defence of Canada. However, the wording used here is "be injurious to federal-provincial relations". I venture to say that the term "injurious to federal-provincial relations" is very wide in scope and would affect the whole of our Canadian life. We rely on one man's opinion as to what might be injurious. When we say injurious do we mean something which might drive Quebec out of the Confederation? The answer is, yes. In such a situation, we would have unanimous agreement and we would all be willing to screen out any such documents.

Since I think that democracy is based on reasonable compromise, and there will be some difficulty here if someone wishes to screen out a document, I suggest that when either side asks for a document to be withheld the court could be told that it is a touchy document. The judge could then hear the evidence in camera. Subclause (2), of course, rules out such a possibility completely and the document is withheld without any examination of the document whatsoever. It is left entirely to the judgment of the cabinet minister involved. Since the litigation might be directed at the very department where this document resides or a document might be in the very possession of the cabinet minister himself, he might well have an interest in not disclosing it. It seems to me that a great deal of discretion is put into the hands of one person.

Since I have full confidence in the judges of our courts, I can see nothing wrong with the suggestion that the proposal not to disclose the document be heard in camera. It seems to me that our judges will certainly not be so perverse, on seeing that a document might be injurious to the interests of Canada, as to rule that it should be disclosed. If we adopt the amendment, we will have more than one person's opinion and nothing would be done in secret or behind closed doors, nothing would be left to the opinion of one man. As confidence in our law officers and in our governments at all levels is in some jeopardy, I think it would be very wise at this stage of the development of federal-provincial relations, and in our attempts to improve the whole administration of our administrative law in Canada, that we lean over backwards by saying that ministers of the Crown should not make judicial decisions on their own. We should ask the judge, the litigants and perhaps the cabinet minister, to get together in camera to explain why a document should not be disclosed, and thus reach a reasonable compromise.

Another way of dealing with this situation would be to separate the document in the presence of all interested people. I venture to say there are few cases in which all of a document is secret or all of it is injurious to the public interest. Some parts of a document might be very relevant to the proper adjudication of a case, and other parts might have to be screened out with the approval of all parties. Some of it could be used for the purpose for which the document had been requested in court in the first place. It seems to me that that part of a document which may be injurious to the security of the people of Canada or to the best relations between the provinces—and that is the crux of the present argument—could be screened out to everyone's satisfaction.

Therefore, I support the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): I have examined the text of the committee's hearings with regard to the present clause and I find nothing of great import. As a matter of fact, I can find no discussion at all with regard to this subclause except for the statement which is recorded at page 3312 that clause 41 is carried. In other words, the clause was carried without previous discussion.

Mr. Woolliams: That is not correct. If you look at other parts of the committee's proceedings, you will find that we did discuss the clause.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I am saying there was no discussion at that time, that is when the clause was passed. It may have been discussed when the briefs were being presented, but we do not know who was present at the time. We do know that on certain occasions members were not able to be present at the meetings because they either had to be in the House or elsewhere. In any event, they were not there. I want to hear an explanation from the parliamentary secretary, and I am sure other members in the House would also want it, and a clear definition from him of what is meant by federal-provincial relations. If the term is as wide in scope and as all embracing as suggested by my colleagues and by the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), then of course one

must object to it most vehemently. I think it is incumbent upon the minister or his parliamentary secretary to give us the full explanation of what is meant by the term "federal-provincial relations." On that basis, I say that unless such an explanation is given I will have to support the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Greenwood.

• (3:50 p.m.)

After all, we know that the whole of the jurisprudence and the common law are full of anomalies. In many cases that have been heard in the courts in Great Britain and in this country the Crown, as a matter of course, has for some reason or another declared that certain documents were privileged, and that was that. The citizen, who perhaps was suing the Crown for disclosure of a document related to a claim against the Crown, was left without recourse when the Crown took refuge behind this so-called privilege of Crown documents. This, in effect, perpetrated an injustice.

I should like to have a definition given by the minister of what is deemed to be federal-provincial relations. There are all sorts of relations. For instance, if a judge were able to find that there was federal control over a pipeline, but that provincial interests were also involved, would this be deemed to be federal-provincial relations? Would documents with respect to that matter be deemed to be privileged? We should not have anything like that. The minister should be fair with the House; come clean, and tell us precisely what is meant by that phrasing.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I have the right, under the rules of the House, to speak twice at this stage.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I have asked the minister a question. Perhaps he may answer it on my time.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I understand the hon. member is asking a question, and if the minister replies to the question it seems to me it would be in order.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Thank you for allowing me to transgress the rules, Mr. Speaker. I think the hon. member knows what is meant by federal-provincial relations in the same way that he knows what is meant by international relations. The meaning of the phrase is clear. If I were to give an off-the-cuff definition, which would not be binding on any minister or on the courts, I would say this is the relation between the federal government and the provincial governments.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question on motion No. 14? The question is as follows: Mr. Brewin, seconded by Mr. Lewis, moved:

That Bill C-172, An Act Respecting the Federal Court of Canada, be amended by striking out the words "or to federal-provincial relations," in subclause (2) of clause 41 at page 23.

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

[Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West).]

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those in favour of the said motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 75 the recorded division on the proposed motion stands deferred.

Order. If hon. members agree, it might be the wish of the House now to consider motions Nos. 1 and 2, and I think No. 10 was consequential thereto. Hon. members will recall the remarks of His Honour the Speaker earlier this afternoon to the effect that these motions would be reinstated on the Order Paper, and also the other one with which His Honour was concerned from a procedural standpoint. So, if it is the wish of the House I will put Nos. 1 and 2. Is it the understanding of the House that No. 10 can be considered at the same time?

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, the only problem is that if Nos. 1 and 2 were defeated then No. 10 would become superfluous. With the greatest respect, Mr. Speaker, may I say you are correct and I would ask that 1, 2 and 10 be considered in one block. In that way, we can be brief because much of the material we discussed yesterday will apply to these amendments also.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, we agree to that. We agree to reinstate Nos. 1, 2 and 10 on the suggestion of the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) that we treat them together and they be voted on together.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my understanding that the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) asked yesterday that No. 10 be withdrawn because of the Speaker's ruling, but that the House has now agreed that the three motions be considered.

The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) moves motion No. 1, which is as follows:

That Bill C-172, An Act Respecting the Federal Court of Canada, be amended by striking out subclause (d) of clause 2, page 1 thereof, and substituting therefor the following:

"(d) "Court" or "Federal Court" means

(i) the Federal Court of Canada, and

(ii) for the Province of Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Alberta, the trial division or branch of the Supreme Court of the Province,

(iii) for the Province of Quebec, the Superior Court of the Province,

(iv) for the Province of Newfoundland, the Supreme Court of the Province,

(v) for the Province of British Columbia or Prince Edward Island, the Supreme Court of the Province,

(vi) for the Province of Manitoba or Saskatchewan, the Court of Queen's Bench for the Province, and

(vii) for the Yukon Territory or the Northwest Territories, the Territorial Court thereof;"

The hon. member for Calgary North also moves motion No. 2, which is as follows:

That Bill C-172, An Act respecting the Federal Court of Canada, be amended by striking out subclause (e) of clause 2, page 1 thereof, and substituting therefor:

"(e) "Court of Appeal" or "Federal Court of Appeal" means

(i) that division of the Federal Court of Canada referred to as the Court of Appeal or Federal Court of Appeal by this Act and

(ii) with respect to an appeal from a court other than the Federal Court of Canada, the court exercising general appellate jurisdiction with respect to appeals from that court;"

Is it the pleasure of the House to deem motion No. 10 to be read and put to the House?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): I have already expressed my appreciation to the Speaker in reference to the reinstatement of motions Nos. 1, 2 and 10. Again, I want to say that I appreciate very much the courtesy given us, and the observations that were made concerning why they were declared to be out of order. I think I can be quite brief at this time, Mr. Speaker, because yesterday we dealt with many of the facts when we were dealing with clauses 18, 28 and 29.

What are motions Nos. 1, 2 and 10 all about? There is a Federal Court to be set up under this bill, with a certain jurisdiction. Basically that jurisdiction has been set out as covering Crown corporations, boards and commissions and where the Crown is involved in any matter of contract and tort, as well as various other things.

What we are asking for in this amendment is basically that the definition of the term "federal court" include not only the Federal Court that is to be set up under this bill but also the trial courts of the various provinces, that is, the superior courts, which would have concurrent jurisdiction. By concurrent jurisdiction I mean this: That a citizen who wishes to litigate, or the Crown for that matter if it wished, can choose the place where they want to litigate. If, for example, people live in Toronto and want to litigate through the superior court or Supreme Court trial division in Ontario, they may do so. If they live in Calgary, Edmonton or Vancouver they may litigate in their own courts in the same way.

What is the main argument for this? Justice, like everything else today, has become a very expensive commodity. That is why I maintain that justice is somewhat rationed in Canada. The law is the same for every Canadian, but in the application of the law there is a law for the rich and one for the poor. I say it would be much cheaper and much more reasonable for people to be able to litigate in their home courts.

Federal Court

Over and over again in these debates the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) has said, "Well, it is just as cheap to litigate in the Exchequer Court or in the Federal Court." If that argument were sound then my answer to it would be that I have confidence in the people. They will be able to decide which place is the cheapest in which to litigate. I am satisfied that the Canadian people would use their own local courts, and I will deal with some evidence in that regard in a few moments.

In respect of the Exchequer Court, may I say that I have been criticized from certain sections for seeming to be against the Exchequer Court. I want to make it clear that I am not against it. It has had its place in Canada, and a good place in Canada, particularly in tax matters and other matters, but what I maintain is that it is a specialized court. These matters were studied very carefully by the Standing Committee. When Mr. Henderson came before that committee he pointed out that he was not representing the Canadian Bar Association, but had been asked by them to give evidence because of his knowledge. He pointed out that because the Exchequer Court is of a different calibre than the courts we have in our provinces, it takes a specialized lawyer years to learn the rules, the methods and the jurisprudence, all of which are necessary to litigate in the Exchequer Court. What really happens is that you are setting up a specialized field for a few people.

• (4:00 p.m.)

An hon. Member: Right.

Mr. Woolliams: Naturally, Mr. Henderson—and I am not being critical of him personally—had some affection for the minister's big federal court. Why? Somebody said he lives in Ottawa. He is a very distinguished scholar and counsel in the Exchequer Court itself and with that skill he knows that many cases will come to his office because not many men are trained in this field. It boils down to one thing, that a few people become specialists in litigation in the federal court or Exchequer Court, and that has been the situation. Professor Garry D. Watson, who is a professor of law at Osgood Hall in Toronto said that some lawyers from smaller centres—and when we are dealing with Calgary compared with Toronto, it is a small centre—will try their hand at litigating in the Exchequer Court, which is similar to the federal court. After they get their fingers burned, they will throw up their hands and say that they will never again try to use their ability in that court as it is not fair to their clients.

What will happen is that men of the calibre of Mr. Henderson, and a few others across Canada, will handle all the litigation in this court. Like specialists in any other field, say a gynaecologist in medicine, they can demand high fees but the average man litigating against that most powerful opponent, the state, cannot afford powerful and expensive lawyers.

An hon. Member: They must be Liberals.

Mr. Woolliams: As a result justice is left undone. Justice will be rough and that is the purpose for giving the

specialists that edge. I have heard the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) talk about the average man being on the poverty line in Canada, and I do not think there is any difference between us on that philosophy. There are people below the poverty line who cannot afford lawyers and that is what we sold to the committee. Surely, with that underlying philosophy of the minister, and his affection for the average man, he will see that in order to get justice the average man should have an option to litigate in his own provincial court. That is really the reason behind motion No. 1.

Now, motion No. 2 provides that: if you can litigate in your own trial court, then you should be able to appeal in the court of appeal of that province. It is accessible and familiar to the average lawyer working in his own community. So you see, the arguments relating to motions Nos. 1 and 2 are identical; they both refer to concurrent jurisdiction.

Let us see what some of the evidence was in this regard. I have read the report of the Committee which did study this in May and June. The Committee went into this bill very extensively, and it was not only the Conservatives who agreed but the NDP went along with us as did certain Liberals. Indeed, I am surprised that some of them are not here speaking on this motion today. I should like to quote from the report of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, No. 26 where Mr. Hogarth, who is a distinguished counsel from British Columbia, is reported as follows:

> You see, my basic premise is why not leave that to a provincial court to determine? I cannot understand the compulsion to give this power of review to a whole new court structure. With the greatest respect, I cannot see why you just cannot give that power of review to the courts of ordinary inherent jurisdiction.

Meaning provincial courts.

> Despite what you have said with respect to the restrictions placed on the prerogative writs by statute, those restrictions have never been particularly adhered to by the courts and the courts have always assumed their inherent jurisdiction. I cannot understand why we have to have the federal court structure to handle those appeals. Why not just give it to a provincial court judge?

Those are Mr. Hogarth's words. That is why there was a tie. It was rather unfortunate that one or two members who might have been with us on that day could not attend, but there are so many committees meeting at the same time that one cannot always be at a particular committee.

An hon. Member: Shame.

Mr. Woolliams: The chairman of the Justice and Legal Affairs Committee, for whom we all have a lot of affection, has twice been placed in a position of having to break a tied vote. He exercised his vote in favour of the bill as it is drafted. That was his prerogative, but what I am emphasizing is that the amendment had such a close shave in the committee. This is not a frivolous suggestion; this suggestion carries weight and I think you will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, with your knowledge of the committees, that sometimes a little partisanship slips into these committees. This is not all one-sided, of course; it is not all government members, because sometimes there is some failing on our side too.

An hon. Member: Hear, hear.

Mr. Woolliams: Speaking of the Liberals and Conservatives getting together reminds me of a story told by the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Douglas) on the hustings at one time but I cannot repeat it here. When the Liberals and Conservatives get together, there has to be something out of the ordinary to make them forget about their politics for the moment. The New Democratic Party went along with this sympathetic viewpoint. If the Minister of Justice would accept the motions on the Order Paper as we have accepted his, we would have a very good bill.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Woolliams: I was hoping that he would have the same kind of feeling as some of his colleagues who hold him in high esteem, and that he would support us on this amendment as did at least half of his colleagues who gave it so much serious thought and support when we needed it.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): You are breaking me up.

An hon. Member: Shame.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Terrible.

Mr. Woolliams: I think any one of us who held a job of privy councillor in the cabinet might find that the problem is that every department is so large it is impossible for everybody in it to know each other's views. The lawyers in the Department of Justice are very skilled; they have drawn the statute for the minister and have put in all the safeguards ahead of time, so that is pretty tough opposition for the little man.

An hon. Member: It sure is.

Mr. Woolliams: It is a tough place to litigate, when you are fighting the state. It is all-powerful and very difficult for people who have not the money to fight that kind of power.

Some hon. Members: Shame, shame.

Mr. Woolliams: I should like to quote from the evidence to substantiate my position which was supported by witnesses in the committee. Mr. Henderson said the suggestion had some merit. He went that far at least, even though he knew he was a specialist in the field. I asked if it was not a fact that a lawyer practising in a province knew the rules of the provincial court. Indeed, if he did not he should not be there. Normally, he is

familiar with the atmosphere and the judges who sit and is familiar with the environment in which he is practising. The judges are able to make decisions more fitting to the average man because of the familiarity not only the lawyer but of the judge, with the area in which the questions of contract or tort are based. This is what the professor said. I do not know who insisted on calling Professor Watson but as sometimes happens when you are the lawyer for the defence and find witnesses for the Crown more favourable to the defence, Professor Watson proved to be a good defence witness. Maybe it was the boys from the Liberal side from Toronto who felt that another view should be put forward, and that is why he supported this suggestion.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): May I ask the hon. member a question? Does he realize that Professor Watson is primarily dealing with another branch of law and has never handled a case before the courts?

Mr. Woolliams: He would not be alone in this regard—and I hope this gets reported—because I know a lot of Queen's Counsellors who would not know how to draw a small debt summons. I also know a lot of judges whose first appearance in court was after they were appointed. This does not shock me. I do not think there is anything wrong with that.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Many professors have not had court experience, but at least they do not become stereotyped. They analyse a problem from an academic point of view. The problem with a practising lawyer is that he becomes non-flexible. I am more of a defence lawyer. I have never prosecuted anyone, but I have defended many cases. Possibly my built-in ideas about the rights of people go too far because I am a defence lawyer. I find that Crown lawyers, including the Minister of Justice, have a different mechanism. The moment a charge is laid, Crown lawyers want to put the fellow away for a long time. Of course, the judges and juries keep the balance. I will return to the remarks which I was making before the very kind interruption of the Minister of Justice.

An hon. Member: What about Joe?

Mr. Woolliams: I think the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) is a very good lawyer. He is also a good salesman. This bill really only gives this court bits and pieces. In view of that, there will only be a few people in a limited number of situations who will be able to resort to the court on a regular basis. Consequently, only a small group of lawyers will practice in that court. This will produce a real problem with regard to the jurisdiction of the court in certain types of cases.

When a person from a small town or city in Canada becomes involved, he contacts his regular legal adviser. The legal adviser suggests that this is a matter for the Exchequer Court. The lawyer will tell him that he does not have much experience in litigation of this type. The normal pattern is for the lawyer to suggest some expensive lawyer in Ottawa who will handle the case. This is why we need concurrent jurisdiction. The minister or one of his officials stated that in the United States they have these courts, but there is a difference.

In Canada, the judges are appointed by the federal government and the magistrates by the provincial governments. The federal government appoints judges of the county court, court of appeal, Exchequer Court, the new exchequer court of appeal and the Supreme Court of Canada. My friend stated that many matters will now come under the new federal court, because jurisdiction will be removed from the provincial courts. All the Minister of Justice has to do is to ensure that the men he appoints are specialists.

I have practised in most types of courts in Canada, including courts outside the province of Alberta. I have seen some judges deal with highly specialized matters. I am certain their judgments were equal or superior to those that would have been made in the Exchequer Court because they had knowledge of the situation. For example, a judge in the province of Alberta would have knowledge of national parks. In dealing with a dispute under the Canada Grain Act, a judge from western Canada would at least know the colour of wheat. Familiarity with subjects is important. That is why I ask for the support for this amendment. Professor Watson had this to say:

> Looking at the news areas into which the Federal Court Bill would take us with regard to jurisdiction of the court, who is to be the grateful beneficiary of the investiture of the new Federal Court with concurrent jurisdiction over negotiable instruments?

That is a very important point. If we look at the present jurisdiction, we see that there is jurisdiction over negotiable instruments when the Crown is involved.

> Is it finance companies or is it to be debtors who are going to thank the federal government for having given them another forum to which to take their disputes? Or will it be either one of them who first finds himself involved in a battle, a jurisdictional battle in the court for which he will pay to litigate to find out the answer as to whether or not—

As to whether or not he is in the right court. That is the trouble in the United States. There are so many different courts in that country they need a group of specialists to determine which court should deal with the matter. If provincial courts are given concurrent jurisdiction there would not be any procedural argument as to which court is the right one. He goes on to say:

> I simply raise this question: Is the only answer to give this jurisdiction to a federal court? In other words, would it not be possible to draft, if there are problems—and I gather there are problems with regard to, for instance, the location of an action against a federal tribunal the problem of the plaintiff moving from one province to another suing a federal administrative tribunal—

He says it is very simple to get over that objection noted on page 13. Once you choose a jurisdiction, you are stuck with that particular jurisdiction in all provinces.

I now wish to deal with the matter of legal chaos. I will use the example of a three-way accident involving

cars A and B and car C, an RCMP vehicle. Because the Crown is involved this must be decided in the new federal court. A and B can have their case decided in the provincial court. What happens if the provincial court decides that A is at fault and the Exchequer Court decides that B is at fault? When the sheriff picks up the property to pay for the damages, which judgment governs?

Dozens of powerful corporations make contracts with such Crown corporations as Panarctic. If they become involved in litigation, there are eight corporations which could be sued. The problems of these corporations could be litigated in the provincial court, but if the Crown were in breach of contract the provincial court could not make a decision. If the provincial court decided that a company was at fault and the Exchequer Court decided that the Crown was at fault or one of the other companies involved, we then have legal chaos. Mr. Watson said that he did not have any experience as a court room lawyer, but he was able to look at the chaos that some lawyers meet with this bill.

I now wish to deal with one other thought. The most important instruments a citizen has are special writs. At one time I was very critical of administrative boards. I had a lot of suspicion about them, but I have changed my philosophy. There is a place for administrative boards. When a matter is decided by the board everything, including the kitchen sink, goes in. I compare the powers of a board to a book. It has four sides. The powers of boards are set out in a book about the size of the book I am now holding. If they exceed those powers, their orders can be quashed. It is very simple, really. There is no need to go through a procedure costing $1,000 or $2,000. You go to a judge and say: This board has exceeded its authority and I want its order quashed. The mistake is generally on the record, or it is a question of law, or the decision was contrary to natural justice. Those rights have existed for a number of years. They are the safeguard of the citizens against an all-powerful state. This is why we find special remedies given to the trial court in section 18 yet the right of appeal in section 28, sets out the same reasons as those applicable to special remedies. This is legal chaos in itself.

• (4:20 p.m.)

To compound it, two of the witnesses before the committee said they still did not know whether, when boards exceeded their authority, people who felt themselves aggrieved should apply to the ordinary courts of a province or not. One lawyer may hold one view, and another lawyer may hold a different view. Lawyers do not always agree; that is why we have judges. But why should citizens be put to such great and unnecessary expense?

With great respect, I suggest that the motivation behind this bill was to give the Crown more power. Remember, people who work for the Crown, and I am not being disrespectful to them, naturally hold the philosophy that if you are going to play a game of cards it helps to have a good hand. But, Mr. Speaker, once in a while when I am playing cards I like to have the right to deal.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

An hon. Member: Stacked deck.

Mr. Woolliams: That's right. I want to make sure the deck is clean when I am playing blackjack. These people put together a bill. They have thought it out so as to give the greatest power to the Crown. The amendments I propose would at least put some safeguards into it from the point of view of the average man. These two amendments are very serious; in fact, I have never been more serious. I thank the House for its kind attention and I hope hon. members will give what I have said the kind of consideration for which I have sought to argue.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I shall not get into a forensic duel with the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams). Those of us who are members of the committee have heard his arguments a number of times.

An hon. Member: Never better than today.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Never better than he was today. But there was nothing new. This issue was canvassed thoroughly by the committee under the chairmanship of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Tolmie). I should like to pay tribute to him—he is sitting in the House today—for his leadership and impartial chairmanship of a very sensitive committee of the House of Commons—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): —a committee which transacts at least as much business as any other committee of the House.

Despite some of the flourishes of the hon. member for Calgary North, during most of our deliberations we engaged in a non-partisan review of the bills which came before the committee. The hon. member mentioned that Liberals had occasionally disagreed with the position taken by the government before the committee. I see no objection to that, because one of the merits of the committee system is that it enables Members of Parliament to exercise independent judgment relatively free from the control of party whips. As a matter of fact, I have found myself on the losing side on several occasions before that committee. One was in connection with the breathalyzer test; the hon. member for Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Murphy) beat me on the penalty. The government did not seek to revive this issue on the report stage; we took our beating in committee because we believe in the committee system. The fact that the chairman had to break a tie in the voting on several occasions, as the hon. member pointed out, is in itself an indication that we have been considering this bill in a non-partisan way. But the question raised by the hon. member was considered thoroughly by the committee and rejected by it, so the hon. member cannot say the subject did not receive the consideration which it merits.

I wish to analyze briefly the jurisdiction of the Federal Court. The hon. member sought to give the impression that this bill was the expression of a reaching out for power on the part of the Crown. Well, the jurisdiction of the federal court differs from the present jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court in only a very few aspects. First, there is a jurisdiction of review and appeal over federal boards and tribunals. That is an extension of jurisdiction. The second extension is concurrent jurisdiction with provincial courts over matters involving promissory notes or bills of exchange, where the Crown is a party. The third extension is a concurrent jurisdiction with the provincial superior court in matters concerning aeronautics. Those are the only extensions in jurisdiction given.

I wish to analyze the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court and the Federal Court and attempt to explain it, through this House, to the people of Canada. Historically, the act was set up because there had to be some forum in which claims could be made against the Crown in right of Canada. So all actions against the Crown in right of Canada are taken in the Exchequer Court—and if I use the term "federal court" I am not doing so on the assumption that the House will pass this measure but to make it more convenient for hon. members by using a consistent terminology.

There are certain branches of federal law which, for historical and practical reasons, come before the federal court. This is because they are complicated, because litigation is specialised and because a certain expertise has to be developed. They involve questions of Admiralty, of industrial property, patents, trademarks and copyright, expropriation, estate tax and income tax. As I say, this type of law is specialized. It often involves the Crown and it has been adequately handled by the Exchequer Court in the past. As a matter of fact, several judges from provincial superior and supreme courts have advised me privately that they wished jurisdiction over industrial property could rest exclusively with the federal court. They say that a case involving patent or copyright so seldom comes before a provincial court that the judges lack the necessary background or expertise to deal with it, properly and trials are unnecessarily long because of lack of experience in this type of case.

There are other branches of federal law which are left to provincial courts—divorce and bankruptcy, both of which fall within the jurisdiction of Parliament. It is worth noting that because of the technical nature of these branches of the law, the law itself has to be supplemented by very full sets of rules. Indeed, in these two fields, the rules from a procedural point of view are almost as important as the substantive provisions of the act itself. In order to place a technical branch of the federal law within the competence of a provincial court it is necessary to supplement it with extremely comprehensive rules. Some Chief Justices of provincial courts have suggested to me that the federal government ought to take bankruptcy cases away from the provincial courts and give them to a federal court. There are a number of judges in Ontario and Quebec who would prefer to see the federal bankruptcy law handled by the Federal Court.

• (4:30 p.m.)

We are not grabbing back jurisdiction, as the hon. member suggests. We have left bankruptcy where it is, and we have left divorce where it is. As a matter of fact, we are hoping that divorce cases will be handled not only by superior courts, but that advantage will be taken of the latitude in the law and that county courts will handle divorce as well. I would inform the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) that there is sufficient latitude in the law, in my opinion, to allow county court judges in Ontario or elsewhere to hear divorce actions.

There are certain branches of the law with national impact involving litigation that crosses provincial boundaries and which is probably better handled by a federal court than a provincial court, where only one party to the action might be in his home territory. This is why we suggested concurrent jurisdiction in the the aeronautics field. Supposing there was an air tragedy involving a major air line; it is likely that the passengers on the aircraft would come from more than one province. On the other hand, in the crash of a small plane in the Okanagan valley involving two or three people from British Columbia, any subsequent litigation obviously should properly be brought before the Supreme Court of British Columbia, and there is nothing in this federal court bill to take away this jurisdiction.

However, in the case of a national disaster involving passengers from every province in the country and even from abroad, rather than have a host of actions brought in various provincial superior courts or supreme courts all across the country, it would be better for all litigants to have one forum where the action can be decided at one and the same time.

So there is no federal power grab, to use the synonym of the hon. member for Calgary North. The jurisdiction is not being increased except in the three areas I have described. The jurisdiction has been increased in the field of promissory notes and bills of exchange where the Crown in right of Canada is party to the action, and in the field of aeronautics. In both these areas the jurisdiction is concurrent, not exclusive. There is still concurrent jurisdiction left with the superior courts.

In reviewing the supervisory jurisdiction of federal boards, commissions and tribunals, the whole rationale of the bill is that there should be a review procedure, whether by way of the traditional common law prerogative writs or the new statutory review remedy available under clause 28. Right of appeal under specialized statutes is preserved under clause 29.

As I say, there should be a common forum so that the federal boards cannot be attacked or harassed by a multiplicity of jurisdictions. Federal boards should be dealt with on a federal basis. I make no apology for this because in clauses 18, 28 and 29, as I said yesterday, we are setting up the infrastructure of public administrative law in this country, a branch of the law that has been too weakly developed to this point.

The hon. member for Calgary North adduced an argument that I know by heart.

Mr. Woolliams: I know yours too.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I also know mine by heart, and I make it only in response to the speech of the hon. member. We did introduce evidence to the effect that the federal court is no more expensive for the litigant than any other court. I submitted the tariffs of the Exchequer Court and they compared favourably with those of the Supreme Court of Alberta, the Supreme Court of Ontario and the Superior Court of Quebec. There was very little difference between them.

The hon. member also argued that the federal court is not accessible. Let me tell him it is now on circuit. I have tried to explain that under clause 7 and clause 16 the court is empowered to go on circuit, to go where the litigants want to litigate. If an action arises in the federal court between citizens of Alberta, then the federal court will go to Alberta to hear the action, whether it be an application, motion, or any other type of interlocutory proceeding, or whether it be a trial on the merits or an appeal. The circuit procedure that has been part of the practice of the court for the last two or three years under the present president is now written into the law in statutory form.

The hon. member for Calgary North argued that the procedures of the court are complicated. We have submitted the rules of procedure.

Mr. Woolliams: The minister does not agree with Mr. Henderson.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Henderson is very knowledgeable before the court, but he knows as well as I—and I have had a good deal of practice before the court as well, I might add—that the new rules of procedure were modernized and published last year. I say that they are as streamlined and as non-technical as the rules of any of the supreme courts or superior courts of this country.

This is a court that tends to have a certain type of specialty, a certain type of expertise, as a result of the very nature of the sort of litigation that comes before it. It is true that lawyers do not get before the federal court, or will not get before it, as often as they appear before the Provincial county court or superior court. The simple answer to this is that there happen to be more automobile cases, more matrimonial cases, more property cases and more contractual and tortious cases, or *délit* cases, to use the language of the Code Civile of Quebec, than other types of litigation.

However, in regard to matters that have historically and properly placed within the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court, matters having a national impact, a certain specialized importance, matters that involve the provinces or the federal government and citizens of the country, this court is a useful vehicle for the purpose of administering justice in the interests of the people of Canada.

One final remark, Mr. Speaker. I listen often to the hon. member describing the forces of the Department of Justice being mobilized against the little guy. I would remind him there have been times when the Department of Justice has had to take on some of the big landowners in Alberta who are represented on occasion by the hon. member for Calgary North in order to defend some of the leasehold interests in that province. I know his argument is fiction, and I always listen to it with a smile, as I did on this occasion.

The Department of Justice represents the people of Canada and ensures that the people of Canada are properly protected.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): It ensures that the laws of taxation are fairly administered. Sometimes the Department of Justice, on behalf of the people of Canada, has to prosecute tax evaders and the like. It also has to make sure that the people of Canada get the best price in cases of expropriation. So I suggest his argument works both ways.

The department tries to recruit the best lawyers it can. It is true to say that 50 per cent of the cases coming before the Supreme Court of Canada and 50 per cent of the cases coming before this court are brought on behalf of the people of Canada. We bring cases dealing with admiralty matters, taxation, industrial property cases and expropriation. I think the people of Canada expect the Department of Justice to represent them as best it can, and the department will continue to do so, even against clients represented by my hon. friend from Calgary North.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I understand the hon. member for Calgray North wishes to ask a question.

Mr. Woolliams: Assuming for a moment that everything the minister says is acceptable, rather than letting the minister or his department decide, has he any objection to letting the people decide whether it is cheaper to litigate in court A compared with court B.? That is all I am asking. What is the objection to letting the people decide?

An hon. Member: No answer.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, may I first of all apologize to the House. I misread part of a report, which was more or less a synthesis, with regard to clause 41 (1) and (2). The hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) moved an amendment in the committee which was negatived on division. I said that it had carried seemingly without discussion, and I apologize to the hon. member for innocently misleading the House. I goofed on that one.

There does not seem to have been much continuity to the discussion but I can readily understand some of the points made by the minister, though I was not so persuaded by some of the arguments put forward by the deputy minister, Mr. Maxwell, at the committee hearings, particularly in view of some of the final amendments made by the committee which appeared in the report of June 9. It seems to me that, notwithstanding the persua-

siveness of Mr. Maxwell, there is a built-in attitude or frame of mind as a result of his extensive communication with the department. Quite frankly, I think he is too involved with the department to look at the situation as one does from the outside. I would caution the minister very seriously and sincerely that while the department does say it sets out to defend the interests of the people of Canada, that is not so in fact. The interests of the Crown become paramount. It is not the interests of the people that become paramount. There is a very grave distinction between the interests of the Crown and the interests of the citizen.

• (4:40 p.m.)

The minister knows that when he was with a firm in Montreal which made a specialty of taking on the Department of National Revenue, those who took cases for prosecution on behalf of the department were not doing so with the interests of the people in mind. This was done on behalf of the government with a capital "G".

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): In those days we took on every department.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): In any event, that was the case. There is one point I want to suggest to the minister which may provide an out in respect of the point made by my colleague the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams). The minister did say that judges would travel on circuit as provided in clause 7 and subsequent clauses. He said a person from Vancouver would not necessarily have to come to Ottawa to pursue a case. There are many interlocutory procedures. This is the point that concerned my friend.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): They will be heard there, too.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Interlocutory procedures arise for certain purposes and need one judge. Perhaps this judge will not be travelling at the time. I trust we are not going to have judges travelling around like the stars in the firmament.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): There is provision for deputy judges in clause 10.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): This is the point, the provision involves difficulties. The appointment of a deputy judge under clause 10 can only occur on the recommendation of the Chief Justice, as I recall it, with the approval of the governor in council. In other words, there has to be an order in council for this. The clause states:

—any judge of a superior, county or district court in Canada, and any person who has held office as a judge of a superior, county or district court in Canada, may, at the request of the chief justice—

I presume that is the chief justice of this federal court. Let me repeat:

—may, at the request of the Chief Justice made with the approval of the governor in council, act as a judge of the Federal Court—

I wonder why a couple of superior court or county court judges in a province could not be appointed on a permanent basis. They could hold the position of deputy judge for the purpose of interlocutory proceedings in respect of which one has to obtain an ex parte order or orders that have to be obtained for substitutional service and this sort of thing. I refer to what we call interlocutory applications made in chambers. These are the things in regard to which you are able to go down to see a judge in his chambers. I suggest this would remove a great deal of difficulty. If the judge or members of a federal court did not happen to be in Edmonton, for instance, I, as a barrister with a case for some citizen in hand, could get an order for substitutional service or something of that nature. Under this clause, I would have to wait for the federal judge to come or retain an agent in Ottawa to get that order from a federal judge in his chambers here. I do not think that should be the case.

Let me offer as a sincere suggestion to the minister that one judge could be appointed in the city of Calgary, the city of Edmonton and at other points on a permanent basis so that members of the bar would know they could go to see Mr. Justice so and so, or his honour judge so and so, and get the necessary order in that way.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) is aware that this matter was discussed yesterday. I intervened in the discussion on amendment No. 3, which has already been put to a vote. This dealt with the rota of judges. I hope he will not feel I am being discourteous if I do not reply on this issue, because I am already on record in *Hansard* on the point.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I am sorry I did not see those remarks in *Hansard*. It seems to me the minister might have replied in the same vein to the hon. member for Calgary North because this was a good part of the argument of that hon. member.

Having said that, I will not come to the practicalities of the matter. I suggest to the minister that this will create almost a bar here in Ottawa to deal with the federal court. The minister may shake his head but this happens to be one of the facts of life when working in centres some distance removed from Ottawa. The minister, when practising in Montreal, found it easy to get up here to Ottawa, but I will ask him whether his clients of very limited means could afford to send him from Edmonton or Calgary to Ottawa at an expense of some $220 just for airfare?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): He would not have to do it because the court is on circuit.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Because of the timing, it may be necessary to appear before the court here. One may have to retain an agent in Ottawa to initiate the proceedings because, undoubtedly, they will have to be initiated in Ottawa. Statements of claim and other documents will have to be filed here. There will be a tremendous business created for members of the Ottawa bar. If the minister does not think that is going to increase the costs, I do not know what will. He mentioned that court

fees will be the same but has he ever considered that other item we call solicitor-client fees? Has he ever seen an agent's bill? It may be that justice is expensive in this country, and it can be very expensive when the procedures become more and more involved.

My friend and colleague, the hon. member for Calgary North, is familiar with the situation and knows what he is saying. He has had considerable experience practicing before the court here in Ottawa. I have had limited experience before the Supreme Court of Canada, but let me assure you that the costs of agents are particularly high. They get involved in these cases as much as possible because this is part of a specialized business. One has only to look over a bill of costs to see what this expense involves when a special application is made by an agent in chambers here in Ottawa.

Let me go to another point in relation to the reservation and exclusive right for writs, as provided for in clause 18. Recently I attended a meeting of the Edmonton bar association. That meeting was attended by distinguished counsel from both the academic and practising fields. They examined this bill. It appeared as though they had just seen it for the first time. I find it rather strange that the bar as a whole in Canada has not responded with more interest to the provisions of this bill. I do not think even the Canadian Bar has directly made any full representation or examination in the form of a detailed brief.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Yes.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): There is a dispute concerning the nature of the approach that was made here to the effect that no one made representations directly on behalf of the Canadian Bar. I can make a safe bet, I believe, that the British Columbia Law Society, the Alberta Law Society nor any other law association in the country have not turned their minds officially to this bill. When it comes time either to have it appear in the other place or be proclaimed, there will be a great awakening and the minister will receive all sorts of representations. Before long, we will be asked to amend the bill. I am only blaming the lawyers themselves. They did the same thing in respect of the Canada Corporations Act. Until representations were made to them, and they were asked to react, very few if any made any contribution or comment. Now, when one speaks to them about the bill they express horror concerning some of the provisions. I think a somewhat similar situation will occur with regard to this particular bill.

I wonder why it is necessary that to have a reservation of exclusive original jurisdiction for the application of writs of habeas corpus ad subjiciendum, writs of certiorari, writs of prohibition or writs of mandamus as provided in clause 17? I must say that under clause 18 we also have these exclusive, extraordinary remedies referred to the trial division. In the past, as I understand it, these have also been under the jurisdiction of the superior courts of the provinces. It seems to me I come back to the principle advocated by my hon. colleague from Calgary North, that it should be up to the individual to choose the court in which he will launch his action. I must say I realize what the intention is, but I have these reservations. It is a large central court. I do not know whether the ultimate idea is that regional divisions of the Court shall be established, such as exist in the United States, and that there would be a Canadian federal circuit court based regionally, say, in the Prairies, in Ontario, in Quebec and in the Atlantic provinces. In any event, I support the amendment of my hon. colleague. I have some hesitation, as I have indicated, in respect of particular clauses.

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief in supporting my hon. friend from Calgary North. First, I assure the minister and the House that I shall not become involved in the area of argument between the minister and the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) in which each portrays himself as sort of a barefoot boy David of the law profession fighting the horrible Goliath. I will leave that battle to be determined between them as best they can. But I do not think we need take up a collection to provide either with shoes.

I should like to make one point in respect of the minister's suggestion concerning the rates in this new federal court being similar to those in other courts. What we pay for when we find it necessary to see a lawyer is that lawyer's time, and what is in that lawyer's "noggin". If that lawyer should be an expert in divorce work or in whatever field it might be, it is not necessary for him to spend all the time in the world on the case and it will be handled competently.

However, if once in a blue moon a lawyer has to launch an action in the new federal court, the first thing he will have to do is read the rule book of that court. The minister says it is simple. Perhaps it is as simple as the rules which now exist in respect of the Exchequer Court. But the fact is that the lawyer would have to read them. He would have to spend some time in determining their simplicity and in deciding how to proceed. If he should have only one case in a particular year in this court, then the full burden of his investigation of the rule book would fall on the client who comes to him with that one case. On the face of it, while one might compare the tariffs between the courts, that is not the whole story. We must consider that it is the time involved for which the lawyer charges, as well as his knowledge or lack of knowledge, and the time he has to spend obtaining the knowledge with which to serve his client. It is for this that he must be paid.

Those of us who are lawyers know that in some courts the procedure is as intricate as an 18th century minuet or the ritual courting dance of the whooping crane. It is necessary for one to have a great deal of skill to find his way through the procedure in order to serve a client. Therefore, I hope the minister, recognizing the basic common sense of the argument from this side, will accept the amendment of the hon. member for Calgary North.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? The question is on motions Nos. 1, 2 and 10. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motions?

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion, the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Pursuant to section 11 of Standing Order 45 the recorded division on the proposed motions stands deferred.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Lundrigan)—Fisheries—Initiatives to offset overfishing by foreign draggers—Oceanographic studies; the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis)—War Measures Act—Vancouver police refusal of permission to Viet Nam Committee to hold march.

It being five o'clock the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' business as listed on today's Order Paper, namely, Private Bills. As there are no private bills listed on today's Order Paper, the House will now proceed to the order of business Notices of Motions (Papers).

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

INDIAN AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR REPORT BY BERGER, TISDALL, CLARK AND LESLEY LTD.

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena) moved:

That on Order of the House do issue for a copy of the report on attitude of Indian people based mainly on a visit to the Six Nations Reserve on July 16, 1969, submitted to the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development by Berger, Tisdall, Clark and Lesley Ltd., as referred to at page 6 of the quarterly report on public relations activity, June, July, August, 1969 by the said Berger, Tisdall, Clark and Lesley Ltd.

• (5:00 p.m.)

He said: May I say with respect, Mr. Speaker, that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Buchanan) desires to make a comment first.

Mr. Judd Buchanan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, the department has not felt able to table this report, which should be termed a letter since that is what it is. The reason it has not felt able to do so is that an undertaking has been given to the people who made the comments which have been included in this letter that they would be made on a confidential basis, and that their names would not be divulged. That is the reason the department has felt it was not in a position to table the letter, and therefore the notice of motion for the production of papers has been denied.

However, this morning I had a chat with the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) and explained this to him. He said that so long as we would table the letter he would be quite agreeable to having us substitute, instead of the individual names, the name of an Indian spokesman, and delete the reference to other individuals. Otherwise, the letter is exactly as it came to the department. So, with this understanding we will be happy to table the document as amended and I believe the hon. member will then be prepared to withdraw his notice of motion for the production of papers.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Generally, I am quite agreeable to that. I appreciate the courtesy of the Parliamentary Secretary in calling me earlier today and explaining the situation. I also commend him for doing a fine research job and in convincing the department that it was in error last year when it advised the parliamentary secretary of that day of the circumstances surrounding what is now termed a letter.

I might add that the quarterly report of the company in question, namely, Berger, Tisdall, Clark and Lesley Limited, makes reference to this particular document, which is now called a letter, and in fact it is called a report. My reference to the word "report" was based on the use of that term by the company in question.

I wonder if I could say in passing that I do not think it is material whether I withdraw the motion or whether we assume it is passed. In either case the same effect will be accomplished, namely, the document which the department has refused to make public earlier will now be made public and quite appropriately so. I am agreeable to withdrawing the motion, but this is immaterial except for the fact that if I withdraw the motion I think the Parliamentary Secretary will have to have the consent of the House to table the letter because there will be no order of the House to do so.

All this leads us to conclude that parliamentary secretaries and cabinet ministers all too often in the past—and this proves the point—have been at the mercy of department officials who may want to conceal something which they have no right to do. I would appreciate it very much if the newly appointed parliamentary secretaries, in prosecuting their positions to the full would look more closely at their departments when documents are classified as confidential.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the wish of the House that the document be tabled, subject to the reservations and

conditions mentioned by the Parliamentary Secretary in his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The motion is withdrawn.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

* * *

HEALTH AND WELFARE

WELFARE AND INCOME SECURITY—REPORT OF DR. J. W. WILLARD

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre) moved:

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of any reports or reviews with regard to social welfare legislation and income security prepared by or under the direction of Dr. J. W. Willard, Deputy Minister of Welfare for Canada, since June 25, 1968.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the material which is the subject of this resolution and that is why I sometimes refer to it as the Willard report and sometimes as the Willard reports. That is not a matter of consequence but I thought it might be useful to indicate that whichever term we use, singular or plural, we are talking about the same material.

The Willard report, as I understand it, is a document prepared either by or under the direction of Dr. J. W. Willard, deputy minister of welfare for Canada, on the question of social security, perhaps social welfare, perhaps income maintenance, and other related questions. It is some time since that report was prepared. We did learn that it was in the process of preparation, and a couple of years ago the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Munro) indicated that consideration was being given to the tabling of that report when it was completed. After a time that tune was changed. We were told that we would not get the Willard report as such but that we would get a white paper based on it. That promise was very definite. Indeed we were told that we would get that white paper before the last session ended. The session ended and we did not get the white paper. We have been told in this session that we are still going to get a white paper, that it will not be the same white paper that we did not get last session but that it will cover some of the same ground.

It is not my purpose in these few remarks to be as provocative as these few sentences I have uttered may suggest. We can save that for other occasions. I should add that what we are most interested in is the legislation that will arise out of this whole study, whether we are talking about the Willard report or about the white paper based thereon. But it does seem to me that a pretty fundamental issue is involved in this motion, and I make an earnest appeal to the government that it reverse its decision of last year and that it agree now to make the Willard report public. This government has had a great deal to say about participatory democracy. It has declared that its aim is to get the people of Canada involved in the decision making process. It has set up Information Canada which is supposed to be established for the purpose of getting information through to the people of this country. In fact, some ministers on the other side of the House have declared openly that they think the stance that has been taken in the past—and which is still taken—that no government document or material is to be produced unless there is a clear case for it should be changed. This means that a great deal of government material never sees the light of day. As I said, there are many ministers who say that the reverse should be the position, namely, that every government document should be made public unless there is a good case for not doing so.

In the field of social security, pensions, welfare and income maintenance we have a subject that is extremely important. I do not deny for a minute that I have some ideas in this field. Some people might even think I have some prejudices that I press time after time. But even though I admit that, I insist that in the decade of the seventies we have got to do some real sorting out of the whole question of income levels and the relationship of social security legislation to our economy as a whole. We have got to take a good, hard look at all of our income programs, whether they apply to income from earnings or income from social security programs.

• (5:10 p.m.)

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if the government has used public funds and has put such an eminent civil servant as Dr. Willard to work on this whole question, the material he has produced should not be withheld from the people of Canada. I know of Dr. Willard's work well enough to know that whether his conclusions agree with mine or not, which after all does not matter, in his report there will be abundant material that would be useful to the parliament and to the people of Canada in grappling with this whole broad question of income levels, income maintenance and social security.

An hon. Member: The guaranteed annual income.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Yes, the guaranteed annual income is something that comes into it and, as I say, I am speaking in a very restrained manner this afternoon because I do not believe that this is the time to get into the particular social security changes that I want to see developed. There are plenty of opportunities to do that, but rather I am basing my case for this motion on the fundamental proposition that here in the Willard Report is a mass of material, a mass of information that I am sure would be useful to the people of Canada, and would be useful to us now, not when it is let out of the archives 25 or 30 years hence. It has been paid for by the people of Canada, and I think we ought to have it.

I have no sympathy for the argument that the government probably has, even though it will not put it forward, that it will embarrass the government if it produces this report and then comes down with legislation that does not go along with what is suggested in the report. Surely we are big enough not to take that approach.

If Dr. Willard's studies were to be valuable they had to be done on a broad basis without just suggesting this or that particular program. There had to be an examination of the whole question of income levels and social securi-

ty. I am satisfied, as I say because I know of the work of this distinguished civil servant, that the material he has produced is valuable material. I think it is a shame, I think it is irresponsible on the part of the government to say that this is in the private preserve of the members of the cabinet.

I hope that the Parliamentary Secretary, who, I presume, will be responding to me, will realize that in this appeal this afternoon I am refraining from what I might have done—making an appeal for raising the old age security pension, for establishing a guaranteed annual income and what have you. He knows my views perhaps as well as I do myself. But I am approaching the matter in what I think is a fair, almost academic manner.

Here is a mass of material, produced by an eminent civil servant, and paid for by the people of Canada. It is material that relates to a pressing problem facing Canada in the seventies. I do not think it is fair for it to be kept secret, and even though last year the government turned my motion down I hope it will accept it this year and table the Willard Report in parliament.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gaston Isabelle (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to say a word on the motion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles). He has always been interested in social legislation in Canada, and I know also that his interest is genuine.

However, one must not forget that if the government seeks to progress through normal means, it must have at its service people who can work in peace and quiet, undisturbed by public opinion, in order to better devise progressive programs, especially as far as social security is concerned. I know that all that information is accumulated at the present time so that such a document can be put at the disposal of all in due course.

Mr. Speaker, notice of motion No. 51 deals with the production of reports of studies on social welfare legislation and on proposals concerning income security, prepared by the federal Deputy Minister of National Health and Welfare, or under his direction, since 1968.

That motion covers all the area of social security, namely income security, as well as welfare care and services. In dealing with that motion, I thought I could give a brief outline of some important progress made in the area of social security, and examine some of the main problems we are facing today in that area.

As I just said, the expression "social security" is often used to mean income security programs, as well as those designed to ensure welfare care and services. Through the years, Canada has understood social security in various ways. Although what progress has been made stems from long years of steady evolution, it is only in the last 25 years that the most important legislation has been adopted. Indeed, it is only in that period that the overall system of social security we know today has evolved.

We note three very distinctive stages in the progress of social security in Canada.

The first stops with the World War I. Until that time, social security legislation was almost non existent and progress slow. With the growth and the expansion of the country, new economic and social needs appeared, and it became necessary to supplement private and local social measures with wider measures such as provincial legislation on child welfare, on the provincial ownership or control of institutions for the mentally ill, the retarded, the consumptives, the blind and the deaf-mute, and the act of 1908 on Canadian annuities which marked the start of federal legislation for old age security in Canada.

The second stage stretched from the beginning of World War I to the beginning of World War II in 1939. The progress of social security is closely linked to the rapidly increasing industrialization, the social and economic upheavals of the depression of the 30's, as well as the migration from rural areas to the cities, and the increase in prices. It is this gradual increase in prices which slowly has contributed to the transfer of social security planning from the local and provincial governments to the jurisdiction of the federal government. Several major programs were set up at this time: provincial workmen's compensation boards, allowances to needy mothers, and federal-provincial old age pensions.

• (5:20 p.m.)

The adoption, in 1914, by the Ontario government of legislation to help workers injured on the job was one of the first steps toward a modern social security system. It included, and this is important, the principle of collective responsibility and State insurance. Moreover, it inaugurated a new way of protecting the temporarily or permanently disabled or sick worker, and his family in case he should die at work. The legislation provided for medical assistance and cash allowances over the period of time the employee was disabled and also for the implementation of accident prevention programs. The example thus given in the legislative field was to be followed by other provinces. Then came a second important accomplishment in that field: the introduction of a complete rehabilitation service for disabled workers.

In 1916, the Manitoba legislature passed legislation in order to help needy mothers and their dependents and other provinces followed with similar legislation in following years.

The year 1927 was outstanding as the year of the first important federal move in the income security field, namely the old age pension legislation that was passed then. The scheme provided for federal participation to the cost of provincial pensions granted to people 70 or over, who were declared eligible following a means test taking into account the applicant's income and assets. The same policy was followed in later years with respect to legislation concerning the blind (1937), old age assistance at 65—proclaimed in 1951—and allowances to wholly disabled people, in 1954.

On account of the extensiveness of unemployment during the depression period of the 30's, unemployment assistance measures had to be introduced and one can say that the provinces asked the federal government to assist provincial as well as municipal governments in coping with the high cost of unemployment. It was at

that time that the federal government decided to create a national unemployment programme.

The federal unemployment insurance legislation, passed in 1940, provided among other things the establishment of a national unemployment service.

The third stage covers the World War II and post-war periods, the most flourishing era of social security in Canada. It coincided with times of great industrial expansion and economic growth which enabled us to finance the new and more ambitious social measures that became necessary to cope with numerous urgent problems in the social and economic fields.

It was during that stage that we adopted a new concept of social security. It marked the advent of plans granting universal coverage to nearly everyone above or under the age limit and redistributing revenues to the benefit of households with children and adolescents; this was achieved under the family and youth allowance program whereas, on the other hand, the old age security pensions took care of senior citizens.

In 1951, the implementation of a Canadian old-age security plan was becoming one of the most ambitious—and I would say daring—undertakings that Canada had ever devised in the area of income security.

In order to supplement those universal programs, in 1965, the government established the Canada Pension Plan which is a complete program of social security, providing retirement pensions and disability allowances as well as benefits to survivors. Contributions to the plan started in 1966, benefits to survivors in 1968 and disability allowances in 1970. Under the plan, retirement pension related to income, which will come to maturity after a ten-year transitional period, will supplement the uniform standard old-age security plan. Benefits under the Canada Pension Plan will follow wage changes and will increase with consumer prices; old-age security is also controlled, in a way, by consumer prices.

The Canada Pension Plan provides for its application not only in a province where such a plan would have been established. The province of Quebec has in fact set up its own plan, as we know, the Quebec Pension Plan. The two plans have however been coordinated so as to offer throughout Canada a contributory pension plan. Under such a formula, we have tried to cover nearly the whole active population by adopting a compulsory system.

Another way—

• (5:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Will the hon. member permit a question? In view of the fact that what the hon. member is giving us reads like the introduction to the Willard Report, I wonder if it would not be simpler just to table the report?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Isabelle: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to my hon. colleague from Winnipeg North Centre that I have not received that report. In second place, if I can conclude my study on the review of the social security social legislation which Canada passed several years ago we could perhaps reach a consensus and make hon. members admit that the publication of such a report now is unthinkable. Indeed, I have the impression, as I said at the beginning, that all the studies dealing with this matter should be reconsidered, in order to publish a new and complete report. I am as eager as the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre to read that report, which according to various rumours is extraordinary.

Another approach, Mr. Speaker, to income security for older persons was introduced in 1966 when the guaranteed income supplement for all old age pensioners was established through legislation. Until then, these people, because of their age, received little if anything under the Canada or the Quebec Pension Plan. The legislation providing for a guaranteed income was implemented in January 1967; it guaranteed a minimum income to old age pensioners. The concept of a guaranteed minimum income is a major new development in the field of income security in Canada. Indeed, instead of a means test in terms of the actual income, the use of a means test in order to determine the entitlement to the benefits of this new plan is a departure from the universal coverage connected with Canadian income security schemes.

Great progress has been achieved in the field of health protection for the citizens, through the establishment of a federal plan of health grants in 1948 a national hospital insurance in 1958, a federal health fund in 1966 and the medicare plan in 1968.

Under the Hospital Insurance Act, the Canadian government shares the working expenses connected with hospital care in general hospitals, that is, active treatment hospitals, chronic disease and convalescent hospitals which operate under hospital insurance plans administered by provincial authorities. All provinces participate in the plan which offers a complete range of hospital services available to all residents in each province. Furthermore the federal government shares the expenses of out-patients clinics if the province so desires.

Among the main objectives of Medicare there is the determination to provide to all Canadians the medical services available, regardless of their financial means, thus making early diagnostic and treatment easier.

The federal government agrees to pay 50 per cent of the costs incurred by the participating provinces provided that the medicare plan of each of those provinces meets certain minimum criteria in connection with the extent of the coverage, the universality of the coverage, the portability of benefits and the public administration of the plan. Each provincial plan must meet the following requirements:

a) Be administered as a non-profit public organization under the control of some provincial authority;

b) Provide all necessary medical services, through practising physicians, to every citizen of the province, as insured services available to all under the same conditions, or, in other words, general coverage of medical care;

c) Insure in addition at least 90 per cent of the total number of insurable residents in the province during the first year, and undertake to raise this percentage of

insured people to 95 per cent during the three following years;

d) Make the system "portable", that is to say, to give full coverage including all services, after three months' residence in the province, as well as coverage outside the province during the waiting period when a person decides to settle in another province.

Besides, the Medical Care Act allows the federal government to include other services provided by non medical specialists and this, also pursuant to the conditions laid down by the Governor in Council. Up to now, such extra services have been limited to some special techniques used by dental surgeons, within the framework of hospitalization.

Two provinces, British Columbia and Saskatchewan, joined the federal plan on July 1, 1968. Manitoba, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland did so on April 1, 1969, Alberta on July 1, and Ontario on October 1. As of November 1, that is next sunday, the province of Quebec will also be in it. It is foreseen that other provinces will eventually join the plan in 1970.

Mr. Speaker, the federal government has undertaken, under the Canada Assistance Plan, enacted in June 1966, to pay half the cost of medical care provided by the provinces and the municipalities to recipients of assistance payments, these being based on a means test. Other people in need of medical care and not receiving payments can, after their needs have been similarly assessed, receive periodic medical care. The provinces decide on their own how such care is allotted.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. I regret to interrupt the Parliamentary Secretary, but I must remind him that his time has expired.

[*English*]

Mr. F. J. Bigg (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I wish to support this motion that an order of the House do issue for a copy of the Willard report. We are informed that one of the reasons no action has been taken on the veterans affairs report is that the government is waiting for the master plan to be unfolded. This is my main reason for supporting this motion. I do not want the government to have a screen to hide behind, if indeed they are using the Willard report to hide behind. Our veterans, particularly the Hong Kong veterans, should be attended to immediately.

When the Willard report is issued, it will be of great value. I cannot state now that I will support most of the findings in that report because I do not know what it will contain. However, I presume it will attack the problem of poverty in Canada and will no doubt suggest some form of guaranteed income for all Canadians. That is not a partisan priority; I think all members are interested in some form of guaranteed income.

The way in which this problem is attacked is very important. We want to know what an expert in the field, such as Dr. Willard, has to say about it. That is only one of the things to which we look forward. I do not expect we will get the Willard report immediately, even if this motion is unanimously adopted. I suggest we should be making plans right now to deal with the poverty situation in Canada. We should be working on the problem of unemployment today. Young Canadians in particular are upset spiritually and economically. Although Parliament may not be able to do a great deal for them in a spiritual sense, it can help them in an economic sense. I suggest there should be government assistance for these people. They should not be offered handouts. What they need is a challenge to use their youth and to show faith in Canada. They should be offered the opportunity of exploring our resources. They should be paid bonus wages for making a proper survey of the natural resources in our northland.

There should be an income tax incentive for our youth. It is ridiculous to charge young people income tax on the one hand and to give them bursaries or scholarships on the other. The finest way of encouraging them to get a good education is to pay them well for participating in the development of our burgeoning young nation. They should have the opportunity to pay their own way through university. I have no sympathy for those who do not look after themselves and are not able to attend university. By assisting our young people we will be preventing poverty before it can occur. I am not saying that we should abolish many aspects of social justice. I am in favour of most of it.

• (5:40 p.m.)

But let us plan now and not wait until even the Willard report comes out as an excuse for inaction. Let us give them right now an opportunity to take up their responsibility, to use their imagination, their initiative, their energy, and make sure right now, even if it is at considerable expense, that we use and develop resources of our nation as a lodestone to involve these young people. Then they will not be such easy prey for the FLQ or any other crackpot organization to get hold of, when we need each and every one of them for the development of our country. I will close without more ado. This is only a short pep talk I am giving. Hon. members know what is needed as well as I do. I support the motion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and I hope it will come to a vote.

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): I, too, Mr. Speaker, wish to support this motion for the tabling of the Willard report. I listened with interest to the remarks of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Mr. Isabelle). I have come to know and admire his qualities during the time he has been chairman of the Health and Welfare Committee. I admire, also, the way in which he outlined the history of our social welfare legislation and spoke of some of the developments which might be expected in the future. However, I should like to have heard a little more about the policy underlying the government's refusal to accept this motion. I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will even now undertake to reconsider this decision before very long.

Several of us have a number of similar motions for the production of papers. I believe the government's refusal to table them is based on an old-fashioned way of look-

ing at things. In the old days, the idea was that experts got hold of papers, documentation and information, and then hung on to them, feeling that this was a source of power or, in any case, that other people were quite unable to extract any value from them for a useful purpose. I do not believe this is any longer the case. Today people are accustomed to getting a great deal of information over radio and television and in other ways; they are becoming more and more involved in forming opinions on policy. I am glad to know that the government has been disposed to help members of the opposition parties in this House to get secretarial assistance, technical assistance and assistance in research so that they may be in a better position to deal with the questions of policy which arise.

To return to the Willard report, for a number of years a good many of us who sit in this House have been deeply concerned about social security issues. We want action to be taken on the basis of the fullest possible understanding. We have been waiting all summer very hopefully to get this report. We do not want to find, when the report is finally tabled, that there is insufficient time in which to study it or to consider all its ramifications. We would like very much to see this report now.

Dr. Willard is a man with wide experience, a man who has done a great deal of work in this field and we should like to have the benefit of hearing his recommendations as soon as possible. I believe the government itself would have everything to gain by making them available to us. There may be reasons why the government does not wish to present this document.

An hon. Member: They are afraid.

Mrs. MacInnis: They may be afraid that in some cases the people who were involved in the research would be embarrassed. I am sure Dr. Willard would not be in the least embarrassed to have his research work made public and discussed publicly. I am sure he would be the first man in this country to want the fullest discussion of his work, not only by members of this House but by the public generally as a means of preparing the ground for the legislation which he has been urging for a long time.

Dr. Willard was one of the first to suggest the need for greater income in the form of a guaranteed income or in some other form. I cannot believe, either, that the government would be embarrassed by this report if it were produced. What has the government to be embarrassed about, unless they do not intend to go along with Dr. Willard's findings and hope that if they withhold it they can bring in some kind of mini War Measures Act, at which time it would be impossible to discuss this issue in a calm atmosphere?

There is another possibility which may underlie the government's reluctance to table this report. It is the snobbery of a lot of scientists, a snobbery which remains in some quarters although most modern scientists are getting away from it; the idea that it is the mark of a real scientist to be able to keep his work and his findings away from the public. This is a very old-fasioned attitude. The Parliamentary Secretary put it in a few words when he said that these people liked to "travailler dans l'ombre et le silence" undisturbed by the "bruit du public", or something like that—I did not take down his exact words. Mind you, Mr. Speaker, I have great sympathy for people who like to work undisturbed by crowds and noise, but in this case the work is finished. The work in l'ombre et le silence est fini, et maintenant c'est le moment d'exposer leur travail au peuple et aux membres de ce Parlement.

People are not stupid. People are able to use these findings. But even if they were stupid and could not use the findings intelligently, let us not lose sight of the fact that it is the people of this country, the taxpayers, who pay to have these studies done. If you have paid your money, whether it is for shoes, food, a house or a report, you have a right to see what you have paid for. I really think this is the most compelling argument in favour of production and against keeping all these things under wraps.

Hon. members will see that a large number of motions for the production of papers are on the Order Paper in my name; two or three dozen, I imagine, and I know it will seem at least twice that number to hon. members on the government side. But I have not placed them on the order paper just for the sake of being cantankerous. I think there is a real principle at stake; it is that members of this House have a right to know the facts and members of the public have a right to know the facts. I, for one, intend to keep on bugging and bothering and making a nuisance of myself along with others in this House until we get satisfaction.

These studies do not belong to the government. The public has paid for them and we, as representatives of the public, have just as much right as those sitting on the other side of the House to know what is contained in these reports. It is the government's right, of course, to decide what to do on the basis of the facts and figures contained in the reports, but as to the contents of the reports we feel we have a right to know. Therefore, I strongly urge the Parliamentary Secretary to reconsider the position he has taken. He is a man of science himself. As a matter of fact, I have heard him argue at various times in favour of getting witnesses before us who could speak on the subject from different angles. Certainly, he showed himself in favour of bringing out the fullest possible information concerning matters before us before we took up our positions.

• (5:50 p.m.)

We have been through that with the inquiry into smoking and with various other inquiries, including abortion and birth control, and I have found that he has been fair and most anxious to facilitate the largest possible number of witnesses with different points of view appearing before the committee. Appearing before the committee means appearing before the public and helping to mould public opinion before there is any question of legislation being introduced. The old-fashioned idea

that the law comes first, that the government says "This is it" and then tries to squash the people under it until it is accepted, will not work these days. The new approach is to have the facts discussed and examined first. Anything that cannot stand this kind of public scrutiny will not work today; it is wrong and unworkable because the public insists on having the facts.

Therefore, it is with a great deal of conviction and appreciation that I support this motion for the production of the Willard report. At the same time I ask the government please to reconsider its policy of trying to keep these reports and studies away from the members of the House and the public whom we represent.

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, the notice of motion standing in the name of the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) requests the tabling of the report by Dr. J. W. Willard on social security in Canada. I listened very intently to the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) and I am sure that when the government tables its white paper on social security some time during the session, the Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs will have many hours of deliberation on much of the information contained in the Willard report. Doubtless Dr. Willard himself will also appear before the parliamentary committee.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre suggested that we must do some real sorting out of our income security and protection programs. I agree with that. It seems to me that this is exactly what the government has been doing in preparing its white paper which will be presented to Parliament this session. The Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs and the whole House will have a chance to debate this white paper at considerable length.

Dr. Willard's report is an internal document, not the report of a royal commission. Certainly it will have had a most useful bearing upon the preparation of the government's social security white paper which will be presented this session. There are many family income security programs in Canada. One of them which I am sure will be considered in the white paper on social security is the family allowance program. One aspect of social security is the protection given under the system to families with children. Canada has had an income security program providing cost allowances to dependent children since the end of the Second World War. In many respects our program was unique in terms of its structure and it would be interesting to review the development and some of the consequences of this program.

The family allowances program was established in Canada in 1945. Prior to this date, family allowances were studied in Canada by a parliamentary committee of the House of Commons in 1929 and by a social insurance commission in the province of Quebec in 1933; but in neither case were any recommendations made. In 1943, Dr. L. C. Marsh, in his report on "Social Security for Canada" prepared for the advisory committee on reconstruction, recommended a family allowances program for Canada and suggested that this scheme should occupy a key position relative to a general social security system.

The implementation of family allowances in Canada was motivated by many social and economic factors. On the social side, the program was intended, firstly, to recognize the economic burden of families with children as compared with the needs of families without children. Secondly, it was designed to give a greater measure of equality of opportunity to children. Thirdly, it was contended that it would help ensure an adequate income for social insurance and social assistance recipients with children.

On the economic side, the prime consideration was the role which family allowances were expected to play in helping to maintain a high level of employment and income by stabilizing consumer spending on goods and services. Another important economic consideration was that family allowances were seen as a means for adjusting the wage system in Canada to provide for the social responsibilities of the worker with children. The cost of family allowances in the first year of operation was estimated at $245 million. It appears that the present and future costs of this program were carefully considered in relationship to the national income and the ability of the Canadian economy to support these costs. One of the substantial criticisms levelled at family allowances when the program was being considered was that it was too heavy a fiscal burden to be assumed by the federal government. It was argued by some that the federal government could easily support this program provided national income continued to increase.

Another argument in support of the ability to pay was that the economy had managed to support was expenditures at an annual rate of $4 billion, so that the $200 million for family allowances should be easily provided for. Events have since shown that the Canadian economy has experienced a rate of economic growth which not only has been sufficient to finance family allowances but has been adequate enough to finance a comprehensive social security system which has largely developed since the end of the Second World War.

The foregoing have been some of the important considerations which influenced the development and design of the family allowances program. Let us now look at the structure of payments and benefits available to children in Canada. Family allowances is a program which pays benefits to all eligible children in Canada meeting certain minimal conditions. The program of children's allowances consists of: family allowances, which pay benefits to children at the monthly rate of $6 for each child under 10 years of age and $8 for each child aged 10 or over but under 16 years—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the hour appointed for the consideration of private members' business has expired. I do now leave the chair, to resume same at eight o'clock p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

Federal Court

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

FEDERAL COURT

MEASURE RESPECTING CONSTITUTION, JURISDICTION, ADMINISTRATION, ETC.

The House resumed consideration of Bill C-172, respecting the federal court of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Before the House commenced private members' hour at five o'clock we had deferred the vote on motions Nos. 1, 2 and 10. With the leave of the House I shall now call motion No. 13.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North) moved:

That Bill C-172 respecting the federal court of Canada, be amended by adding to clause 38 page 22 thereof the following subclause:

"(3) The provisions of section 38 shall apply where persons other than the Crown are involved in any such proceedings".

He said: Your Honour, I have nothing to say on this motion because it merely provides that the provisions of section 38 shall apply where persons other than the Crown are involved. I put forward the argument in this regard this afternoon, so there is nothing more to say. This amendment just brings the matter into line with the earlier discussion.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, we believe that for the reasons we advanced, the amendment is not necessary. We believe it is clear from the first subclause of clause 38 that the clause applies to all matters and proceedings in the court, and subclause 2 was added merely to make it clear that the general rule stated in subclause (1) was binding upon the Crown. In those circumstances, we feel we have covered the matter.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question? All those in favour of the said motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

Motion No. 13 (Mr. Woolliams) negatived.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We will now consider motion No. 15.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

Hon. John. N. Turner (Minister of Justice) moved:

That Bill C-172, an act respecting the federal court of Canada, be amended by (a) striking out line 5 on page 35 and substituting the following:

"the Crown in any proceedings in the court shall be paid to the Receiver"; and

(b) striking out lines 19 to 21 on page 35 and substituting the following:

"Crown in any proceedings in the court"

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Woolliams: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I make this suggestion. The Minister of Justice was good enough to advise us that the reason for some of these amendments was procedural in order to clean up certain matters in the bill. It would expedite matters if he would give an explanation of the purpose of each of the amendments.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) is quite right. I circulated to those interested in the bill the reasons behind motions Nos. 15, 16, 17 and 19. They are technical and are only for the purpose of clarification; they do not involve any change in policy. The purpose behind motion No. 15 is this. Dealing first with the proposed change to subclause 3, it was decided that no special procedure need be established by the Governor in Council for the payment of money, so that these words can be viewed as unnecessary. The law should not require a procedure that is unnecessary. With reference to the change in subclause 1, this is proposed simply to make it clear that the provision deals with proceedings in the federal court only.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 15 (Mr. Turner, Ottawa-Carleton) agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We shall now consider motion No. 16.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice) moved:

That Bill C-172, respecting the federal court of Canada, be amended by striking out line 33 on page 37 and substituting the following:

"applies, to the exclusion of any other right of appeal in respect of a judgment, de-"

He said: Mr. Speaker, here again the purpose of the amendment is for clarification and does not involve any change in substance or principle. The introduction of these new words is in order to clarify the route of appeal that must be taken in respect of a judgment, decision or order given or made after the act comes into force. As the provision is now written, it might be open to the view that two conflicting routes of appeal exist, and such a view could give rise to uncertainty and confusion. The amendment proposed therefore makes it clear that an appeal will lie to the new court of appeal in the first

instance and a further appeal will be open to the Supreme Court in accordance with clause 31.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 16 (Mr. Turner, Ottawa-Carleton) agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House will now consider motion No. 17.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice) moved:

That Bill C-172, respecting the federal court of Canada, be amended by (a) striking out line 16 on page 40 and substituting the following:

"Parliament of Canada other than this act, including any such act passed in the third session of the twenty-eighth Parliament"; and

(b) striking out lines 26 to 29 on page 40 and substituting the following:

"Column I of Schedule B to this act are repealed or amended in the manner and to the extent indicated in column II of that schedule."

He said: This amendment would make it clear that all references to the Exchequer Court and the Exchequer Court Act in existing acts and in bills being introduced in this session are amended. This amendment would also delete any reference to Part II of Schedule B.

• (8:10 p.m.)

When the federal court bill was introduced in the last session, it was introduced sufficiently late in the session to enable other bills in the House that contained reference to the Exchequer Court and the Exchequer Court Act to be precisely identified and amended in Part II of Schedule B. Since the federal court bill is being introduced at an earlier stage in this session, it was thought preferable to delete Part II of Schedule B and merely amend all bills introduced in this session by reference. Some of the bills now referred to in Part II of Schedule B require precise amendments. However, those bills have now received royal assent and are more appropriately dealt with in Part I of Schedule B.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 17 (Mr. Turner, Ottawa-Carleton) agreed to.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice) moved:

That Bill C-172, an act respecting the federal court of Canada, be amended by striking out lines 30 to 37 on page 40 and lines 1 to 11 on page 41 and substituting the following:

"65. This act shall come into force on a day to be fixed by proclamation."

He said: Mr. Speaker, clause 65 deals with the coming into force of the bill. Since it is proposed to delete Part II of Schedule B, the references to the coming into force of the acts mentioned in that part may be deleted. Subclause 3 is also deleted, as it deals with the Supreme Court Act amendments which have now received royal assent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 18 (Mr. Turner, Ottawa-Carleton) agreed to.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice) moved:

—That Schedule B of Bill C-172, an act respecting the federal court of Canada, be amended

(a) by striking out the subheading "Part I" on page 43;

(b) by striking out the amendment to the Canada Elections Act, 1960, c. 39 and substituting the following amendment to the Canada Elections Act, 1969-70, c. 49, on page 43:

"Canada Elections Act 1969-70, c. 49	Subsection 3(4) is repealed and the following substituted therefor: "(4) The Chief Electoral Officer shall be paid a salary equal to the salary of a judge of the federal court of Canada, other than the Chief Justice or the Associate Chief Justice of that court, including any additional salary authorized by section 20 of the *Judges Act*, and is entiled to be paid reasonable travelling and living expenses while absent from his ordinary place of residence in the course of his duties."

(c) with reference to the amendments to the Canada Shipping Act, as follows:

1. by striking out the first line of item 7 set out in Column II on page 46 and substituting the following:

"7. Subsection 658(1) is re-" ";

2. by adding immediately after item 7 on page 47 the following item:

"8. Subsection 658(2) is repealed."

3. by renumbering items 8 to 10 as items 9 to 11, respectively,

4. by striking out the first line of the renumbered item 10 on page 47 and substituting the following:

"10. Subsections 710(1) and (2) are repealed" ;

5. by striking out the first twelve lines on page 48 and substituting the following:

"discharging of cargoes on board or from that ship, or the trimming of coal on board that ship, and that ship is at any time found in Canadian waters, the Admiralty Court may, upon its being shown by any person applying in accordance with rules of court that *prima facie* the claim against the owners is a good claim, issue an order for the arrest of the ship."

6. by striking out subsection 710(3) on page 48;

(d) by adding the following item to the amendments to the Customs Act set out on page 52, as item 1 thereof, and by renumbering items 1 to 6 as items 2 to 7, respectively:

"1. Paragraph 45(1)(c) is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"(c) any person who entered an appearance in accordance with subsection (2) of section 44, if he has a substantial interest in the appeal and has obtained leave from the court," "

(e) by striking out the renumbered item 7 of the amendments to the Customs Act on page 54 and substituting the following:

"7. Paragraph 45(21)(c) is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"(c) "rules" means rules made under the *Federal Court Act*." "

Federal Court

(f) by striking out item 4 of the amendments to the Divorce Act on page 55 and substituting the following:

"4. Subsection 20(2) is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"(2) For the purposes of this section, where any petitions for divorce pending between a husband and wife are removed under subsection (2) of section 5 by direction of the federal court—trial division into that court for adjudication, the proceedings shall be deemed to be taken in the province specified in such direction to be the province with which the husband and wife are or have been most closely associated according to the facts appearing from the petitions." "

(g) by striking out the amendment set out in column II opposite the Excise Tax Act on page 55 and substituting the following:

"Subsection 58(3) is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"(3) Where leave to appeal under this section is granted, the appellant shall, within sixty days from the granting of the leave, deposit in the registry of the federal court the sum of one hundred and fifty dollars as security for costs, and thereupon shall set the appeal down for hearing at such time and place as the court may direct, and an officer of the registry shall notify the Tariff Board, the appellant and the other parties to the proceedings under section 57 accordingly." "

(h) by striking out the amendment to the Expropriation Act, R.S., c. 106 and substituting the following amendments to the Expropriation Act, 1969-70, c. 41, on page 55:

"Expropriation Act 1969-70, c. 41

1. Paragraph 2(1) (a) is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"(a) "Court" means the federal court of Canada;"

2. Paragraph 43(b) is amended by adding thereto the words "except that upon the coming in to force of the *Federal Court Act*, the reference shall be construed as a reference to Section 57 of that act;"."

coming into force of the *Federal Court Act*, the reference shall be construed as a reference to section 57 of that act;"."

(i) by striking out the last twelve lines on page 58 set out in column II, with reference to the Industrial Design and Union Label Act, and substituting the following:

" "24. A certified copy of any order of the court for the making, expunging or varying of any entry in the register of industrial designs, or for adding to or altering any registered industrial design, shall be transmitted to the minister by an officer of the registry of the court, and such register shall thereupon be rectified or altered in conformity with such order, or the purport of the order otherwise duly entered therein, as the case may be." "

(j) by adding thereto, immediately after the amendments to the National Energy Board Act set out on page 61, the following:

"Northern Inland Waters Act 1969-70, c. 66

Section 21 is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

"21. (1) An appeal lies from a decision or order of a board to the federal court of appeal upon a question of law, or a question of jurisdiction, upon leave therefor being obtained from that Court on application made within one month after the making of the decision or order sought to be appealed from or within such further time as that court or a judge thereof under special circumstances allows.

(2) No appeal lies after leave therefor has been obtained under subsection (1) unless it is entered in the federal court of appeal within sixty days from the making of the order granting leave to appeal.

(3) Any minute or other record of a board or any document issued by a board in the form of a decision or order shall, if it relates to the issue, renewal, amendment or cancellation of a licence, be deemed for the purposes of section 20 and this section to be a decision or order of the board."

Nuclear Liability Act 1969-70, c. 67

The heading immediately preceding section 26 and section 26 are repealed."

(k) by striking out the reference to "subsection 64(3)" in the list of sections contained in item 1 of the amendments to the Railway Act on page 62; and

(l) by striking out Part II thereof on pages 65 and 66.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the whole of amendment No. 19 relates to amendments to Schedule B. These amendments to Schedule B are proposed as one motion because they are all technical in nature. Most changes are the result of the bill being introduced at a later time, so that amendments to bills that were in the House in the last session and that were set out in Part II of the schedule are now amendments to acts and should be set out in the portion of Schedule B that is now Part I. Part II would be deleted and replaced by the general enacting words referred to in connection with clause 64. A few other amendments to Schedule B are proposed in order to make other technical changes that have been recommended for purposes of consistency or clarification.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister one question which is not pertinent to this amendment but relates to a problem I have. There is a group of acts which set up boards which have appeal procedures, and there is a group of acts which set up boards which do not have appeal procedures. Do all the acts which involve appeal procedures now come under the federal court of appeal?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): All those acts which came under the Exchequer Court now come under the federal court of appeal.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion No. 19 (Mr. Turner, Ottawa-Carleton) agreed to.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The House will now proceed to the votes which have been deferred in accordance with section 11 of Standing Order 75.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I think we should clarify the situation so that we all know where we stand. As I understand it, my motions Nos. 1, 2 and 10 will be voted on together. The hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin), or perhaps someone on his behalf, may speak concerning his amendments. Motions Nos. 1 and 2 set up the concurrent jurisdiction of the trial division and the court of appeal, and motion No. 10 sets up the procedure for that. Motion No. 3 will be voted on separately because it provides that judges move around. Therefore, there will be two votes so far as our amendments are concerned.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I was hoping there would be some way in which a non-lawyer could get into this discussion. On behalf of the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) I am happy to indicate that one vote on amendments Nos. 4, 7 and 9 will be satisfactory.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): What about the vote on motions Nos. 5 and 6?

Mr. Woolliams: They also go together.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Perhaps Your Honour would summarize the situation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: As I understand it, the situation is this. It is agreed that motions Nos. 1, 2 and 10 are to be grouped and taken in one division. Motion No. 3 would be taken separately. Motions Nos. 4, 7 and 9 would be grouped and taken in one division. Motions Nos. 5 and 6 would be taken in one division, and motion No. 14 would be voted on separately. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is so ordered. The question is on motions Nos. 1, 2 and 10 (Mr. Woolliams) as follows:

No. 1

That Bill C-172, an act respecting the federal court of Canada, be amended by striking out subclause (*d*) of clause 2, page 1 thereof, and substituting therefor the following:

"(*d*) "Court" or "federal court" means

(i) the federal court of Canada, and

(ii) for the province of Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick or Alberta, the trial division or branch of the Supreme Court of the province,

(iii) for the province of Quebec, the Superior Court of the province,

(iv) for the province of Newfoundland, the Supreme Court of the province,

(v) for the province of British Columbia or Prince Edward Island, the Supreme Court of the province,

(vi) for the province of Manitoba or Saskatchewan, the Court of Queen's Bench for the province, and

(vii) for the Yukon Territory or the Northwest Territories, the Territorial Court thereof;"

No. 2

That Bill C-172, an act respecting the federal court of Canada, be amended by striking out subclause (*e*) of clause 2, page 1 thereof, and substituting therefor:

"(*e*) "Court of appeal" or "federal court of appeal" means

(i) that division of the federal court of Canada referred to as the court of appeal or federal court of appeal by this act and

(ii) with respect to an appeal from a court other than the federal court of Canada, the court exercising general appellate jurisdiction with respect to appeals from that court;"

No. 10

That Bill C-172, an act respecting the federal court of Canada, be amended by adding to clause 28 page 19 thereof the following subclause:

"(7) The notice of appeal and the filing shall follow the rules set out in section 27."

Division

The House divided on motions Nos. 1, 2 and 10 (Mr. Woolliams) which were negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alkenbrack
Baldwin
Barnett
Bell
Benjamin
Bigg
Code
Comeau
Crouse
Dionne
Fairweather
Forrestall
Fortin
Gauthier
Godin
Grills
Gundlock
Harding
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Laprise
La Salle
Lundrigan
MacDonald (Egmont)
MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond)
MacInnis (Mrs.)
MacLean
MacRae
McCleave
McCutcheon
McIntosh
McQuaid
Mather
Matte
Mazankowski
Monteith
Moore
Noble
Nowlan
Orlikow
Paproski
Peddle
Peters
Ricard
Ritchie
Rodrigue
Schumacher
Skoberg
Southam
Stewart (Marquette)
Tétrault
Thomas (Moncton)
Woolliams
Yewchuk—57.

NAYS

Messrs:

Allmand
Andras
Badanai
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Benson
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Caccia
Chappell
Chrétien
Cobbe
Comtois
Corbin
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Davis
Deachman
De Bané
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Dubé
Duquet
Forest
Forget
Foster
Francis
Gendron
Gibson
Gillespie
Goode
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guilbault
Hellyer
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Hymmen
Jamieson
Jerome
Laing (Vancouver South)
Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt)
Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
MacEachen
Mackasey
McIlraith
McNulty
Mahoney
Major

Division

Messrs:

Marceau
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Munro
Murphy
Noël
O'Connell
Olson
Otto
Penner
Pepin
Perrault
Pilon
Pringle
Prud'homme
Reid
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Roy (Laval)
Serré
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
St. Pierre
Sullivan
Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whiting—93.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motions lost. The question now is on motion No. 3 (Mr. Woolliams) as follows:

No 3

That Bill C-172, an act respecting the federal court of Canada, be amended by striking out clause 7 on page 5 thereof and substituting the following:

"7. (1) The rules may provide for a rota of judges to provide for a continuity of judicial availability in any centre where the volume of work or other circumstances make such an arrangement expedient."

(2) No judge shall be required under rules made under subsection (1) to remain in any centre other than the National Capital Region for a period longer than one month, unless it becomes necessary to do so to complete the hearing of a cause or matter, or unless he consents thereto."

The House divided on motion No. 3 (Mr. Woolliams) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alkenbrack
Baldwin
Barnett
Bell
Benjamin
Bigg
Code
Comeau
Crouse
Dionne
Fairweather
Forrestall
Fortin
Gauthier
Godin
Grills
Gundlock
Harding
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Laprise
La Salle
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lundrigan
MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond)
MacInnis (Mrs.)
MacLean
MacRae
McCleave
McCutcheon
McIntosh
McQuaid
Mather
Matte
Mazankowski
Monteith
Moore
Noble
Nowlan
Orlikow
Paproski
Peddle
Peters
Ricard
Ritchie
Rodrigue
Schumacher
Skoberg
Southam
Stewart (Marquette)
Tétrault
Thomas (Moncton)
Woolliams
Yewchuk—57.

NAYS

Messrs:

Allmand
Andras
Badanai
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Benson
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Caccia
Chappell
Chrétien
Cobbe
Comtois
Corbin
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Davis
Deachman
Dubé
Duquet
Forest
De Bané
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Forget
Foster
Francis
Gendron
Gibson
Gillespie
Goode
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guilbault
Hellyer
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Hymmen
Jamieson
Jerome
Laing (Vancouver South)
Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt)
Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
MacEachen
Mackasey
McIlraith
McNulty
Mahoney
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Munro
Murphy
Noël
O'Connell
Olson
Otto
Penner
Pepin
Perrault
Pilon
Pringle
Prud'homme
Reid
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Roy (Laval)
Serré
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
St. Pierre
Sullivan
Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London-East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whiting—93.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost. Motions Nos. 4, 7 and 9 have been approved by order of the House to be taken in one division. The question now is on motions Nos. 4, 7 and 9 (Mr. Brewin) as follows:

No. 4.

That Bill C-172, an act respecting the federal court of Canada, be amended by striking out clause 18.

No. 7.

That Bill C-172, an act respecting the federal court of Canada, be amended by striking out subclause (1) of clause 28 and substituting the following therefor:

"The court of appeal has jurisdiction under this section to hear and determine an application to review and set

aside a decision or order made by or in the course of proceedings before a federal board, commission or other tribunal upon the ground that the board, commission or tribunal

(*a*) failed to observe a principle of natural justice or otherwise acted beyond or refused to exercise its jurisdiction;

(*b*) erred in law in making its decision or order, whether or not the error appears on the face of the record; or

No. 9.

That Bill C-172, an act respecting the federal court of Canada, be amended by striking out subclause (3) of clause 28 and substituting the following therefor:

"The court of appeal shall have exclusive jurisdiction (*a*) to use an injunction, writ of certiorari, writ of prohibition, writ of mandamus or writ of quo warranto, or grant declaratory relief, against any federal board, commission or other tribunal; and (*b*) to hear and determine any application or other proceeding for relief in the nature of relief contemplated by paragraph (*a*) including any proceeding brought against the Attorney General of Canada, to obtain relief against a federal board, commission or other tribunal;"

The House divided on motions Nos. 4, 7 and 9 (Mr. Brewin) which were negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alkenbrack
Baldwin
Barnett
Bell
Benjamin
Bigg
Code
Comeau
Crouse
Dionne
Fairweather
Forrestall
Fortin
Gauthier
Godin
Grills
Gundlock
Harding
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Laprise
La Salle
Lundrigan
MacDonald (Egmont)
MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond)
MacInnis (Mrs.)
MacLean
MacRae
McCleave
McCutcheon
McIntosh
McQuaid
Mather
Matte
Mazankowski
Monteith
Moore
Noble
Nowlan
Orlikow
Paproski
Peddle
Peters
Ricard
Ritchie
Rodrigue
Schumacher
Skoberg
Southam
Stewart (Marquette)
Tétrault
Thomas (Moncton)
Woolliams
Yewchuk—57.

NAYS

Messrs:

Allmand
Andras
Badanai
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Benson
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Caccia
Chappell
Chrétien
Cobbe
Comtois
Corbin
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Davis
Deachman
De Bané
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Dubé
Duquet
Forest
Forget
Foster
Francis
Gendron
Gibson
Gillespie
Goode
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guilbault
Hellyer
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Hymmen
Jamieson
Jerome
Laing (Vancouver South)
Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt)
Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
MacEachen
Mackasey
McIlraith
McNulty
Mahoney
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Munro
Murphy
Noël
O'Connell
Olson
Otto
Penner
Pepin
Perrault
Pilon
Pringle
Prud'homme
Reid
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Roy (Laval)
Serré
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
St. Pierre
Sullivan
Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whiting—94.

Division

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motions lost. The House will now divide on motions Nos. 5 and 6 (Mr. Woolliams) as follows:

• (9:00 p.m.)

No. 5

That Bill C-172, an act respecting the federal court of Canada be amended by striking out lines 1 and 2 on page 18 thereof and substituting the following:

"28. (1) Notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, the court"

No. 6.

That Bill C-172, an act respecting the Federal Court of Canada, be amended by striking out paragraph (c) of subclause (1) of clause 28 on page 18 thereof and substituting the following:

"(c) based on its decision or order on an erroneous finding of fact that it made in a perverse or capricious manner."

Division

The House divided on motions Nos. 5 and 6 (Mr. Woolliams) which were negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alkenbrack
Baldwin
Bell
Bigg
Code
Comeau
Crouse
Dionne
Fairweather
Forrestall
Fortin
Gauthier
Godin
Grills
Gundlock
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert (Bellechasse)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
Laprise
La Salle
Lundrigan
MacDonald (Egmont)
MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond)
MacLean
MacRae
McCleave
McCutcheon
McIntosh
McQuaid
Marshall
Matte
Mazankowski
Monteith
Moore
Noble
Nowlan
Paproski
Peddle
Ricard
Ritchie
Rodrigue
Schumacher
Southam
Stewart (Marquette)
Tétrault
Thomas (Moncton)
Woolliams
Yewchuk—49.

NAYS

Messrs:

Allmand
Andras
Badanai
Barnett
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Benjamin
Benson
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Caccia
Chappell
Chrétien
Cobbe
Comtois
Corbin
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Davis
Deachman
De Bané
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Dubé
Duquet
Forest
Forget
Foster
Francis
Gendron
Gibson
Gillespie
Goode
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guilbault
Harding
Hellyer
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Hymmen
Jamieson
Jerome
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Laing (Vancouver South)
Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt)
Langlois
Laniel
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
MacEachen
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Mackasey
McIlraith
McNulty
Mahoney
Major
Marceau
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Mather
Munro
Murphy
Noël
O'Connell
Olson
Orlikow
Otto
Penner
Pepin
Perrault
Peters
Pilon
Pringle
Prud'homme
Reid
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Roy (Laval)
Serré
Skoberg
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Stafford
St. Pierre
Sullivan
Thomas (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (London East)
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whiting—103.

[Mr. Speaker.]

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motions lost. The House will now divide on motion No. 14 (Mr. Brewin) as follows:

That Bill C-172, an act respecting the federal court of Canada, be amended by striking out the words "or to federal-provincial relations" in subclause (2) of clause 41 at page 23.

The House divided on motion No. 14 (Mr. Brewin) which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS

Messrs:

Aiken
Alkenbrack
Baldwin
Barnett
Bell
Benjamin
Bigg
Code
Comeau
Crouse
Fairweather
Forrestall
Grills
Gundlock
Harding
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Lambert (Edmonton West)
La Salle
Lundrigan
MacDonald (Egmont)
MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond)
MacInnis (Mrs.)
MacLean
MacRae
McCleave
McCutcheon
McIntosh
McQuaid
Marshall
Mather
Mazankowski
Monteith
Moore
Noble
Nowlan
Orlikow
Paproski
Peddle
Peters
Ricard
Ritchie
Schumacher
Skoberg
Southam
Stewart (Marquette)
Thomas (Moncton)
Woolliams
Yewchuk—49.

NAYS

Messrs:

Allmand
Andras
Badanai
Basford
Béchard
Beer
Benson
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Breau
Caccia
Chappell
Chrétien

Messrs:

Cobbe
Comtois
Corbin
Cullen
Cyr
Danson
Davis
Deachman
De Bané
Dionne
Douglas
(Assiniboia)
Dubé
Duquet
Forest
Forget
Fortin
Foster
Francis
Gauthier
Gendron
Gibson
Gillespie
Godin
Goode
Goyer
Gray
Guay (St. Boniface)
Guilbault
Hellyer
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan
Boundary)
Hymmen
Jamieson
Jerome
Laing (Vancouver
South)
Lambert
(Bellechasse)
Lang (Saskatoon-
Humboldt)
Langlois
Laniel
Laprise
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard
(Lac-Saint-Jean)
MacEachen
Mackasey
McIlraith
McNulty
Mahoney
Major
Marceau
Marchand
(Kamloops-
Cariboo)
Matte
Munro
Murphy
Noël
O'Connell
Olson
Otto
Penner
Pepin
Perrault
Pilon
Pringle
Prud'homme
Reid
Roberts
Robinson
Rochon
Rodrigue
Roy (Laval)
Serré
Smith
(Northumberland-
Miramichi)
Smith
(Saint-Jean)
Stafford
St. Pierre
Sullivan
Tétrault
Thomas
(Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner
(London East)
Turner
(Ottawa-Carleton)
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whelan
Whiting—103.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice) moved that Bill C-172, respecting the federal court of Canada, as reported (with amendments) from the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, be concurred in.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

An hon. Member: On division.

Motion agreed to.

• (9:10 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: When shall the said bill be read the third time?

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, we are prepared to get it out of the road and to see whether the government really has any effective legislation available.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We agree, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: It is not clear to the Chair what the hon. member is agreeing to.

Mr. Baldwin: Third reading.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton) moved that the bill be read the third time and do pass.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: On division.

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

* * *

EMERGENCY GOLD MINING ASSISTANCE ACT

AMENDMENT EXTENDING APPLICATION TO JUNE 30, 1973

The House resumed, from Monday, October 26, consideration of the motion of Mr. Greene that Bill C-4, to amend the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, in 1948 the original Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act was passed. It was designed to be a very temporary measure to aid mining communities throughout Canada while they passed from a period of wartime, with its shortage of men and materials, into the new era that was developing in our country, an era when the mining industry, particularly the gold mining industry, found itself in difficulty. I think everyone who participated in the passage of the original act thought that the measure would bring forth other measures of a more permanent nature to solve the problems of the gold mining industry.

The reason the country was so concerned about the gold mining industry was that during the war the industry had lost many of its employees and had had difficulty buying equipment and simple requirements such as hoses, drills, steel, machines and so on. The hope was that the mining industries of Canada would return to their former condition, prior to the war. I am sure many members here are unfamiliar with the role played by the gold mining industry in the years prior to the war. I remember when most of the employment in northern Ontario was in the gold mines. People came from all over Canada to work in the industry. Wages were considerably higher than those of other industries in the country. A salesman in a gold mining community could expect to make money on his sales, something that was almost impossible in other parts of the country.

We believe that we built Toronto. There are those who disagree, but nevertheless we believe that we supplied most of the money that built Toronto, and in turn that there is an obligation by Toronto that has not been met. The fact is that the gold mining industry was a key industry in the late depression years. Without the industry, the depression would have been much more severe in Ontario. Therefore, in 1948 when mines were being closed as a result of economic conditions during the post-war years it was only reasonable that this measure was passed to assist the industry.

I am sure that no one who participated in passing the act in 1948 expected it to stay in existence for longer than three years, which was the original period, but several things happened to make it impossible for the gold mining communities to return to the economic level they had attained prior to the depression. For one thing, the product of the gold mining industry is a national commodity. All newly-mined gold in Canada is sold to the Canadian Mint, and the Canadian government in turn sells that gold, or most of it, to the United States which deposits it in Fort Knox where it becomes part of the international money system of the world.

While the cost of every other commodity has gone up, with the resultant effect this has had on the gold mining industry as on every other industry and individual in Canada, the price of gold itself has not changed. I do not intend to make a speech about the gold standard because a number of Socialist colleagues sitting behind me are not known for their great love of monetary metals. However, I think it is important to ask what role gold plays in our monetary system.

Since 1948 the government of Canada has paid out a subsidy of $281 million to the industry, and this is a period of 22 years. I think everybody who is interested in the payment of subsidies should ask why the Canadian government has been willing to sell gold at $35 an ounce to the U.S. treasury when it costs them a subsidy of $281 million to ensure the continuance of gold mining. We have now reached the stage where today 28 mines employ a total of roughly 7,300 gold miners. We shall be paying $14 million this year by way of subsidy to the industry. If that sum were divided among those employees, it would go a considerable distance toward providing them with an income to stay at home.

No one has decided what relationship gold has to the International Monetary Fund or what value there is in continuing to mine gold. I am sure there are some who do not realize the contribution made by the industry in post-war years which enabled the Canadian treasury to sell gold to the United States in return for U.S. dollars, at a time when this currency was badly needed to develop areas of Canada.

The industry presented a brief to four ministers and members of Parliament last June. They pointed out in their brief that the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act had been responsible for keeping in existence most of the gold mining communities. Not only did it help maintain jobs, but part of the general subsidy sustained long-established communities that were facing serious threats to their continued existence.

• (9:20 p.m.)

I am sure some people ask why we bother to keep these communities in existence. It is very interesting to note that in most of the major mining communities in Canada where gold mining has been subsidized over the last few years, changes have taken place. This would indicate that there will be an end to the type of assistance the federal government has supplied under the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act. I am thinking particularly of the town of Timmins. Originally Timmins was one of the largest gold mining camps in North America. It produced a great deal of gold for the monetary system of North America and it was developed almost entirely around the gold mining industry.

I can remember when one of the mines in Timmins had close to 5,000 employees. Each employee was making 52 cents an hour on the surface, and when I first started, 58 cents an hour working underground. That does not sound like very much money today, but in those days they were among the highest paid employees in the country. Over the years, as other industries have developed in the mining field, gold mining wages have remained notoriously low. Very little of the subsidies has gone directly or proportionately into the wage structure. In Timmins we now have one of the largest copper producers in the country. We also have several large asbestos producers. We also have producers of zinc, lead and base metals. Even the McIntyre Mine, which is known all across the nation and across the world, has been able to develop a copper property inside the old gold-producing area, so that the same facilities are now being used to produce copper and gold.

Changes have taken place and some advantages are enjoyed in the communities because of new methods. This has only been possible as a result of maintaining the gold mine over a period of time in order to keep up the communities vital to any mining taking place in the area. The situation at Kirkland Lake is very similar. In 1957, when I was elected, there were probably nine gold mines in Kirkland Lake but today there are only two. We have added to that mining area a copper producer, an iron producer and in the immediate periphery we have developed several other base metal mines. Although the area is not self-sufficient, it is heading in that direction as the gold mining industry fails.

I have been told by the industry, as certainly the committee that met with them was told, that it is their opinion that in the very near future—in mining, that means in the next five years—world gold production will probably be used solely for industrial purposes with very little gold being made available for monetary purposes. I am not making a financial speech on financial matters, because I certainly am not capable of doing so. Since I have been a member of this House I have found that very few people are capable of making such a speech, and most of them are not here now.

It seems to me there is a relationship between gold and world trading. We have always been very happy to sell wheat to Russia because Russia did not pay us, as some other countries did, with money which we loaned them on a long-term basis to be paid back to us in bits and pieces. Russia paid us in gold bullion. We were very fortunate in this regard because we could accept that gold at $35 an ounce, hold it for a short period of time and then sell it to the United States at a profit of $7 per ounce. Perhaps we should deduct that profit from the subsidies we have paid. This might reduce them to some extent. This side of the gold mining industry is one we have not explored. I am not sure that the Bank of Canada has ever known what to do with gold. I do not know who the bright guy was in the treasury board who a few years ago said we should start hoarding gold and establish our own stockpile. But this paid off; it was a good move. There must be some smart financial people who are not in that field now because the price of gold on the international market is very little higher than $35 an ounce.

As far as the gold mining communities are concerned, they are still selling gold at a fixed price. The price has been fixed for many years. This industry, unlike any other, is not able to take advantage of the marketplace to meet higher costs, higher wages and higher maintenance expenditures. In northern Ontario, particularly in my part of the country, we have tried a number of schemes over the years. I was very pleased to hear the minister say when he introduced this legislation that there were strings attached. He said this is the time for municipalities, labour unions, employers and the gold mining industry itself, as well as the provincial government, to co-operate with the federal government in finding some way of solving the problem that the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act was established to solve. I congratulate him for coming to this conclusion. I came to this conclusion before I came to this House when I was working in the gold mines.

When I first started working in the gold mines, the industry made a good profit on each employee. This good profit has not been made on each employee for a long time. The industry has just got by, but has been doing a service to communities and to itself. If you think in terms of a woman who likes to be kept in the manner to which she has been accustomed, the gold mining industry has been accustomed to a fairly high standard but it is not now being kept in that way. The gold mining communities are willing to participate with the federal government in its attempts to find a solution.

We not only have the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act; we have the incentives program and assistance to northern minerals exploration. The industry is asking that this program be extended to the whole of Canada and that more money be put into the fund so that finances can be provided for exploration in all parts of Canada rather than in the Yukon and Northwest Territories only. Assistance in the form of incentives has been of help, but it has not been directed in the proper way. If it is to be directed to the mid-Canada corridor, where most of the development is taking place, we will obviously require much stronger incentives than we now have. It is all right to hold out a carrot to entice industry, but what industry do we expect to entice? We do not find anyone coming to nibble at the carrot.

We can offer to supply new development companies with services such as water, sewage, fire departments, schools and all the modern facilities of a big city at about one one-hundredth of the cost of these services in our major cities. But it seems to me that if the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) is going to hold out to these communities a carrot in a form other than subsidies, he will require the co-operation of four or five branches of government which would have to decide that certain industries would be better off in these areas than in our major cities.

• (9:30 p.m.)

This was done in England in two ways. First, the industry was told that the undistributed profits of the company could not be used unless the company had a lease, and that it could obtain a lease only if it were prepared to move into the area to which the authorities wanted it to move and, secondly, it would not be granted a building permit in any area other than the one designated. I know this plan did not work 100 per cent. But industries were enticed to go beyond the periphery of London, Coventry and other major points and settle in areas such as the Midlands which had gone out of textile production. Heavy industries were brought into these areas, with some success.

I should like the minister to table the interdepartmental report he received. This was prepared not only by his department but, I understand, by a number of departments. The gold mining industry is not like any other industry; its problems are different. I am not particularly concerned about the 20, 25 or even the 40-year old people in the gold mining industry. We are concerned about the 50 per cent in the industry who are over 50 years of age. They have only a limited educational background and over the years they have been trained only in lode mining.

Although there are other mines in the area, the miners cannot work in them because of the dissimilarity in mining methods. Originally, gold and silver mining was carried out by one or two miners in an isolated area almost entirely on their own initiative, although supervised by others. This situation is not duplicated in other areas of mining. So the gold mining industry is in serious difficulty and, more importantly, the communities that have been built up around the industry are in serious difficulty.

In my opinion, the mid-Canada corridor concept mentioned by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) the other day in this debate is a matter to which the government should give serious consideration. Here we have a plan developed by private initiative, which indicates the immense potential of the mid-Canada

corridor. It indicates to the general public that those who invest money in the mid-Canada corridor will reap immense financial benefit. I have absolutely no interest in Mr. Rhomer running a large portion of Canada. I am not the least interested in giving him that large section of Canada, but I think the government should not neglect the study he has made and the information he has given concerning the immense potential of this area. I suggest, as the minister mentioned, that the gold mining communities are centrally and strategically situated in this area. They would be the basis for any organized development in that part of Canada.

The Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) indicated that growth centres would be established. If he has pursued that policy very far, the results have missed me because in northeastern Ontario the growth centres obviously will be the established mining communities which have immense quantities of social capital. They have houses and all the amenities of the major cities. In most of these communities there are educational facilities the equal of any in Canada. In my opinion, for the employment factor we have in these communities today the facilities are far in excess of their needs.

I do not think a man who has worked for 30 or 40 years in the gold mining industry can be retrained mentally or even physically. He cannot be retrained to work in an office or even to do factory-type work. Over the years he has worked in that area and has educated his children, who cannot find employment in the area. He has worked in order to build a home for himself and his family. He has roots in the community and has made a contribution to the social capital of the community. Now he is faced with the almost immediate closing of all the gold mines if the provisions of the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act are not continued.

I believe those who say that the subsidy is rather silly will have to come up with an immediate solution to take care of the people who will be displaced almost immediately if emergency gold mining assistance is cut off or curtailed. So I am looking forward to the meetings of the committee to which this bill is to be referred and to hearing the views of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources in respect of the bill and his discussions with people in the mining communities concerning a solution to this problem.

The people in the mining communities today are not particularly happy with their record in respect of welfare. Kirkland Lake is the highest welfare area in the province of Ontario, with Timmins a very close second. They are not proud of these statistics or of the fact that the mining communities are dependent upon the federal government for emergency gold mining assistance to enable them to continue in existence—not to make their industry viable, but just to keep them there at all. What we want is an opportunity to expand Kirkland Lake. Every year in the past 30 years Kirkland Lake has lost a small portion of its population. We have reached the goal of the many young people today who say that we should have a population increase of zero. We have done a little better. Because of the facilities we have, the fact that we own our own railway in northern Ontario, the fact that we have good highways and have commodities other than the products of mines, we should with the assistance of the government be able to develop a viable community.

If the government could come up with a well thought-out, well planned and well founded policy that would have hope of success, the people of northern Ontario would owe the government a vote of thanks. The people of the gold mining communities are not happy that they have to come before the public every two or three years and request the continuation of the subsidy for a commodity which most Canadians believe should be left in the ground.

On behalf of the people of these areas, I say that I do not believe they have anything to be ashamed of, because the contribution of the gold mining communities to the economy of Canada and the development of the provinces in which the gold mines are situated is a very great one. Because of this I believe these people deserve support in respect of the passage of emergency gold mining assistance legislation.

• (9:40 p.m.)

If I am at all unhappy about this bill, it is because we have retained the word "emergency" in its title. It seems to me, and it has seemed to me for some time, that anything that goes on for 22 years is no longer an emergency but is a fact of life. I am an optimist, although not sufficiently optimistic to buy gold mining stock; but I am always hoping that the international price of gold will go up.

I am sure that if the world continues in the unsatisfied and unsettled condition which exists in almost every part of the world, there will continue to be people putting gold under their beds and it is possible that the price of gold will go up. I suggest that if it goes up sufficiently high to enable mining communities to exist on their profits, they will be able to pay back to the rest of Canada many times over the contribution people have made to them over the years, because as the situation in the world deteriorates it is my opinion that gold will again become a very valuable international trading commodity.

I hope members of the House will find it easier to support the contribution that will be made under the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act than wait for the day when an increase in the price of gold will make it possible to expand this industry.

Mr. B. Keith Penner (Thunder Bay): Mr. Speaker, my remarks concerning this bill will be brief, because although at one time my constituency was a major producer of gold, that is no longer the case. There are many abandoned gold mines throughout the area, but the last of these closed down in the spring of this year and salvage operations are now under way. So I am pleased

at the extension of this assistance because in other parts of northern Ontario it will still be important to the communities that depend on this industry. In my constituency it will make no particular difference.

I would now like to speak about the effects on the community when the gold mining industry ceases to exist. It is in this area that the EGMA has failed, because although it gives a great deal of money to the industry, when a mine closes down none of that money benefits the workers or the community in which the industry existed and from which the community profited for a number of years.

Last June, Lakeshore Gold Mines Limited announced the closing of their mine. I am referring to the MacLeod-Mosher mine in Geraldton, Ontario. What has been the effect of the closing of this mine? A very large number of workers found themselves in serious trouble. I do not want to take the time of the House in going through the figures and statistics concerning the number of workers and their ages, but let me summarize briefly. Approximately 52.4 per cent of the remaining work force at MacLeod-Mosher are over 50 years of age. This age factor presents a serious problem to these workers. Who will hire them?

It is a known fact that even though legislation exists to prevent discrimination because of age in employment, nevertheless such discrimination does exist. Companies are very dubious about hiring people over 40 years of age, which is most unjustified and shortsighted. The gold mining industry has not been prepared, and never has been, to accept its responsibilities to the workers and the communities in which they operate. So the social fact is that what we have done with these workers is simply to throw them on the heap. I believe that some kind of assistance should be provided for these people.

The Department of Manpower and Immigration came to Geraldton and did an excellent job in trying to relocate these people. But relocation is not always the answer when people have become involved in a community for many years, when their children have gone to school and grown up in the community, and when they have bought a home and paid for it. In such circumstances they are not always anxious to be relocated. Also, the service industries depend upon these people. So when the Department of Manpower and Immigration promises relocation for those who cannot possibly find jobs or be retrained, this is not always met with great joy and delight in the community.

The only teeth in the new bill is to make the companies which are to receive this assistance promise that they will use the services of the Department of Manpower and Immigration, and that is acceptable. The only problem is that it does not go far enough. That is why I think there should be more teeth in this bill. In order to receive this assistance, the companies should be required to make a further contribution to the workers when the mine closes down.

Of course, the gold mining industry complains that it is not a profitable operation. I find this rather hard to accept. Let us consider a few of the figures in respect of Geraldton. MacLeod-Cockshutt Gold Mines has been operating since 1938. From 1938 to the end of 1966, MacLeod-Cockshutt milled 9.4 million tons of ore for a total value of recovery of $49,150,576.00. In addition to that amount, about $2.9 million came from government subsidies through EGMA. Consolidated Mosher Mines Limited started operations in 1962, and in that very first year they received $385,411.99 through EGMA. From 1962 to 1966, inclusive, the operative income was $12.4 million from bullion recovery, and $2.4 million in EGMA. To put all these figures together, the total value recovery is $61 million plus. In addition, these companies have received during this period $8 million plus in EGMA. This represents a grand total of more than $69 million.

When I go to Geraldton, knowing that this amount of money has been produced from this community, I notice that nothing is left. Very little exists in that community to show for all these fabulous earnings. What we have here is something that northern Ontario has been familiar with for far too long in its history. This is the grab-and-run policy of the mining industry. This grab-and-run approach has to be replaced with something different. It has to be replaced by a policy that puts people and their interests first. The new bill makes some small concession to that, as I have mentioned. It says that the Department of Manpower and Immigration must be involved. That is not enough. Something more is required. More government action is required. There must be a guarantee that a far larger portion of the wealth produced in northern Ontario will remain there to benefit the region and its people who have spent their lives in this region of Canada; otherwise, the potential of growth in this area will not be realized. It is quite evident that if the workers are to be protected and the north is to be developed, government action and intervention are required to ensure that the workers will be given a fair shake.

When you look at the gold mining industry in total, you find some rather interesting figures for the province of Ontario. I am referring to the Ontario Department of Mines Review, 1969. According to this review, last year was the third consecutive year that the Ontario mining industry topped the billion dollar production mark. Gold production for 1969 in Ontario totalled around $45 million. These figures indicate that that industry is a giant among giants and could well afford to accept, and should be made to do so, its responsibilities to the workers and the communities that are and were instrumental in helping the industry make such fabulous earnings.

• (9:50 p.m.)

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I strongly feel that this amending bill, besides insisting that the companies become involved with the Department of Manpower and Immigration should include a severance pay clause benefitting workers who can no longer find employment even through the services of this department. Older miners

should be allowed to retire in the communities in which they have spent so much of their lives, and some of the profits of the companies should be made available to allow them to retire in an acceptable manner.

Provision should be made for some sort of severance pay and also for some sort of payment to communities which have lost this industry. The aim should be not only to assist the corporations that mine the gold but to assist those workers who invested their lives in the industry, and also the communities surrounding the industry. When a gold mine closes down the community is left, and so are many of the miners, with no assistance provided for them.

Mr. Oza Tétrault (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I notice that the minister is in the chamber and I know he will listen to my remarks. In March of this year I made a speech on the subject of gold mines, especially those in northern Quebec, seeking extension of the subsidy on gold mining which was to be discontinued on December 31, 1970. Now a new approach has been taken and the subsidy will be paid until June, 1973. In my speech in March I emphasized that the municipalities in my constituency were very nervous about the prospects for the mining industry. We did not know whether the government was going to continue the subsidy. This is a situation which has existed since 1948, and every three years people have been sent from my constituency to plead with the government to continue the subsidy.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, representatives of many municipalities have submitted fairly long briefs to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene) clearly showing the importance of gold mining in northwestern Quebec.

I appreciate the fact that the cost to the government of subsidizing gold mines is fairly high, since that has amounted to $280 million since 1948. On the other hand, it should not be forgotten that the citizens of the different mining communities pay taxes, unemployment insurance contributions, etc. If the government does the necessary computing, it will find, I am sure, that it is not the loser, since it has surely received millions in direct and indirect taxes.

Some 2,000 gold miners with their families live in northwestern Quebec. Consequently, the closing down of those mines would compel thousands of workers to migrate, and this would increase unemployment as these men are not trained for other work.

Mr. Speaker, experience has shown that retraining is not always possible for workers over 40 and, right now, almost 50 per cent of miners are 45 years old or over and about 75 per cent of them have less than 10 years of schooling.

As the representative of a region where the economy is based mainly on the mining industry, I know full well

that Canada could not do without that precious metal currently used in the making of various products. In fact, which of us does not own a gold watch, ring or chain?

The few millions the federal government gives this industry represent a real investment, because the importance of gold in private industry is forever increasing. Indeed, South African engineers say that industry will soon absorb almost all the gold produced.

Moreover, with grants to gold mines, the government is promoting exploration, which is essential. Everything possible should be done to ensure successful results.

Mr. Speaker, let us simply recall the good years when prospecting played an important part in the economy of northwestern Quebec. The Horne mine was discovered there and it is now the Noranda mine, one of the richest copper deposit in Canada.

One thing for sure, the problem we are discussing today will crop up again in 1973. I think that the federal government should endeavour to come up with a final solution to the problem of gold mining assistance. As I said earlier, stopping subsidies would create insurmountable difficulties in various areas of the province, particularly in northwestern Quebec.

One method has been suggested to counteract the closure of gold mines and that is to retrain the miners and grant them allowances enabling them to relocate where they might work at their new trade. Unfortunately such a program would strangle the economy of mining towns where there would be nobody left but children and older people.

Above all, I do not understand why the government is paying the farmers to prevent them from producing wheat and that, on the other hand—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but his time has expired.

[*English*]

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

FISHERIES—INITIATIVES TO OFFSET OVERFISHING BY FOREIGN DRAGGERS

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, I feel deeply honoured that we have two eminent environmental experts in our presence this evening in the person of the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) and in the person of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene). Their presence almost

flabbergasts me because I am going to touch on a topic that demands a tremendous amount of expertise and I have only two or three minutes with which to scratch the surface.

It is encouraging to notice that in the area of oceanography, about which I raised this question with the Minister a couple of days ago, Canada by its efforts with *Hudson 70* has been making some dramatic moves. It is also encouraging to read a report in the *Globe and Mail* on trilateral efforts by Canada, the Soviet Union and the United States in the area of research respecting herring resources on Canada's east coast.

• (10:00 p.m.)

I want to open up the question of the whole business of marine resources—not only the renewable resources but others such as oil, minerals and the like. I ask the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry if he could now for a few minutes, and later in a prepared statement, elaborate on Canada's present and future efforts in oceanography and matters to do with marine resources.

I have been reading a great deal of literature on this subject and I notice that most people writing on it today acknowledge that our marine resources are of much more value than our land resources. It startled me to learn that the offshore oil resources and the continental shelf resources as outlined at the 1958 Law of the Sea Conference at Geneva indicate that there may be as much as 300 billion barrels of oil as one type of resource. That is over and above fishing and what can be called renewable resources.

I have been reading a number of articles by eminent people in the field who feel that Canada, among the major marine nations of the world, has to regain lost ground in terms of oceanographic study. Rear Admiral Harry Porter, writing in the March, 1970, edition of *Canadian Shipping* in an article called "Seapower and Canada," said:

> Today, much effort is being spent on oceanographic research —research into the biological content and chemical and physical properties of the sea. This work has major economic and military significance, and is of particular importance to the fishing industry. Canada carries out a modest program in this field, while the U.S. has a large program. The Russians have a research fleet that, in numbers, is larger than the rest of the world's put together.

I do not know if Rear Admiral Porter knows exactly what he is talking about, but I have checked him out and apparently he is a rather conservative individual, in the non-political sense. There is also an article by Mr. M. J. Colpitts, chief of the marine division of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, which appeared in the June/July, 1970, issue of *Sea Harvest*. In this he indicates practically the same conclusion and goes on to point out the efforts being made by a number of countries such as the United States with its 1966 Marine Resource and Development Act in order to give all its marine studies, oceanographic studies, and so on, a particular direction, a specific and encompassing contribution. They feel it is very important to be in the vanguard in this area.

Great Britain in 1968 formed the Committee on Marine Technology, and also in 1968 France announced a program to tie together all the efforts they are making in this particular area. The Republic of Germany, which is one of the greatest predators of the fisheries on the east coast of Canada, in 1968 set up the German Commission for Oceanography. Six other nations, including France, constitute what was termed Eurocean. These six nations are trying to work together on oceanographic studies.

I raise the question because yesterday I had an opportunity to talk with a number of people at the United Nations who are expert in the field, regarding the Law of the Sea. The Minister of Fisheries and Forestry has been saying we must have a vehicle for bringing about discussions and negotiations on our marine resources as they pertain to fishing, but these people tell me that they are only now in the stages of setting up a preparatory committee to find out if they will have such a conference, what the agenda will be and who will participate.

They tell me that the United States has assembled such a mass of information and such documentation on the business, and has accumulated ecological studies, mineral rights, territorial rights and so on, that it will take them about two years to find out exactly what the United States has presented. Indeed, they feel it is likely to take about five years before the preparatory work can be carried out for such a study. However, they feel it is physically possible within two years but could take as long as five. I look forward to hearing from the minister about the work he has done in the last few weeks with respect to the Soviet Union and Canada, and I hope he will tell us more about his plan for the east coast of Canada.

It seems that discussions along the lines that have taken place will form the burden of our activity in connection with marine technology. We are concerned about what happened on the west coast, where Canada held discussions in this area. We are so backward in this area that we cannot sit at the same table. It is like me trying to twist arms with Yukon Eric. I wonder if the minister, notwithstanding—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Lundrigan) covered a lot of ground in his seven minutes. I will try and cover part of that ground. First, with regard to oceanography, I do not think Canada needs to hand her head. The hon. member mentioned recent explorations over Georges Bank where Canada, the United States and the U.S.S.R. were diving to see what actually happens on the bottom.

The Russians, with all their men and vessels reached certain conclusions. Canada, renting a little submarine that was built in my riding, went down to the bottom to

see what was happening for the first time. They provided data which is really unique, with regard to herring spawn, for example. No one had this information before. It was found out by Canadians in a submarine that cost three-quarters of a million dollars. The Americans have never come close to this in terms of competence in a submarine that was built at a cost of $11 million by Lockheed. Canada got there first. We got there at a fraction of the cost to the Americans. We are doing all right.

I was surprised to hear the hon. member say that we are not spending money on oceanography. Canada has one of the world's best, if not the best, centres of oceanography at Bedford in the Halifax area. We are spending millions of dollars in oceanographic studies in the north Atlantic. We know a lot about fish in that area. We have some of the best people and best equipment. Coordination of our efforts will be better under the new department of environment which will bring together all matters in connection with our waters. I think we will be more effective in the future.

The agreement with the Russians on the west coast was possible as a result of our closing the port of Vancouver. If we had not done that, the Russians would not have come to us. When we closed the port, the Russians pleaded with us to let them have fresh water so that they would not have to travel 4,000 miles to Siberia. We said we would open the port if they got off the continental shelf. They agreed to do so. Perhaps the hon. member is pleading a similar case for the east coast. If so, is he asking us to close St. John's in order to get the Russians to come to us?

Mr. Lundrigan: That's not fair. You know the difference.

Mr. Davis: The hon. member has said that we should do the same on the east coast as we did on the west coast. I believe we have to take a different approach.

Mr. Lundrigan: I did not say any such thing. I will get even tomorrow. That's dirty pool.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. It is my duty to interrupt the minister and inform him that his time has expired.

WAR MEASURES ACT—VANCOUVER POLICE REFUSAL OF PERMISSION TO VIET NAM COMMITTEE TO HOLD MARCH

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) the following question:

As the police in Vancouver have refused permission to the Viet Nam Committee to hold a march and rally this Saturday, despite the fact that such permission has been granted twice a year on a Saturday for the past five years, will the minister inquire into the matter with a view to ascertaining if this refusal is an abuse of the present regulations under the War Measures Act?

[Mr. Davis.]

The minister was not particularly helpful in his reply, merely suggesting that my question ought to be addressed to the Attorney General of British Columbia. I tried hard to get through to Vancouver this morning to find out if there was anything new to report. In the meantime, I was asked if I would discuss this matter on the late show tonight and I agreed. Subsequently I did get through to Vancouver. I was very glad to learn that someone had relented and that permission has now been granted for the march and rally this Saturday in connection with Viet Nam Day in Vancouver.

• (10:10 p.m.)

So far, so good. But I am not satisfied. I have not been able to find out how this result was achieved. I do not know whether it was the police, the engineering department, the city fathers or His Worship the Mayor who brought it about. I discovered there are people in Vancouver who have the idea that despite his public refusal to have anything to do with the administration of the War Measures Act in the provinces, the Minister of Justice himself had a hand in getting this edict reversed.

I believe that having invoked the War Measures Act, the federal government bears the responsibility for seeing that its powers are not abused. I am one member from British Columbia who believes the people of British Columbia would go along with this line of thinking. Since we have the kind of mayor in Vancouver who is likely to be carried away by his own excitement, especially in times like these, it would be reassuring to learn that the federal Minister of Justice has helped to set things right so that the rally could go on this fall as it has gone on every fall for five years.

I trust that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Béchard) will be able to throw some light on the way in which this situation has been resolved. I can assure him we are very glad it has been resolved, and I hope he will be able to claim credit at least in part for the result, here at the federal level.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the sympathy I feel for the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway, I am afraid that my statement tonight will not give her nor her friends of the Viet Nam Committee the satisfaction they were looking for.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to hear that the planned march will take place. However, I would like to inform the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway that the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister have repeated time and again in this House and elsewhere that the War Measures Act proclaimed on October 16 was to apply only to the specific FLQ problem in Quebec. To the knowledge of the Justice Department, it would seem that Vancouver's Viet Nam Committee does not pursue the same objectives as the FLQ.

On the other hand, the implementation of the regulations provided for in the proclamation of October 16 is under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Attorneys General of the provinces.

Consequently, I think that the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway might abide by the answer given yesterday by the Minister of Justice, namely to get in touch with the Attorney General of British Columbia.

In any event, this march will take place, and I cannot say whether this demonstration will be the consequence of the representations made by the Minister of Justice. However, I cannot but repeat that the jurisdiction of the Minister of Justice does not extend as far as that, since this matter is under the jurisdiction of the Attorney General.

[*English*]

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.16 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, October 30, 1970

The House met at 11 a.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

CONSTITUTION OF CANADA

First report of Special Joint Committee on the Constitution of Canada—Mr. MacGuigan.

[*Editor's Note: For text of above report, see today's Votes and Proceedings.*]

MOTION TO ADJOURN UNDER S.O. 26

NATIONAL SECURITY

INFORMATION LEADING TO INVOKING OF WAR MEASURES ACT

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles), to move the adjournment of the House under Standing Order 26 for the purpose of discussing a specific and important matter requiring urgent consideration, namely, the critical atmosphere of doubt and uncertainty created by the conflicting statements of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand), the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien), the Premier of Quebec and the Mayor of Montreal regarding the nature of the threat to the democratically elected government of Quebec and the administration of Montreal which led the government to proclaim the War Measures Act.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for York South has filed the notice prescribed under Standing Order 26. His proposed motion deals with a matter which is, of course, of extreme importance. Because the application of the War Measures Act has such far-reaching effects on individual freedom, the matter has to be of prime concern to Parliament. This is why very special care must be taken to ensure that all reasonable opportunities for debate must be afforded.

In this regard, it will be noted that the exhaustive and earnest debate which took place in the House following the proclamation of the Act has provided one such opportunity. Since then, debate on the Speech from the Throne has continued and has given hon. members further occasions to consider the many aspects of the matter. In addition, the daily question period has been concerned principally with the situation created by the proclamation of the War Measures Act.

The fact that these opportunities have been provided by ordinary daily procedures does not mean that a special debate might not be held under the terms of Standing Order 26. I suggest to hon. members that while this may be very useful the Chair cannot overlook the provision in the Standing Orders that in a given session there can only be one debate about a particular matter. If we are to have at any time an emergency debate I would think that hon. members would want the Chair to exercise extreme caution in selecting the circumstances under which such debate should be undertaken.

The motion proposed by the hon. member focuses on suggested discrepancies between ministerial statements dealing with the circumstances which have preceded proclamation of the Act. The hon. member charges that these statements have resulted in what he terms a "critical atmosphere of doubt and uncertainty". To my mind, the proposed motion is more in the nature of a censure motion which might well be presented to the House by other procedures.

Standing Order 26 and the practice which has evolved in the application of the Standing Order require that the Chair should take into consideration the probability of the matter being brought before the House within reasonable time by other means. The Minister of Justice has indicated to the House that legislation to be substituted for the regulations under the War Measures Act will be introduced soon. Of course, I cannot commit the minister to any timetable, but my interpretation of an answer he gave earlier this week is that the legislation will be introduced next week.

In the circumstances, and taking into account the relevant procedural requirements set out in Standing Order 26 and in our practice, I must come to the conclusion that the hon. member's motion cannot be put.

• (11:10 a.m.)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

NATIONAL SECURITY

FAILURE TO FIND MURDERERS OF PIERRE LAPORTE AND KIDNAPPERS OF JAMES CROSS—ADDITIONAL MEASURES—RESPONSIBILITY FOR INVESTIGATIONS

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address my question to the Solicitor General whom I thought I saw a moment ago.

Mr. Baldwin: Jumping George.

Mr. Stanfield: I will defer my question until his arrival, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacInnis: Get that roster system working, will you?

Mr. Speaker: I recognize the hon. member for York East.

Mr. Lewis: I think I see the minister arriving, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, as it is now two weeks since the War Measures Act was invoked and there seems to be no report about James Cross, and in view of the fact a spokesman for the Quebec Provincial Police is reported as having said sadly that there is absolutely nothing to report on the investigation and everything is dead quiet, can the minister give any explanation of the lack of success which is very disquieting to the people of Canada, and can he tell the House, perhaps not in a specific way, whether any additional or expanded measures are going to be taken to capture the murderers of Pierre Laporte and the kidnappers of James Cross to secure his liberty?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I assume that in the preamble to the question the Leader of the Opposition takes responsibility for the anonymous spokesman to whom he refers, but I cannot accept that part of the preamble to his question in any way. To begin with, I do not know whether there was such a spokesman or not. I am sorry that the Leader of the Opposition bases his question on that kind of anonymous statement. As to the substance—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: Take your soapbox and go.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Muir: We expect more than that from you, George.

Mr. McIlraith: The hon. gentleman is very good at interrupting. If he will be responsible for a few minutes and try to keep this very difficult situation in perspective, I will give him all the information I am able to give at the moment.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Muir: We don't need a lecture from you. Try to get down to the basic facts.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Muir: If you were alive this probably wouldn't have happened.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. After the debate we have had we might at this point return to the question period and allow the minister to reply to the question.

Mr. McIlraith: As to the substantive part of the question with regard to what further measures we propose to take, that will have to await the passage of time because I have no measures that we expect to take to announce to the House at the moment. As to the details of why there have been no results it would satisfy, I am sure, the feelings of all of us if the criminal aspect of this matter were brought to a successful and rapid conclusion. I can only remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition that this is a situation which very often develops in criminal investigation work and in pursuing the investigation of criminal activities. We always come to that period in the investigations of criminal acts. In these two particular cases, it is admittedly of very great concern to every Canadian that the solutions come quickly and satisfactorily, but I cannot be in the position of reporting from day to day concerning what leads are being followed and whether they are good or bad because, as hon. members will appreciate, it would cripple the investigative work. Not only that, but many of the leads do in fact turn out to be from improper tips or information.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I am a little at a loss to know what the applause is for. I received the same answer a week ago. I should like to ask the Solicitor General what authority is now accepting responsibility for these investigations relating to James Cross under the War Measures Act and in his capacity as a British diplomat. Is the government of Canada accepting the responsibility?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, the legal responsibility for investigating the criminal acts as such is and must remain primarily that of the Attorney General of the province concerned. In addition to that, because of the nature of the crimes in this matter, the federal authority is going out of its way to support in every way possible and assist those investigations. That has been made clear to the House by the action taken in respect of making the army available when requested and the other steps that have been indicated in this House from time to time. There is in addition an element peculiar to the one kidnapping in this case in that it involves a representative in this country of a foreign government.

Mr. Diefenbaker: A foreign government!

Mr. McIlraith: I believe that to be the correct designation of the government of the United Kingdom representative. Perhaps if the former Leader of the Opposition would let the present Leader of the Opposition get the answers—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I believe we have been sidetracked for a moment and also that the Leader of the Opposition has a supplementary.

An hon. Member: Senior or junior?

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to see that the people on the government side of the House seem to think this is a subject of some frivolity. I sincerely plead with the Solicitor General to exercise his responsibilities on behalf of the Canadian people and particularly to Mr. Cross, however he is described, because, hopefully, he is alive. I plead with the Solicitor General to exercise the responsibility of leadership that the Canadian people expect of him at this time.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Leader of the Opposition for that statement and request. I appreciate it very much and would ask him in return to somehow control his followers when he asks responsible questions and permit me to give the answers which I think his questions deserve, as I have tried to do today and on earlier occasions and I have been cut off by his followers.

Mr. Speaker: Order. There are a number of supplementaries. The hon. member for York South.

WAR MEASURES ACT—ARRESTS, RELEASES, CONTINUING DETENTIONS AND CHARGES

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Solicitor General whether he can give the House the latest information with regard to the number arrested, the number released and the number still in jail. I would also ask him whether he has any information concerning any charges laid.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be very glad to do so. The total number arrested, as I have it, is 405. The number released is 273 and the number still being held is 132 as of last night. I do not have the figure as to the number charged.

Mr. Lewis: Has anyone yet been charged, and if a formal charge has not yet been laid does the Solicitor General have any information as to charges that are being prepared?

Mr. McIlraith: I do not know whether anyone has in fact been charged as yet. As to charges that are likely to be laid, I do not think it would be appropriate to give such information as I have, and also it is fairly limited at the moment.

APPREHENDED INSURRECTION—REPORTED SUPPLYING OF ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO LIBERAL MEMBERS

Mr. David Lewis (York South): May I direct a supplementary question to the right hon. Prime Minister arising out of a report of a statement alleged to have been made by the hon. member for Don Valley that he and other members of the Liberal party had information from ministers of the Crown which is not known to the public. Has the Prime Minister or any other minister in his cabinet given information to members of the Liberal party in caucus or otherwise which has not been given to this House?

An hon. Member: Oh, that is a touchy one.

Mr. Muir: The Prime Minister is sulking again.

Mr. Lewis: Just keep quiet a moment.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: When hon. members interrupt the Prime Minister they merely give him an excuse to sit down and not answer.

An hon. Member: He will not answer, anyway.

Mr. Lewis: I want to repeat my question and ask the Prime Minister whether members of his party in this House were given information by him or any other minister in his cabinet which has not been given to this House?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Well, Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak for other ministers. I myself know of no information given to members of this party which I have not given in the House or they have not given in the House. It is conceivable, of course, that some ministers may have said something to members of my party of which I do not know. If I had more details I might be able to track down the suggestions of the hon. member. For my own part, I did deal with this matter in our caucus. I gave to our caucus the same information I have given to the House. In describing the state of confusion in the province of Quebec I may have gone a little further in that secret assembly than I did in the House, but this was done in describing the circumstances which I termed in this House the state of confusion and threats of violence in the province. I may have elaborated on that somewhat.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I please follow that up. Since the Prime Minister's reference to confusion in Quebec and threats of violence is obviously important to other members of the House as well as to the people of Canada, would he now feel free at some appropriate time to inform the House of the points on which he elaborated to members of his party, since for the life of me I cannot see why members of the government party should be privy to information that other members do not have.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The latter part of the hon. member's question is obviously an argument. I am sure he will agree with that.

Mr. Trudeau: I may be able to answer it if you want to consider it as a form of question, Mr. Speaker. In elabo-

rating on what I call confusion in the province of Quebec I gave no secret information to any of our members. What I am telling the House is that I spent a little longer in describing the situation in the province of Quebec which, incidentally, I also described to the leaders of the opposition parties at the private meetings I had with them. But these facts are not secret facts. They are facts that are known by the people of Quebec. They are known by every member of this House from the province of Quebec, whether those members are in our party or in other parties which supported the government's proclamation of the War Measures Act.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

WAR MEASURES ACT—PAYMENT BY QUEBEC FOR SERVICES OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the Prime Minister a supplementary question in view of the statement by the Solicitor General to the effect that the province of Quebec had requested the proclamation of the War Measures Act as well as the services of the Canadian armed forces.

Two days ago, in reply to the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. La Salle) who was inquiring whether the province of Quebec would have to pay for the services of the armed forces in Quebec, the Prime Minister stated, as reported at page 658 of *Hansard*, and I quote:

> Mr. Speaker, the matter is a legal one, but if I can reply, I believe the National Defence Act provides that, when a province requests the assistance of the armed forces in the form of civil assistance, the expenses of the operation are borne by that province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know precisely what the Prime Minister means when he says that the province must bear the costs.

Last night, the premier of Quebec stated that the federal government had never—

Mr. Speaker: Order. It seems to me that the hon. member is making a speech. He could perhaps ask the second part of his question later as a supplementary and allow the Prime Minister to give an answer to the first part.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, to complete the first part of my question, I shall ask the Prime Minister if it is true that Quebec will have to pay for the use of the armed forces in the province?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Well, Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question, which enables me to shed some light on the matter. First of all, I will say that the answer given in the House the other day was correct and that it is based on Section 227 of the National Defence Act. I did say that the cost of these services will be paid by the province which asked for the intervention of the armed forces. The reason for this is that when members of the armed forces go to a province at the request of the attorney general of that province, they act as peace officers not as soldiers. Right now they are not in Quebec under the orders of Canada's commander in chief but under those of the provincial authorities and I think that this is what the people of Quebec want, that is to have the initiative of maintaining peace in their own province. The federal government is certainly not going to get involved in this aspect of their business.

Given the foregoing, I must point out that the regulations adopted under this legislation provide that only additional expenditures must be paid by the province which requested the services of the armed forces. In other words, the province will not be required to assume the costs of the soldier's regular pay or rations, only the extra expenses incurred as a result of provincial authorities requesting the members of the armed forces to do this additional work.

If I may continue, Mr. Speaker. It might be better for me to wait for supplementary questions and I hope there will be some.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Prime Minister if he is aware of the serious objections now being raised in Quebec about our double taxation. In other words, is the Prime Minister in a position to guarantee the people of Quebec that there will not be double taxation and, therefore, injustice regarding the application of Section 227 of the National Defence Act?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the hon. member that when the city of Montreal asked the armed forces to intervene last year, the request was made by the Attorney General of the province of Quebec and Quebec authorities paid for the additional work done by the armed forces.

I could further say that whenever armed forces are sent to other provinces to bring assistance in cases of flood, for instance, although the situation is not exactly the same, the federal government usually sends the bill to the provincial authorities concerned.

This being so, Mr. Speaker, it is true that 12 hours after the province of Quebec had asked for the support of the armed forces—and this for the first time in peacetime—the War Measures Act was enforced. It is therefore possible that from thereon, it should be necessary to make other arrangements for that payment. I have already spoken to Premier Bourassa to that effect. I told him that we should settle the matter together. It is not a financial matter between Quebec and us, but we have to know what are the provisions of the legislation and what was the past practice. What happened last week is quite unusual. There is no precedent for this in Canada in peacetime and consequently, we are ready to discuss the matter of settlement with the authorities of the province of Quebec.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*English*]

RESPONSIBILITY FOR ADMINISTRATION OF WAR MEASURES ACT REGULATIONS

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I have listened very carefully to the Prime Minister's answers on this serious matter and I would like him to give serious thought to this question. Would the Prime Minister advise the House why, as his government proclaimed the War Measures Act, the administration of justice under that Act is not being carried out by the federal Department of Justice as it was in the war? Why was this responsibility thrust on the provinces?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Well, for a very simple reason, Mr. Speaker. The National Defence Act is written in this way: it is at the demand of the Attorney General of a province that the army is brought in as an aid to the civil power. This law has been debated many years ago by Parliament and we did not see any reason, in this particular case, to do anything which was contrary to what was done in the past. On the contrary, we feel that the province of Quebec should be supported in its determination to establish law and order in that province, and when they acted as they did under the National Defence Act we responded in the way in which governments have responded in the past.

Mr. Woolliams: May I ask one further question, Mr. Speaker? Under the War Measures Act there were certain new offences created. In view of the fact that during the war the War Measures Act, following implementation, was administered by the federal Department of Justice, why was the change made in these circumstances and the responsibility thrust on the provinces so that they are taking all the evil and bad effects?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, this is a view of events which does not correspond with ours, of course. The House probably knows that the argument in the province of Quebec is that the federal government is running too much of their own affairs, and we as a government which believes in federalism think, on the contrary, that the province should be running its affairs in all areas which in normal times are under its jurisdiction.

As the hon. member knows, under the Criminal Code the responsibility for administering the Criminal Code is that of the provincial Attorneys General. That is why, in the regulations under the proclamation, we stated that the regulations would be administered by the Attorney General of the province, and it is these regulations which were voted upon by the house and which had the unanimous support of the Conservative party as well as other members of this House.

Mr. Baldwin: Only when we pushed you into bringing in a new Act in 30 days.

KIDNAPPING OF JAMES CROSS—NUMBER OF RCMP ENGAGED IN INVESTIGATIONS—OFFERING OF REWARD

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, arising out of statements made this morning by the Solicitor General I have a couple of questions because of the situation in which Mr. Cross presently finds himself. How many members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police are engaged at the moment in active investigations concerning, particularly, the Cross case? Second, in view of the fact that Mr. Cross occupies a quasi-diplomatic position, why is it that the government of Canada has not offered a reward? I brought this up some two weeks ago and it is supported now by Mr. Kelly, a very distinguished retired member of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I shall try to deal with the two questions separately. As to the numbers of RCMP directly and immediately involved, if the hon. member is relating that to the active work of the joint anti-terrorist squad in Montreal, the number is 300. Incidentally, I should add that they are all bilingual. In addition, there are other members of the force in that province doing other individual items of supplementary work—a very large number, probably the same number. In addition, there is a very large number in headquarters who are checking certain records, the kind of thing that has to be checked out by way of identification, finger-prints and so on. In addition, there are others in other parts of the country who from time to time may be checking on individual items or leads affecting one or two of the persons for whom warrants have been issued.

As to the second question on the subject of a reward, that matter has been under continuous consideration for quite some time by the government. A reward has not yet been offered for reasons that were considered carefully and which we thought were good and sufficient cause for not offering a reward at the particular time. The situation at the moment is that no reward has yet been offered.

Mr. Diefenbaker: If the government does not intend to offer a reward, why was the offer of $50,000 put up by certain Toronto businessmen not accepted?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear that the right hon. gentleman did not listen to my earlier answer to his second question. I made it very clear that the government had not yet offered a reward.

Mr. Diefenbaker: When? How long?

Mr. McIlraith: I suggest that the hon. member is attempting, in placing the supplementary question, to misinterpret that and say that the government has not the intention of offering a reward. I was very careful not to say that and I point out to him that *Hansard* will substantiate me.

Mr. Diefenbaker: How long, oh Lord, how long?

[*Translation*]

WAR MEASURES ACT—COST OF PROTECTING CERTAIN MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister.

Could he tell us who will pay the cost of detailing members of the armed forces to protect members of Parliament here in Ottawa or elsewhere?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I did not understand the hon. member's question.

Mr. Godin: Mr. Speaker, I would like to know who will pay the cost of detailing members of the armed forces to protect members of Parliament here in Ottawa or elsewhere.

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, if members of the armed forces are substituted for RCMP officers, the Solicitor General of Canada may be billed for it by the Department of National Defence. The Solicitor General hopes this will not occur; you see, it is a matter to be settled amongst ourselves.

When troops are substituted for policemen in the province of Quebec, the answer would normally be the one I gave a short while ago.

[*English*]

EARLY REMOVAL OF FREEZE ON NATIONAL DEFENCE BUDGET

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the Prime Minister, because there is a lot of concern about the cost involved, whether or not the government has given any consideration or had any discussions to date about the removal of the freeze on the Department of National Defence budget earlier than 1973?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the question is certainly not urgent. The budget is frozen for three years and we will consider in due course whether in the application of the four priorities established by the federal government in its statement of April, 1969, the defence department should have a higher budget, a lower budget or the same budget.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Joliette has a supplementary question he wants to ask?

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): No, Mr. Speaker, this is not a supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: I shall recognize the hon. member in a moment.

[*English*]

For the moment the Chair will allow a supplementary question to the hon. member for Egmont.

WAR MEASURES ACT—INSTRUCTIONS TO PERSONS RELEASED FROM DETENTION NOT TO EXPRESS VIEWS THEREON

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): I have a question for the Solicitor General, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister advise the House whether police officials in the province of Quebec have been instructing persons released from detention not to talk to the press or to express any views in regard to their detention in order not to risk further detention? If such advice has been given to people formerly under detention, what is the view of the government and what action will be taken?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I have no information on whether or not the Quebec provincial police have been instructing detained persons as they are released.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Hon. members will recognize that we have just about reached the end of the question period. It may be the wish of hon. members that the whole question period this morning be reserved for the very important matters that have been raised, but we will have to consider within a very few moments whether to give an opportunity to hon. members with other questions. For the moment, the Chair will recognize the hon. member for Egmont on a supplementary question.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): For the purpose of clarification, I wonder whether the minister would agree on behalf of the House to investigate this very important question of civil liberties and report back to the House at the first of the week?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I do not quite follow the hon. member as to what civil liberty is involved if someone tells some one else what the regulations under the War Measures Act contain. I am not quite clear as to the inference to be drawn from the question. If the hon. member wants to clarify it—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps this clarification may be arranged between the hon. member and the minister.

SUBSTITUTE LEGISLATION FOR WAR MEASURES ACT REGULATIONS—PROVISION OF BILL TO MEMBERS

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Acting Minister of Justice. Have the provincial Attorneys General been shown a draft copy of the government's proposed legislation to replace the War Measures Act? If so, can the Acting Minister of Justice tell the House when Parliament will also be granted this privilege?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Acting Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the Attorneys General of the provinces have not been shown any such draft bill.

Mr. Woolliams: Just a moment, now. That is not correct.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

ALLEGED CENSORSHIP OF CONTENTS OF UNIVERSITY STUDENT NEWSPAPERS

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Solicitor General whether he can now

answer the question I asked in his absence more than a week ago? I asked whether Royal Canadian Mounted Police officers were censoring university newspapers and, if so, whether they were doing this with the authority of the government?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I did not answer that question earlier. RCMP officers are not censoring university publications.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I wonder how the minister can square that answer with news reports last week that before the Carleton University newspaper could be published the RCMP—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

INDIAN AFFAIRS

REFUSAL OF ENTRY TO BANFF SPRINGS HOTEL TO GROUP FROM MORLEY RESERVE—RESOLUTE BAY, USE OF NATIVE LABOUR ON LOCAL PROJECTS

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and tell him how pleased we are to see him back in the House after the many question periods he has missed. Is he in a position now to answer the questions which were posed to him earlier? One was about the Banff Springs Hotel and the other had to do with the Department of Transport and the employment of Indian and Eskimo people in the Territories. Also, while I am on my feet may I ask him whether he has made recommendations to the Prime Minister with respect to the possibility of appointing Indian people to the Senate?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, it would take quite some time to answer the three questions, but I can—

Mr. Speaker: The minister might perhaps answer the first two questions. I do not think that the third one is in order.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, it is true that I was not here two or three times during the question period. Indeed, I was in western Canada and in the Yukon. I met Indians from Saskatchewan and Alberta. I even went to British Columbia—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The minister might perhaps answer the question now.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, about the incident in Banff, we inquired from the management of the hotel in question. It was a mistake by the manager who thought that these Indians were there as artists. They had signed no contract with the management of the hotel.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Following discussions between the Indians and the Association of Architects, the Indians were allowed to hold their display of native art without being considered professional artists for all that.

With regard to the situation in Resolute Bay, the interpretation mentioned by the hon. member was arrived at by mistake. Yet the matter is quite clear. The Department of Transport itself hires over half the available Eskimos to do specialized work. The company was informed that it should not expect a great many specialized employees because they were already working for the Department of Transport.

There has been no discrimination whatever. The Department of Transport is simply interested in hiring them first.

* * *

HEALTH

INDICATION OF TAR AND NICOTINE CONTENT ON CIGARETTE PACKAGES

Mr. Oza Tétrault (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I intended to put a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare, but in his absence I shall put it to the Prime Minister.

Does the Prime Minister expect the adoption in the near future of measures compelling Canadian cigarette manufacturers to indicate on every package the tar and nicotine content of their products, as has recently been undertaken in United States?

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me this question was asked a while ago. I would not want to be unfair to the hon. member, but, if I am mistaken, the minister might answer this question in due time.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

WAR MEASURES ACT—ASSOCIATION OF PAUL ROSE WITH PARTI QUÉBÉCOIS

Mr. Roch La Salle (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Solicitor General a question.

In view of the fact that a member of the government said yesterday at the University of Ottawa that Paul Rose, who is now wanted by the police, was the chief organizer of a PQ candidate at the last elections and in view of the fact that this statement may be a blow to the reputation of the Parti Québécois, could the minister tell the House whether this detail appears on Paul Rose's record and, if not, could he report to the House as soon as possible?

[*English*]

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of any member of the government being at Ottawa University yesterday and I have no knowledge—

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am not sure whether the question was asked of the Solicitor General. Even if the minister is the one who made the statement outside the House, the question would have to be asked of the Prime Minister.

[*Translation*]

Perhaps the hon. member could direct his question to the Prime Minister.

Mr. La Salle: Shall I repeat my question, Mr. Speaker? I was asking the minister whether he was in a position to confirm the statement of a government member to University of Ottawa students yesterday to the effect that Paul Rose was chief organizer for a Parti Québécois candidate from the Montreal area during the last provincial elections? Can the minister tell whether Paul Rose's record—

Some hon. Members: Not chief!

Mr. La Salle: All right, not chief. I should like to know whether Paul Rose's record contains this information, since such a statement is in fact detrimental to the Parti Québécois. Could the minister give us some more information on this?

[*English*]

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of the alleged statement—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The minister is replying to the question. I am not sure that we are getting anywhere in trying to elucidate the very important point raised by the hon. member for Joliette.

[*Translation*]

It might be advisable for the hon. member to secure this information through another channel rather than by asking a question at this stage since we have only two minutes left before the question period ends. The hon. member might ask his question again on Monday.

* * *

[*English*]

FINANCE

PRIME INTEREST RATE—ACTION TO BRING ABOUT REDUCTION

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Following his discussions with the presidents of the various chartered banks, who in effect thumbed their noses at his request for a reduction of interest rates, does he plan to take any action by way of legislation or otherwise?

[Mr. McIlraith.]

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the Toronto-Dominion Bank has lowered its prime rate. I am also informed that this morning the Royal Bank of Canada lowered its prime rate by half of one per cent.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

USE OF WAR MEASURES ACT TO CONTROL HALLOWEEN ACTIVITIES

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. In view of the fears of many parents about incidents tomorrow, on Halloween, especially in Montreal and Ottawa—I except heavily guarded Rockcliffe from Ottawa—can the Prime Minister say whether the government is giving any special consideration to the taking of precautions under the War Measures Act?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of any. I know that local authorities have taken special precautions. If they need our help or if they need the assistance of the army, we will be glad to assist.

Mr. Bell: Perhaps the Solicitor General, who has a very special interest in Ottawa, can give us one of his helpful replies. Will he consider imposing an early curfew at least for Halloween under the War Measures Act?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I understand the concern behind this question. I do not believe it would be an appropriate use of the War Measures Act to declare this kind of curfew in the several cities across Canada on Halloween. However, I should add that the authorities in several municipalities to my knowledge have been quite concerned about this and have taken action within the authority they already have to quieten the activities of very young people on Halloween.

* * *

ROYAL CANADIAN MOUNTED POLICE

INVESTIGATION OF SHOOTING OF YOUTH NEAR SASKATOON

Mr. Lorne Nystrom (Yorkton-Melville): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Solicitor General. On October 20 the minister said his department was investigating the incident of a 15-year old youth being shot to death by an RCMP officer near Saskatoon. Has the minister completed his investigation? If so, can he inform the House of the results?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I do not have the report yet. The coroner's inquest was to proceed, I believe, on October 26, and the police investigation will not be completed until after the coroner's inquest has been completed. Perhaps it would be better if I were to wait until the two reports are in before making a reply.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

EMERGENCY GOLD MINING ASSISTANCE ACT

AMENDMENT EXTENDING APPLICATION TO JUNE 30, 1973

The House resumed, from Thursday, October 29, consideration of the motion of Mr. Greene that Bill C-4, to amend the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Oza Tétrault (Villeneuve): Mr. Speaker, I was saying last night that I do not understand why the government offers western farmers subsidies for not producing wheat while it is considering the possibility of cancelling the subsidies to gold mines.

Mr. Speaker, these subsidies insure employment to many people as well as the development of areas with inexhaustible resources. I believe that before long northwestern Quebec will no longer depend on gold mines, but in the meantime the government should extend its program in order to insure the survival of the communities involved.

In closing I would like to remind the minister that since the government is subsidizing new industries in designated or special areas, it should also subsidize industries already in existence.

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I feel some obligation to speak on Bill C-4 because I come from an area to which the provisions of this act apply.

The bill under study is entitled "An Act to amend the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act", and is introduced by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Greene). It contains the following recommendation:

His Excellency the Governor General has recommended to the House the present measure to amend the Emergency Gold Mining Act to extend its application to June 30, 1973.

This new bill proposes four changes which, on the whole, merely authorize an extension of the assistance to gold mines up to June 30, 1973. The first change provides for an extension of the application of the act until 1973; the second provides for an increase of 25 per cent in assistance.

According to clause 2 of the bill, this Act will not apply to mines that were not in production during the month immediately preceding August 7, 1970.

Mr. Speaker, there may be reasons why certain mines did not produce during the month preceding August 7, 1970. Perhaps they did not because they had not received enough assistance to produce or maintain their operations. The explanatory notes of clause 3 are as follows:

The purpose of this amendment is to require a person who receives any payment under the act to agree to hire any new employees through the facilities of the Department of Manpower and Immigration, to give four months' notice of the closing of his mine to the minister—

This is a rather important clause because, not so long ago, we witnessed the closing of a mine in the area of Cadillac. No notice had then been given and hundreds of workers were laid off without anyone guaranteeing them any security whatsoever or helping them in any way to find other employment.

And mining authorities of the province of Quebec are still faced with the problem of the Cadillac-Molly mine that closed its doors without notice.

I continue quoting the explanatory notes for clause 3:

—and to use the services of the Department of Manpower and Immigration for the purposes of finding employment for the former employees.

Mr. Speaker, the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act adopted in 1948 seeked to help gold mine operators to overcome economic difficulties caused by increased production costs and a stable gold price. The purpose of this legislation was to extend gold mining operations and to give people in communities where their living depends on such operations a chance to gradually adapt themselves to the reduction of financial support.

An amendment to the legislation in 1967, that is 19 years later, extended its enforcement for a 3-year period, that is up to December 31, 1970.

The number of reef mines eligible for assistance provided by the legislation has decreased from 87 in 1948, to 44 in 1960 and to 35 in 1968.

Five reef mines which received financial assistance provided by the legislation put an end to their operations in 1968 and it is expected that four or five others will do the same before the end of 1971, if they do not receive any assistance.

The Wasamac mine No. 2 in the Rouyn-Noranda area remained the only mine in operation in 1968.

The amounts paid to gold mine operators as of March 31, 1969, for the years 1948 to 1968 inclusive amounted to $261,293,250.09 for a production of 57,166,704 ounces of gold sold in accordance with the provisions of the legislation.

The total amount of assistance payable for gold produced and sold during the calendar year 1968 is estimated at $14,300,000. As of March 31, 1969, the total assistance paid for 1968 amounted to $11,430,163.02, that is about 90 per cent of the assistance granted as a result of applications already received. The remainder is payable following an audit of the applicants' books.

I have here a table showing the amounts of assistance paid from 1948 to 1968 to all the gold mines in operation in Canada. I also have a table which shows the produc-

tion of bullion in Canada from 1948 to 1968. For the year 1968 I can see a production of 2,748,333 ounces of gold.

In northwestern Quebec, the Horne mine was to prove the richest in Canada. This discovery was but the first of several others which helped make this mining area the most important in all the province of Quebec for a good number of years.

From 1922 on, the Noranda Company has developped into a major concern and is today an internationally known company which has the facilities here in Quebec to process copper ore and to manufacture finished products.

The operation of the Horne mine opened the way for the Noranda foundry—the biggest in the world—and later for the Canadian Copper Refiners plant in Montreal East, the most important copper refinery in the world.

Since the first delivery made by the Horne mine to the Noranda foundry, 54 million tons of ore have been extracted from that vein and this ore has produced nearly 1,200,000 tons of copper and 8,300,000 ounces of gold. In 1967 the production of that operation amounted to $24 million. The foundry of the Horne complex has handled since the beginning more than 17 million tons of copper concentrates originating from other Quebec mines and other provinces. In 1967 the deliveries of the foundry amounted to $227 million. The Horne complex, including the mine, the concentrator and the foundry, provides 1,600 jobs and pays each year $9.5 million in salaries.

The Noranda Mines Company reinvested a part of the profits in the exploration of the area in the immediate vicinity of Noranda and of the whole territory of the province. With the years, this company discovered or acquired a participation in several concerns already existing in Quebec, as for example, the Quemont mine which has been working for 20 years a copper-zinc-gold-silver-pyrite deposit. This concern has extracted, since the beginning of its operations, 14 million tons of ore; it employs 350 persons and pays each year $2.5 million in salaries.

The situation is about the same for the Normetal Mining Corporation Ltd., located some 75 miles north of Noranda, near the Ontario border.

The Noranda group, although it is dominant is not the only one active in the area: Lake Dufault Mines Ltd., a branch of Falconbridge, has been operating since 1964 a copper-tin-gold-silver lode which, although of limited size, has contributed more than $75 million to Quebec mineral production. In 1968, metal deliveries reached $13 million and some 250 persons were employed.

Wasamac mines operate two small gold lodes in the Noranda area; one since 1965 and the other since May 1968.

The ore treated at the Noranda foundry is routed to Canadian Copper Refiners in Montreal East, which supply work for 1400 persons, whose salaries total $9,000,000 a year. Moreover, each year, more than $8 million are earmarked for the purchase of materials and supplies. Part of this refinery production supplies in turn the Noranda Copper Mills plant built in Montreal East in 1942. The latter employs 950 people and pays salaries that amount to $6.8 million.

On the other hand, the mining industry in Noranda gave rise on the site to related industries, such as Quebec Iron Foundries, a plant that manufactures crushing agents used mainly during the first phase of ore processing. Quebec Iron Foundries owns a chain of foundries throughout Canada, two of which in Quebec, one in Noranda and the other in Mont-Joli.

Those are but a few examples of the great natural resources potential to be found in our area, that is in northwestern Quebec.

Since the start of the mining industry in the Abitibi area, all levels of government have made tremendous investments to allow newcomers to live as full-fledged citizens or, at least, as close as possible to the minimum standards of the twenteth century.

In the fields of roads, education, hospitalization, social services, technical services, communications, radio, television, and so forth, local structures have been established at considerable expense to allow the Abitibi people to develop normally, at the same speed as the inhabitants of other areas; anyway, directly or indirectly, all levels of government, with the help of the Canadian taxpayers, have footed the bill.

Following such efforts and such investments, we would hate to see some municipalities turn into ghost towns because the industry which was the backbone of their economy, could no longer operate.

There is no need to cavil about the causes of the difficulties encountered by the gold mines as they are well known. Moreover the federal authorities are aware of the problem that is to be faced not only by the operators of the gold mines but also by the civic authorities, municipal councils, school boards and especially the workers directly involved in those operations.

For some years now we have been witnessing something new in our area; owners of gold mines have to close down their operations not because of a depletion of ore but because extracting costs are too high and grants too small. Such conditions are a cause of alarm to us and one must expect, should those conditions remain, that they will get worse to such a point that other industries will have to close down also.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Villeneuve (M. Tétrault) was right when he said a while ago that the government subsidizes western wheat producers for not producing any wheat but that it will not subsidize gold production at a time when we would be sure of using or exporting the whole of our gold production, while we are not sure of exporting the whole of our wheat production. Since we are not sure of being able to export our wheat, our farmers are paid for not producing and while we are sure of being able to export the whole of our gold production, payments for producing gold are being refused. To me that is an irresponsible behaviour on the part of the government and that is what my colleague from Villeneuve was pointing out a while ago when he

showed the government the foolishness of their protection measures, for not producing wheat on the one hand and not stimulating gold production on the other hand, and yet gold is a product that permits us commercial exchanges with the United States, that are ready to absorb the whole of our gold production.

Mr. Speaker, the government ought to improve greatly the assistance to gold mines. The gold producers are not asking for a handout from the government, on the contrary, they want it to encourage the development of new mines in that area, if only to meet the needs of the people.

It is therefore of vital importance to the cities in our area that the mining industry be maintained and developed.

To all those who live where gold mines are being exploited, as well as to those who from one end of the country to the other supply goods and services, that act has been a source of great benefit in the past; this is no time to repeal it nor to let it stagnate. It must be improved with a view to contributing even more to the economic development of our area, as well as that of north western Quebec and north eastern Ontario.

The act has played an important social role by protecting the family and society where gold mines are being operated. It has helped, up to a point; but it has harmed, for instance, the development of new mines.

Has any thought been given to those citizens who, after working in gold mines for 20, 25 years, and building a little house at Val-d'Or, Malartic, Noranda, Rouyn, Amos, La Sarre, or Normétal, have been forced to go into exile, to work at Thompson in northern Manitoba, or Sudbury, or in other Canadian provinces, and to leave their homes and what they own behind, in the community in which they have lived for so many years?

• (12:10 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, the government is responsible for this situation. It does not have the right to tolerate, to bring about this situation as it is doing now. As I said, the act played a significant part in protecting the family, but did not fulfil this role to the extent that we could keep our fellow citizens in our area by enabling them, through some assistance, to work at the development of new mines.

Thanks to this act, many workers continued to live decently, when otherwise they would have been forced to go. Some actually had to, because the act was not generous enough. They were able to raise their children, to provide them with adequate food and clothing for 35 or 40 years, whereas had it not been for the act, they might have suffered from poverty, although they are not very rich.

Finally, thanks to that act, an important group of taxpayers—companies or individuals—have kept on paying federal, provincial and municipal taxes. Does the government, by providing assistance to gold mines, not get back a great part of the money through various taxes, hidden or official, in many different ways, such as income taxes, pension plans, etc.? The government turns again to the taxpayers for money. Consumers are left with no purchasing power after all the governments have helped themselves to the workers' pay envelope.

Not only companies' stockholders but also a whole segment of the population live directly or indirectly off the gold mining industry.

The present policy towards laid-off workers under which part of the cost of relocating these people in other mining communities is paid, might of course have adverse effects later on other manufacturing sectors because of a drop in population. It must be realized that most miners being married and having lived in these cities for many years, it is inconceivable to claim that only the head of the family will have to move. This would mean, in short, if 100 miners were to leave, a loss of at least 500 individuals who might, in several cases, fill a position with other industries.

In a short while, other gold mines will have to shut down because of a lack of manpower and of exhorbitant operating costs. A generalisation of this situation would obviously result in a business slump that our cities will not be able to stand. It is easy, therefore, to foresee the slow but certain disappearance of all other industries.

Considering the present needs and the new commitments to be assumed in a changing society which requires more public services, particularly in education, we think it is the right time to adjust the grants to gold mines to enable the management—and that is one of the main objects—to give their employees wage increases similar to those granted in other industrial sectors.

I am urgently asking that those who work in gold mines get the same treatment as those who are employed in other mines or industries. Today, there is an obvious difference between the salaries paid to gold miners and those paid to workers in other industries.

Despite the considerable mechanization which contributed to ease the inflationary pressures on costs through manpower reduction, the mining industry has always depended on a significant human participation. Wages make up from 55 to 60 per cent of production costs. Therefore, the mining industry provides openings for the labour force.

Each dollar of assistance protects about $5 in salary and $2 in supplies obtained from different localities in Canada. That consequence, in human terms, has some importance.

The firms and the men who keep on working, thanks mainly to the act, have paid back to the federal government, in the form of taxes, almost 50 per cent of the aid received, including sales taxes, and even close to 75 per cent, if taxation at all levels of government is taken into account.

On behalf of a worried population who wants to save whatever can still be saved, not only in order to maintain the production of gold, but to promote a certain development of that industry, so that other mines may begin production, if their owners have the certainty that the operation is at least a profitable venture, the urgency of such an act providing for assistance to the operation of gold mines leaves no doubt and is in short a most humanitarian measure.

Additional grants would not be a burden to the Canadian economy unduly because they would come back for the most part, if not completely, to the federal treasury in the form of income taxes, or direct or indirect taxes. Thus by helping industries of prime importance to survive, the prosperity of many areas would be ensured, which would allow to maintain the production of gold.

It is therefore very important that immediate action be taken, if we want not only our cities to survive, but to prosper and expand.

If we want northwestern Quebec to survive, a promising area with an almost unlimited potential but to which governments have not given enough importance, it is necessary to act immediately. Indeed, the population of that area, in 1959, was 51,800, and in 1969, it was 56,000. The gold mines employed 2,360 people in 1959 but only 1,930 in 1969. Their dependants, in 1959, totalled 5,900 and, in 1969, 5,000.

Mr. Speaker, those are the remarks which I wanted to make in connection with gold mines. On behalf of those citizens of northwestern Quebec, and of those of northeastern Ontario, who are in the same situation, I say again that the government can export to the United States the entire gold production of Canada. Indeed, we have a very important trade with that country. And I maintain that the government would then have at least the certainty of keeping its balance of payments with the United States within more reasonable limits than if it put an end to gold production.

On behalf of northwestern Quebec, in the name of the miners and especially of their families, I ask the government to be more generous. I am not begging but I ask the government to give assistance to the development of new gold mines in our region by encouraging prospection and getting the companies to invest there to save from stagnation an important proportion of our population and give our citizens the right to live in their country, Canada, and mainly in this part of the province of Quebec.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: If the minister speaks now he will close the debate.

[*Translation*]

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. members for describing some very important aspects of the problem to the House and to assure them again that the government and the committee will sincerely take their views into account.

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: The minister has closed the debate. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works.

[Mr. Caouette.]

DEUTERIUM OF CANADA ASSISTANCE BILL

AUTHORIZATION OF GRANT TO NOVA SCOTIA TO ASSIST COMPANY

Hon. J. J. Greene (for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion) moved that Bill C-5, to authorize the making of a grant to the province of Nova Scotia for the purpose of providing assistance to Deuterium of Canada Limited, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand), I am pleased to ask the House to approve second reading of this bill. I am sure members in all parts of the House appreciate that the heavy water plant at Glace Bay, Nova Scotia, was planned a number of years ago and was to start production in 1966. It failed to do so because of faults in design. A massive investment by the province of Nova Scotia has been rusting away.

Consequently, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on April 10 of this year announced that the Government of Canada would provide to the government of Nova Scotia the substantial assistance necessary to rehabilitate the plant and get it into production.

• (12:20 p.m.)

The bill now before us will provide part of that assistance. At the time when the project was started, the area development agency approved the company's application for assistance to the maximum of $5 million under the legislation then operative. Under that legislation, the grant would have been paid only when the plant was in production. Moreover, the legislation under which ADA operated sets a termination date. To receive an ADA grant, a plant must be in production by March 31 next year, that is to say, some five months hence. This will not be possible in the case of Deuterium of Canada Limited. Parliament has given the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) authority to grant time extensions, but only when the reasons for delay are beyond the control of the people establishing the plant.

In the Deuterium case, the failure to meet the deadline is due not to external factors but to technical difficulties which clearly must be regarded as the responsibility of the people putting up the plant. Accordingly, the Area Development Incentives Act cannot be used to make the intended $5 million grant.

All members will agree that this has been a difficult and financially burdensome problem for the government of Nova Scotia. That government believes the plant can be rehabilitated, but substantial further expenditures are required. Opposition spokesmen, as recorded in *Hansard* for April 10 last, welcomed the Prime Minister's announcement of the federal government's intention to help the government of Nova Scotia with these expenditures. We, in this House, all recognize that it would be tragic if the large capital investments already made had to be abandoned. One way to save the government of

Nova Scotia from that situation is to pay the $5 million which was expected when the project was launched with the aim of being in production long before the legislative deadline for ADA grants.

Since special legislation would now be required to make this payment, we propose to take the opportunity to ease Nova Scotia's financial problems to a further extent by asking Parliament, through this bill, to authorize payment of the grant in instalments as the rehabilitation of the plant proceeds. This is more advantageous than the normal ADA provision for paying the grant only after production has started.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the substance of this piece of legislation. I believe hon. members on both sides of the House regard it as a necessary contribution to the economy of Cape Breton. On behalf of the minister I, therefore, ask approval of the bill to authorize a grant to the province of Nova Scotia for the purpose of assisting Deuterium of Canada Limited.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Parliamentary Secretary whether he intended to leave the impression that with the passage of this bill only a maximum of $5 million would be available to Deuterium of Canada.

Mr. O'Connell: No, Mr. Speaker; that is not the intention. The role of the Parliament of Canada would be to authorize the payment of this $5 million grant. The Government of Canada has already authorized, as indicated by the Prime Minister on April 10 last, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited to make other financial assistance available, namely, the pre-payment of one year's production being valued at $16.4 million and an increase in the price per pound of heavy water over the lifetime of the contract of approximately $20 million, being roughly $2 per pound. So, those two additional aids have been committed, not through Parliament but through Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, under arrangements with the Province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, in presenting the bill to the House on behalf of the minister the Parliamentary Secretary has outlined the difficulties that were experienced at the Glace Bay heavy water plant. I can only add that I believe I speak on behalf of the citizens of that town when I say they are grateful for the fact that the assistance is to be made available and, as the Parliamentary Secretary has indicated, that the Nova Scotia government, which has changed hands in the last couple of days, apparently has expressed to the federal government its intention to rehabilitate this plant. This is a question which has been uppermost in the minds of the citizens of that town and, I might say, the citizens of Cape Breton and Nova Scotia as a whole. The arrangements that have been made concerning the advancement of moneys by Atomic Energy of Canada Limited will certainly be helpful in respect of the first year's production.

I think the question that has been uppermost in the minds of most people for some time concerned the availability of the new management, now under the direction of Mr. R. B. Cameron and Mr. Nazzer, who is considered to be one of the outstanding authorities in this field. Under their direction the rehabilitation of this plant should be successful. We are grateful that this bill has been brought forward at this time so that the rehabilitation will get underway as quickly as possible. Despite statements to the contrary, the Nova Scotia government of Mr. G. I. Smith worked long and faithfully on this case, and under the direction of Mr. Cameron and Mr. Nazzer I believe the situation has been brought to a point where this financial assistance will get this plant off the ground. Under the management of these two very capable persons the rehabilitation will take place. This, of course, will be a great source of aid and comfort to the people of Cape Breton and, as I said, Nova Scotia as a whole.

Again I should like to emphasize that I am delighted to hear the Parliamentary Secretary say that the government of Nova Scotia, which of course today is a Liberal government, has every intention of going through with the rehabilitation of this plant. I express my gratitude.

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): Mr. Speaker, many of us have long been concerned about the development of this heavy water plant in Nova Scotia, particularly because, despite the planning done many years ago to ensure that we would have a plant that would produce heavy water, as yet none of that commodity has been produced. Many of us are aware of the difficulties the Maritime Provinces are having. We are aware also of the fact that much of their hope for additional development in that area stems from the production of this plant which would have a number of by-products. Hopefully, this should be the basis for the creation of a totally new industry in this province which would make it much more self-sufficient.

Some of us will be reluctant to pass this bill at this time. I say that because of the events that have taken place in the past few months, particularly the statements made by one of the cabinet ministers in that area who said, in effect, to the Conservative government that until it brought forward new plans that would indicate some hope of success in the development of this plant, the $41 million the federal government had tentatively agreed to provide would not be provided. It is very interesting to note that that cabinet minister now seems to have no objection to the paying of this $5 million grant to the province, partly because of the change in government. I certainly give the government credit when I say that that is not the reason for proceeding with this bill. This bill was prepared originally some time ago. I have checked it and find it to be identical with the bill that was before us much earlier. In fact, it was first dated June 15, 1970, so this bill is not new and it was not brought in because of the change in government.

• (12:30 p.m.)

It is not entirely in keeping with the facts that plans are being formed now in such a way that an assurance can be given this plant will go into operation and will

produce heavy water on schedule. If there were evidence of political patronage and the federal government were going to play around with the $5 million for election purposes, I would be opposed to the grant. I am sure, however, the cabinet minister was carried away, and I think, knowing the situation during an election, that his statement was probably not entirely correct.

The previous speaker indicated that the management of the Deuterium plant had changed for the better, and I think that this is something for which we should give credit to General Electric. There seems to be a desire on the part of General Electric to produce a heavy water plant in the Maritimes. It will certainly not be nearly as large as this one. If the Deuterium plant is going to be totally successful, we will have to improve the type of atomic energy reactor we are using rather than use the enrichment type of reactor that is being used in the United States. So, we find that General Electric is co-operative in this regard because the success of its plant will depend on the number of reactors that are sold. Since Canada is selling atomic energy reactors, it is absolutely necessary for us to have the facilities to produce the heavy water which is essential for the atomic reactors that we are attempting to sell.

Therefore, I think we should make a much more formal arrangement with the province of Nova Scotia than we have in the case of the Deuterium plant. I believe that Atomic Energy of Canada is largely responsible for the mess that has developed in that province. I think the advice that has been given by Atomic Energy of Canada has been poor and unresearched. In Ontario, where we have started to use atomic energy for the production of electricity, we have been able in most cases to build small reactors that have been tested before we put money into building large reactors. We have developed to the stage where hydro has now reasonably large reactors operating in the field of electrical production. Atomic Energy of Canada has been able to make a considerable contribution in that field in terms of developing a small pilot reactor, and they have applied their knowledge to a large operational unit. I do not believe this course was followed with regard to the Deuterium plant in Nova Scotia and much of the fault lies, not only with the management hired by Nova Scotia, but also is due to the poor advice and lack of co-operation of Atomic Energy of Canada.

I think the Canadian people have an interest in the plant. If it is not successful, the Canadian people will have to make arrangements for other assistance to be given the Maritimes. It seems to me that now this plant has been developed, and that it has taken almost the total cash assets of Nova Scotia to bring it this far, we as a nation cannot allow it to fail. We will have to supply not only this $41 million by way of assistance, but we will also have to supply a number of other assets to the province of Nova Scotia to make this venture a success. I think that Atomic Energy of Canada must be requested to provide Deuterium with the know-how which they have developed. We should be appreciative of the help of General Electric, but we should also be able to make a contribution to ensure the success of this plant.

[Mr. Peters.]

I think the contribution by Nova Scotia of $140 million to the development of the Deuterium plant is a major contribution by the province toward the development of a totally new industry in the area. Certainly, the change of government is an indication that the people of Nova Scotia are aware of the fact that all the eggs are in one basket, and that the success or failure of the plant will depend entirely on the federal government. I think more contributions will have to be made by the federal government than have been made up to now. We are subsidizing the production of heavy water to the tune of $20 million, and we are making available $16 million in the first year of production. Now, we are making $5 million available for development. It has been estimated that it will cost upward of $20 million to $30 million to enable the plant to produce heavy water. The necessary money will be hard to come by.

I suggest that the federal government go into partnership, through the regional development department, with the Nova Scotia government. The Nova Scotia government will have no pride in having developed this successfully by themselves. Their pride will lie in the ability of this new industry to provide employment in the area. The people will be proud of their contribution toward providing employment and not necessarily in providing the physical facility of Deuterium of Canada. The federal government can contribute by participating directly in the successful development of this plant.

I agree with the previous speaker that the change in management and the hiring of Mr. Cameron and Mr. Nazzer to operate that plant will go a long way toward assuring the federal government that any contribution they make will not be wasted. I think it is unfortunate that an election should have come at this time in Nova Scotia giving rise to a suggestion of patronage by the federal government. There was a suggestion that if one government was not elected there would be no contribution but that if another government was elected a contribution might be made. If the plans for the choice of management and for the plant of Deuterium of Canada had to be submitted to the federal government before this grant could be made, then I suggest that the new government is no more capable than the old one of providing those plans because they have not had the time to develop plans. So, the timing of the contribution by the federal government may be unfortunate in that it gives the appearance that the promise of the federal minister to make a contribution to one government and not another hinged on the outcome of the election.

We have not heard the end of this unfortunate project. It seems to me that more money will be necessary to bring it to a successful conclusion. The Canadian public has an interest in this plant because if it is not successful and we have to go abroad for every atomic reactor that we need, and as well as for heavy water to operate them, then that would indicate other countries which built another form of atomic reactor were right and we were wrong.

• (12:40 p.m.)

The success of the heavy water reactor which we have developed and sold around the world depends, to a large extent, on making this plant a successful operation. It also seems to me that the federal government has been playing around with the type of grants it has been providing, such as ARDA grants, grants matched by production, and grants provided as subsidies to cover the cost of the product. I believe the answer is direct participation by the federal government in the development and management of this plant.

If the federal government makes its contribution in a direct manner then I am sure the new government in Nova Scotia will be as willing, as I presume the previous government was, to enter into partnership with the federal government to make the plant a success. This plant has the potential to end many employment problems in the Cape Breton area, and to solve some of the problems that Ontario and other parts of Canada may experience in the operation of reactors that are demanding heavy water now, not in three or four years from now, and which can only be produced by plants having the capacity of the Deuterium plant in Glace Bay.

Mr. G. W. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, the assistance provided by the federal government to the government of Nova Scotia under this bill was negotiated by the previous provincial government of the Hon. G. I. Smith, and was announced in this House by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on April 10 last. At that time I had an opportunity to make a few remarks on the general problem, and now I am pleased to note that the new Nova Scotia government has confirmed the correctness of the previous decision to proceed to bring the plant into production of heavy water.

There is no doubt about the fact that power sources in Canada are gradually diminishing. They are certainly falling behind projected requirements. New sources of water power are becoming scarcer. The use of coal in the production of power is also diminishing to a considerable extent, and so we must turn to nuclear energy to provide electric power for Canada's future needs. To keep our nuclear power plants operating, it is necessary that heavy water be produced in Canada. The decision to proceed with the establishment of heavy water nuclear plants in Canada was made many years ago because it seemed that Canada had the best source of uranium, and to that time had done the most extensive work undertaken in connection with the peaceful use of atomic power.

I was a member of a special committee of this House, I believe it was in 1960, which examined research in Canada, when the government's decision was discussed by a great many eminent scientists. At the end of very extensive hearings, the decision was confirmed that Canada should continue to develop heavy water nuclear power plants. In the light of this history, the only possibility left is to proceed with this plant at Glace Bay, providing the engineering is successful. I presume that the engineering problems have now been mastered, or that at least the engineers see the possibility of being successful in bringing the plant into production. The sooner that happens the better it will be not only for the people of Cape Breton-East Richmond but also for the whole of Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. O'Connell: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. members who have spoken in this debate for the support which they are giving to the bill. I would say no more, except that I do feel it is important to correct an impression which may have been left unintentionally by the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) as to the role and responsibility of Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. I think it is my responsibility to try to set the record straight.

Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd. is in no way responsible for and had no role to play at all in the design of the Deuterium of Canada Limited plant.

Mr. Peters: That is the problem.

Mr. O'Connell: Heavy water is a product that can be made commercially. There is no radiation, nor atomic aspects connected with it. It is only confusing to compare it with the role that Atomic Energy of Canada might play in advising on the design of atomic reactors, as was the case in Ontario.

This is not an atomic reactor; it is a heavy water plant. Canadian General Electric is producing it as a product, like any other product. It is just water that is 10 per cent heavier than usual. Therefore, it is not correct to associate Atomic Energy of Canada with the problems that have been experienced. It had nothing to do with the difficulties being faced there. Atomic Energy of Canada only underwrote the sales of heavy water. It had to enter into a contract for that, but the responsibility for production of heavy water was the responsibility of the private company that began the operation, and it became the responsibility of the province when it assumed that responsibility from the private company.

The only other point on which I wish to comment was that raised by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) in connection with the engineering. We want to make it clear in this bill that the grant does not begin to flow to the province until Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, which is acting as the agent of the Government of Canada, is satisfied that there is a remedial program and that the new operator who has been selected for the plant has the powers and responsibilities, and in fact has such a program. Then, this grant will flow in terms of the phases of that program as they go into operation.

• (12:50 p.m.)

The grant is therefore subject to the engineering being satisfactory, in the sense that it would be reviewed by Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, but Atomic Energy of Canada would not take responsibility for the engineering or the work itself. That is the responsibility of the owners. The task of the federal government agency, Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, is to be satisfied by reviewing the plans that there is a major chance of

success but it does not take responsibility for the plans. I think it is important to make that clear, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Speaker, could I ask a question of the Parliamentary Secretary? Is it not true that Atomic Energy of Canada Limited, in looking over the plans and recommendations to decide on behalf of Canada whether it has sufficient potential of success, could have supplied that same expertise in helping to develop the management of this plant?

Mr. O'Connell: Mr. Speaker, that is a hypothetical question. The role of the owner was to produce heavy water. In terms of the contract, it was not the role of Atomic Energy of Canada to give advice, in fact, advice was not sought. The hon. member will recall that Mr. Jerome Spevack, who was the owner of the process, held it as a secret process. It is not a situation in which one could give advice to the owner; it is a situation in which the contract was let to provide so much water and it was the responsibility of the owner to do that. Other owners are meeting their responsibility but we have to make it clear that the government of Canada, through its agent, does not accept responsibility for the operation of the plant.

Mr. Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Regional Development.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): One o'clock.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I think that, under the War Measures Act, when looking at the clock the Minister of Justice can say it is one o'clock!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, why don't we introduce the next item and then call it one o'clock?

Mr. Baldwin: It has already been called.

* * *

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

REFERENCE TO STANDING COMMITTEE OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND REPORT OF AUDITOR GENERAL

Hon. John N. Turner (for the President of the Privy Council) moved that the Public Accounts for the year ended March 31, 1969, and the Auditor General's report thereon, and the evidence adduced by the committee during the past session in relation thereto be referred to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Now, it is one o'clock.

Mr. Speaker: It being one o'clock, I do now leave the Chair until two o'clock.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

[Mr. O'Connell.]

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 2 p.m.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The House will resume debate on the motion that was moved by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), for President of the Privy Council and seconded by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin). Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, is the Parliamentary Secretary not to give us his words of wisdom on this very interesting and complicated motion?

Mr. Jerome: Mr. Speaker, I thought I would hear first what the House Leader of the party opposite has to contribute.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I can only hope that this degree of moderate wisdom will be, by a process of intellectual osmosis, carried over to those occupying the front benches opposite so that the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his colleagues will learn to listen to the opposition before doing some of the stupid things they do.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: You mean, that the opposition do.

Mr. Baldwin: This very interesting motion, Mr. Speaker, gives members of the House an opportunity to deal with several aspects of a matter to which reference has already been made. The motion reads:

> That the Public Accounts for the year ended March 31, 1969, and the Auditor General's Report thereon, and the evidence adduced by the Committee during the past Session in relation thereto be referred to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Of course you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members of the House, will notice that this motion is included on the Order Paper as a government order. This is the result of a policy which has been announced by this party and, hopefully, supported by my friends who sit on my left, to this effect: that, with regard to the appointment, the operations and the terms of reference of committees generally, we are not prepared to be as free and easy as we have been in the past. This matter was discussed and the issues were referred to in the debate this House embarked upon at the time of the establishment of the joint committee of this House and the other place to deal with the constitution.

At that time, on behalf of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, I made certain points. I did so in a very friendly way and I propose to be reasonably friendly today. The points I made then were these: that we were becoming very concerned about the operation of committees and about the impact they were having on the capacity of this House to function efficiently and properly as a forum wherein could be debated the affairs of the people of Canada. It was because of our experience with committees last year, not only of this House but of the other

place—we have a vested interest in the operations of committees in the other place because we are both part of the Parliament of Canada—that we made it quite plain that from that time on, all motions dealing with committees would have to be placed on the order paper; that unanimous consent would not be given; and that it would be essential that there be at least an opportunity for discussion. Pursuant to that policy, the government placed on the order paper the terms of reference for the appointment of a number of committees, including this one.

• (2:10 p.m.)

A short time ago the hon. member for Malpèque (Mr. MacLean) placed on record his consent on behalf of this party to the establishment of some of these committees, but consent was deliberately withheld with respect to this committee so that it would provide a vehicle for discussion and an opportunity to renew the interesting debate we had earlier on this subject.

I might say in passing that there are a number of areas of concern to us. One is the question of cost. We are concerned about the cost because the people of Canada are much concerned about the level of taxation. They want to know what Parliament is doing, what its operations are costing and whether all of them are necessary. It is with this in mind that I called into question the extent to which the joint committee on the constitution was proposing to become involved in a travelling program of a substantial nature in accordance with the power sought, and granted, of journeying from place to place.

I should note in passing that the report filed by the co-chairman of the committee this morning makes provision for travelling all over Canada during a period of 45 days from the time the session began until the end of June. The cost involved here might well be substantial. However, I shall go no further on these lines, because I would not be allowed to do so. I draw attention to this matter, however, because we entered a caveat at the time we first held our discussion on this subject. We made our views known at that time, but no notice has been taken of them. Since then, some interesting information has come to us from the other place, information which emphasizes the desirability of providing means whereby this House would have some degree of control after committees have been appointed on motions of this kind. These things should not be left to the committees themselves or to the good offices of Mr. Speaker, who is sometimes left in a difficult position.

The evidence indicates that well over one million dollars has been disbursed so far with respect to two committees of the other place, and more will yet be spent. As was demonstrated by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Hales), who spoke in the last debate on this subject, the possible costs of the committee to which I have been referring will be an amount of similar magnitude. For this reason, whenever there is a motion before us to set up a committee, we intend to bring our concern about these matters to the attention of the House. When a million dollars is being spent, I want to know, and my hon. friends want to know, that good value will be obtained for it in the circumstances which prevail today.

Another area of our concern is the extent to which the multiplicity of our committees is reducing the operations of this House to a nullity. I know there are problems. I know we are learning as we go along. The other day I was reading a report brought in by the new leader of the house in the United Kingdom, Mr. Whitelaw. Some members of this House, including the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) had an opportunity on one or two occasions both here and elsewhere to meet members of the United Kingdom Parliament and discuss our experience with them. Members of the British Parliament were very interested in our committee system, but they warned us: do not go too far or too fast or you will remove all the emphasis from the House and place it on the committees, and the chamber of the House of Commons will cease to be what it has been for so long, the central pivot of our democratic system.

I notice that at Westminster they have gone moderately along the path we have taken by setting up specialized committees to deal with some of their work. I intend, later in my remarks, to commend in the highest terms the Public Accounts Committee. It has carried out its function in an admirable and non-partisan way, and what I have said so far does not apply to that body. But I am using this motion as a peg upon which to hang words of warning to the House, and to the government, with respect to possible abuse of the committee system. When I see only a score or so of members in this chamber, as happens every day of the week, I know there are large numbers of our members who are engaged in committee work or engaged on their constituency duties. But I believe it is incumbent upon us to pattern the committee structure on the basis that this House is the central point around which all the activities of Parliament should revolve.

We ought to examine every proposal to set up a committee in the light of this responsibility, and I can assure hon. members that I intend to do this from time to time in the hope that the government will take up the suggestion I made at the time of the last debate on this subject, a suggestion which was echoed by other opposition members. The time has come, in the light of our experience during the past one and a half years, for the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization to review the operations of House committees so as to ensure that the difficulties and the faults which have been so obvious, and to which attention has been drawn time and time again by my hon. friends on this side of the House, are removed and that necessary reforms are introduced. If this is not done, the committee structure will collapse and bring down with it much of the value of debate in this House.

The Parliamentary Secretary (Mr. Jerome) was a valuable member of the special committee which was the forerunner of the present standing committee, so I am sure he would be the first to acknowledge that the system

which we introduced was experimental in nature. The stage has now been reached at which many of the reforms we brought in then need to be modified in the light of our experience. I am not suggesting that the committee should meet tomorrow and bring forth changes the following day. I recognize that the committee has other responsibilities. But there is no reason why a sub-committee should not be set up to deal with this matter. One has only to hear the outpourings of dissatisfaction and annoyance coming from private members, particularly those on this side of the House, to realize that something ought to be done by way of improvement. But this warning is by way of a preliminary to what I have to say about the particular committee we are being asked to consider this afternoon.

• (2:20 p.m.)

I am glad to see that the public accounts committee is going to be re-established. This is one committee in which, certainly over the last 12 years—with one exception last year with which I propose to deal later—there has been a sort of non-partisan, objective approach on the part of a number of Members of Parliament operating on behalf not only of their constituents but of all the people of Canada. They have examined, scrutinized and challenged the cost of government under capable leadership and brought to the attention of the people of Canada details of extravagances, aided by the Auditor General and the officials of departments who have appeared before them.

Ever since 1958 when the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), as Prime Minister of the day, re-established the committee as a viable and useful entity with a member of the opposition to chair it—now a member of the other place—the committee has had a very effective and useful life and has done yeoman service for the people of Canada.

For that reason, I am glad to see the committee being set up under terms of reference embracing the report of the Auditor General. I think we are lucky to have a very valuable and useful occupant of that position today. It is interesting to note that there have been, I do not know how many Prime Ministers, 15 or 16—there may be some scholars on the other side who can tell me the exact number we have had—yet there have been only six Auditors General.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The number is 15.

Mr. Baldwin: I thought at times the number might have been 13, but I am now told it is 15. However, there have been only six Auditors General in the same period. The present occupant brings a lot of useful character and knowledge to the position. It is of interest to note that during the last few days he was unanimously recommended for re-appointment as Auditor General of the United Nations, this being his third term. I think this inures to the benefit of Canada and it is of some satisfaction to us to realize the value of the present Auditor General. However, I would not be fulfilling my duty in speaking to the House today if I failed to point out that by an anomaly, as far as salary is concerned, which is one of the matters dealt with in the evidence that the motion asks to be referred back to the committee, the Auditor General receives substantially less than his assistant.

In the area of the accountability of governments for spending, I think this is a shocking condition. I hope that when the committee is appointed under its terms of reference, as I am sure it will be, the committee will turn its attention to this particular problem. Some recommendations were made by the committee. I agree with some, I disagree with others, and I must say that there were some that could only be compared with the perverse verdict of a jury in the face of overwhelming evidence before them. However, as I say, one of the matters that must be dealt with by this committee is this salary situation. The qualifications of the assistant Auditor General are very high, and I have great respect for him personally. Yet under the terms of the statute that now governs the operations of the Auditor General and his office, we find this very ridiculous situation prevailing. When the committee is established, I hope it will see fit to turn its attention to this particular issue.

The need today for this committee in terms of the examination made by the Auditor General is very high. This is an age of bureaucrats, and we have a government of bureaucrats. I am not against bureaucrats; indeed, we have to have them today, though we have a particularly invidious group sitting opposite us who are well schooled in the art of being a bureaucrat. However, it is helpful to know that in order to meet the challenge of bureaucracy it is essential to have a public accounts committee, and that it is essential to have terms of reference that permit the closest and most detailed examination of the operations of the bureaucracy as it is spread throughout each department. This, in turn, involves some examination of the changes made in the functions of the Auditor General. This is one reason that the terms of reference to which I have referred included the requirement, as an integral part of the motion, that the evidence taken before the committee last session should be referred to the present committee.

On this issue, as well as on the issue of the relationship of the committee to the Auditor General and of the Auditor General to the government, it is fascinating to read in the evidence, evidence that is quite relevant in this context, some of the statements that were made by Professor Norman Ward, probably the outstanding and acknowledged authority on the public purse, the operations of the Auditor General and the public accounts committee. His credentials are impeccable. He is objective and non-partisan. He is the author of several books and was apparently the last witness to appear before the committee last session. I should like to put on the record before I conclude some of his evidence in the hope that what Professor Ward said will commend itself to members of this committee. When they come to deal with this particular aspect of the functions and duty of the Auditor General, and to deliberate thereupon, I hope they will not

fail to remember what Professor Ward said and to bear it well in mind.

I was speaking about bureaucrats a few moments ago. There is no doubt that there was on the part of government members opposite, and certainly on the part of every member of the administration, a quite obvious and demonstrated attempt to cut down the functions of the Auditor General. The Auditor General had annoyed them: they did not like his criticism. If I ever found an Auditor General who said things that appealed to the government, then I would say he ought to be fired on the spot. No government, particularly one of this size, can fail to make errors of judgment, to over-spend, to be guilty of being improvident, to engage in non-productive payments. That is part of the game and we must expect it. This is why we must have committees, and officials like the Auditor General, who function on behalf of the taxpayer, who will be breathing down the necks of departments, bureaucrats and deputy ministers and saying to them: "Hold on a minute, you are going the wrong way. What are you doing here?" Report must then be made to the House in elaboration of their findings.

When we see, as we saw last year, the then President of the Privy Council (Mr. Macdonald), who has now gone forward into a higher echelon of bureaucracy, and the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Drury) making statements that constitute an obvious attempt to relegate the Auditor General to the performance of functions that were subservient to those he had exercised before, it must serve as a warning to all of us, particularly to members of the opposition. This will not be tolerated.

Let me put on the record at this stage the statement that if this government attempts to bring in new legislation of a kind envisaged by the former President of the Privy Council and eagerly supported by some of his colleagues, this legislation is going to run into the toughest kind of opposition there is from members on this side of the House. I give that warning to the government right now. Having said that, I leave my few remarks in, I hope, a spirit of amity and friendliness. I hope the hon. members who serve on the committee will take these remarks very much to heart.

• (2:30 p.m.)

I have before me the minutes of proceedings and evidence of the committee on public accounts, number 33 dated June 16, 1970. These proceedings took place just before the committee brought down its recommendations to the House. This is part of the evidence that is now being sought to be placed before the new committee. Let me read some of the things Professor Ward said. I should love to put it all on the record, but it will be on the record of the committee.

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Speaker, that is quite a lengthy report and I wonder if the page number could be given just to assist the members?

Mr. Baldwin: Yes, I had intended to give the page number, Mr. Speaker. I hope the hon. member will take this report home, read it and cogitate on it over the weekend. I read from page 33:6 from Professor Ward's evidence:

> I am aware, and I think it is to the eternal credit of the present government, that for the first time in Canadian history the opposition parties have been given small sums of money—

I emphasize that word "small". He continues:

> —for research purposes as parties. I have not yet been able to find out, particularly because I have not had time, how they are using the money and what for, but I hope to. This is, I think, an enormously important step in the right direction, but when you consider that the total amount of money made available to the three opposition parties is around $225,000, as I remember, and the government on its side has behind it a civil service of over 300,000 people altogether, counting the Crown corporations, spending a budget which is now running into the dozens of billions of dollars, $225,000 or so for the opposition does not even qualify as a drop in the bucket as ammunition with which to prepare cases to criticize the government.

Those are Professor Ward's views, not necessarily mine, but I think the comment he makes is interesting. On the next page, 33:7, which is the seventh page of the 33rd volume, the professor is reported as follows:

> I am disallowing here any kind of partisan interest—

I could use those words myself of Professor Ward; I am not disallowing any kind of partisan interest. He continues:

> —from the point of view of a particular party, but it is a fact of life in Canada that for the past half century for all but 12 years, Canada has been governed by a party which never bestows its leadership on a seasoned parliamentary veteran. Without exception every single leader of the Liberals since Sir Wilfrid Laurier have been chosen in convention. Every one of them has beaten far more experienced parliamentarians for the leadership. This, I think, is probably one of the secrets of the party's success, perhaps—

That word "perhaps" is the professor's word. To quote again:

> —but it has as far as Parliament is concerned the rather curious by-product that for prolonged periods the Prime Minister of Canada is not himself a man experienced in sitting on committees such as this. I have not had time to check out all the committees in existence during all the years of the four people I have mentioned; Mr. King, Mr. St. Laurent, Mr. Pearson, and now Mr. Trudeau. To the best of my recollection I have never encountered any of their names in the proceedings of a Parliamentary committee. They have had no experience.

I could add that there are one or two of them that have not had too much experience in Parliament either, Mr. Speaker, and certainly their records since they have become leaders show it. The professor goes on to say and I quote from the same page:

> This again enormously enhances the importance of this Committee and the Auditor General who is Parliament's servant or particularly working with this committee. This is I think a uniquely Canadian phenomenon. I do not know of any other free country in which the leadership of a major party is in power most of the time is given not occasionally or even regularly, but all the time to somebody in effect who opted from outside. That, I think, is again one of the fundamental considerations that has to underline any consideration of the role of Auditor General in Canada, that he occupies a most

peculiar position through no fault of his or anybody else's. The facts of Canadian party life just have worked out that way now for half a century.

I do hope the committee that is appointed for this year will give more serious consideration to those statements. There are so very few really effective and potent weapons available to an opposition party under the kind of system and statutes we have, which permit the government the right to operate in so many cases by Order in Council. To meet the vast forces of government and its supporting bureaucracy, we must have an official like the Auditor General working with a reinforced committee such as the Public Accounts committee.

Finally I have two more quotations from page 9 of the same issue. The first one reads:

This raises the question—which I presume will come up again later but I want to make sure that I put it on the record now because I wish to say something about it—whether or not the Auditor General should simply confine himself to commenting on the legality or otherwise of expenditures or whether he should get himself involved in commenting on what is in effect policy from the point of view of the government.

I pause here because this is the crux of the argument which has developed between the cabinet on the one side and the Auditor General on the other. I am convinced that the two ministers whose names I used, or whose positions are used, did not speak out as they did in criticism of the Auditor General and his role without having behind them the full support of the government and the Prime Minister.

I think the words of Professor Ward must be engraved on the hearts of the members of the committee when they come to examine this problem. What are the functions of the Auditor General? Must he be confined within strict terms, as has been suggested by ministers on the other side, or should he have a degree of freedom which permits him an opportunity to go into other matters, which I submit is so essential? Let me continue with what Professor Ward said:

My general position on this, which I really have held for many years, is that there is no conceivable way in which you could limit an Auditor General to commenting only on the legality of expenditures—none. The reason I say that is that it is his duty, clearly, to report what he considers are extravagant or improvident expenditures.

I pause here to say what a great field he has when he serves with the gentlemen who sit opposite us. Then, to continue:

But they could be perfectly legal. I could be paid by the government $1,000 for $1,000 worth of work quite legally, but under the same kind of contract I could be paid $5,000 for doing $1,000 worth of work and it would be perfectly legal—and I think, it would be the duty of the Auditor General to point out that I had in fact been paid five times as much as the job is worth.

Just as simple as that in those clearly expressed terms, Professor Ward has pointed out the nub of the problem regarding the conflict between the government and the Auditor General. When we see the committee bring in recommendations, as they obviously attempted to do, which would take the government side, then I think probably—I will not say there was a hatchet job because I think I would not be right in saying that—it is time to take stock. There were a few times when the committee obviously attempted, through government members, to carry forward the views of the then President of the Privy Council and to incorporate them in the terms of the recommendations of the committee.

I would like to see the committee review this, too, and the other evidence which was given last June. By reviewing and changing some of those recommendations in light of the clear warning uttered by Professor Ward, they would show themselves to be honourable and distinguished Members of Parliament.

• (2:40 p.m.)

Mr. Cafik: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member a question.

Mr. Baldwin: Delighted.

Mr. Cafik: I am a member of the Public Accounts Committee, and I gather the hon. member is referring to the recommendation in respect of a new Auditor General's act. I may be wrong, and if so the hon. gentleman will correct me, but as I recall it those recommendations in the committee were passed unanimously by all members on the committee. I suggest that if there is any criticism of those recommendations, that criticism I presume would apply to the members of his party as well as to other members.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I have never been an obsequious member of this House. If members on our side of the House in my judgment are mistaken, I would have no hesitation in saying so. This is a policy I would recommend to members opposite. It would be much better if members on the other side would stand up and criticize the government, especially when there is so much to criticize.

The quotation continues:

I hasten to add that this never has happened. But it could happen perfectly legally and it would certainly, I think in a case like that, still be the duty of the Auditor General, whether it was legal or not, to comment on what seemed to him to be an improvident expenditure.

I think this is extremely important, Mr. Speaker. I am just about finished. I hope I have excited other hon. members to get up and defend themselves and contribute to this very important debate which I believe is of great consequence to the people of this country who are saddled with a heavy burden of taxes which will become even greater if the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) has his way. Then, there is this paragraph on page 10:

I do not really know of any way either in which you can prevent the Auditor General from straying over, sometimes at least, even inadvertently, into the field of policy, because policy nowadays is not that clear-cut a thing that you can distinguish the purely financial aspect of policy from policy itself. One only has to consider for example how many of our major expenditures of government today—this again is very unlike the way things were in 1878—are substantive expenditures, like the family allowance, in which the actual administrative cost

is a tiny fraction of the total cost of the program. The Auditor General, if he confines himself solely to the purely legal administrative aspects of running this enormous program, in a case like this is simply going to have to neglect things that conceivably might be worth looking at because they are involved in some kind of policy. I will return to that point later.

Then, finally:

But my general view of this is that the Auditor General really cannot be narrowly confined to a purely legalistic view of his job if he is to do his job properly. Of course he is going to make mistakes—he is human, and of course he is going to aggravate the government—they are human.

I sometimes doubt that statement.

And he should make mistakes and aggravate the government rather than overlook things that ought to be drawn to the public's attention. It is far better that he should be free to make mistakes in the same way that the Supreme Court judge is free to make mistakes than that he should be hampered so that he is afraid to make mistakes.

With that, I shall leave my comments before the House. I say again that in the kind of world in which we live, and with the kind of governments we have in this country and in the United States where the Congressional elections will be held next Tuesday, one of the major issues is the very issue of government expenditures and taxes which are reflected in the cost of living. Any attempt to curtail or limit the powers and functions of the Auditor General or of the Public Accounts Committee would be a great mistake. I urge the committee when it commences its deliberations to bear these things in mind.

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to use any further time of the House on this somewhat routine measure but, as we had anticipated, some of the things the House Leader of the Opposition has said certainly require some comment from this side of the House. I am only too happy to make those comments. I assume I am eligible to reply to the hon. member because, not having risen as high as the ministry and not being in the civil service, I am not subject to that very wide designation of his of being a bureaucrat, which seems to cover just about every one who has views opposite to his. In any event, I think the very subject of this motion, to refer certain matters to the Public Accounts Committee, leads us to a consideration of some of the fine work that was undertaken by this committee during the last session. I think it is significant that co-operation between the parties in this House has led to this vehicle being on the order paper.

We learned that the hon. member had some comments he wished to make in this connection and, accordingly, this matter was held over until this time in order to give him an opportunity to deliver the comments he has delivered today. We are prepared to have these matters discussed because the committee system is an extremely important part of the operations of this Parliament so far as the government is concerned. However, I think the references made by the hon. member to the Auditor General's Act are entirely unfair. I think anyone would agree that last year, regardless of what I think was a very unnecessary political attitude on the part of many members of the House—the most unfortunate atmosphere possible—the whole subject was considered. I think the hon. member will agree with me that, despite the political connotations, legitimate progress was made in respect of that very important statute. I see that the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Hales), who was chairman of the committee at that time is here, as is the hon. member for Pembina (Mr. Bigg). I am sure they and other members who were members of the committee will agree with me that, notwithstanding the extremely difficult and strained atmosphere, the work of the committee progressed very well and that, in fact, there were great accomplishments.

Therefore, I take great issue with the hon. member's reference to this subject because it would seem to be a condemnation of the work of the committee. I take it as the very strongest commendation that even under such difficult conditions the committee made great progress and accomplished many things in much less time than would have been possible under the former rules of the House.

Before leaving this subject, I should like to refer to one other matter pertaining to the same Public Accounts Committee. I refer to the time when very considerable tariff concessions to the Ford Motor Company were debated by members opposite.

Mr. Woolliams: You gave them $10 million.

Mr. Jerome: The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) is again off the subject. This matter was extremely political, in view of the stand taken by members opposite, when it was discussed by the Public Accounts Committee. I am sure members opposite will agree that the kind of investigation that was carried out in the committee would not have been possible if the matter had been dealt with by the Committee of the Whole House. These tariff concessions were discussed with the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) and members of his staff, as well as senior representatives from the Department of National Revenue and the Department of Finance. If any question involving tariffs comes up in the course of the debate on estimates or in the course of the debate of a subject that is before the Committee of the Whole House, a minister has the opportunity from time to time to evade questions by saying that that area of questioning should fall to the Minister of National Revenue (Mr. Gray) or else to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson). That kind of escape is possible here in the House. But the kind of examination that took place in the Finance Committee would not permit that type of escape. The resulting detailed examination that was available through the Committee procedure gave all hon. members on both sides of the House, an unparalleled opportunity to examine that important question in detail. So, I think that the importance of the committee system is self evident. In addition, one should remember that last year some 1,200 hours were spent collectively by the standing committees on the examination of

legislation, in fact about twice as much time as was spent by this chamber.

• (2:50 p.m.)

So, there is certainly a very clear case for the work that is being done in the standing committees and for the entire committee system. When hon. members opposite question the cost, I think it is fair to examine these things because it is not just the cost but the value received that has to be considered. When one sees the number of hours spent in detailed clause by clause examination of legislation and of departmental estimates, in the sort of detail that is possible in the committees but not possible here, one realizes the importance of the committee system. We are in conflict at all times on at least two counts: first, this House is a debating society in the true sense of the word and second, it is important that everyone has time to speak in this chamber on subjects of their choice.

At the same time, we already sit in this chamber as many hours in the day and days in the year as it is possible. The schedule to which we adhere at present cannot be stretched much more. This means that we are in conflict in so far as efficiency is concerned. This place cannot go on maintaining the respect of the citizenry if it does not do its business efficiently. We are using all the available time and we must keep up with the business. The result is that the committee system presents a golden opportunity to make the procedures of the House more efficient, because the matters that have to be discussed can be discussed in the House as well as in several standing committees at the same time. The item of the most fundamental importance is to ensure that through participation in the affairs of the standing committees the whole system is made to contribute and to complement the function of the House, not to compete with it. That, I think, is the problem.

In addition, we are in another conflict which I think is very important because we, who are directly involved in the affairs of this chamber, become knowledgeable about what happens here. We are all elected representatives; we are very much involved in politics and in government, and consequently we tend to think that everyone in the country knows and cares about these matters as much as we do. In fact, they do not. In fact, the great majority of our citizens not only do not know a great deal about the political life of the country or the function of their government, but they do not care.

It is an important function of Parliament as a whole to fulfil an educative role, to take the government, at least to some extent, to the people; to get out to the country and function in other centres than the very much confined space of these buildings. The committee system can do this. When a committee travels to Vancouver or to Halifax or to any of the smaller or more remote centres—and here I am addressing myself to hon. members from the areas outside the major metropolitan centres—the government is brought closer to the people. Hon. members know that they represent people who feel they are very much out of the main stream of events; they are away from provincial capitals and from the national capital.

I think it is a very important duty and function of Parliament to attempt to bring the government to those people and, so far as possible, to let those people participate in and see government functioning in their own centres. The committees that travel about the country, as well as working at the time that they are there, fulfil that very important function. So, we have the conflict of efficiency as opposed to the debating society approach which enables everybody to hold up the work of this House and carry on until everyone has had a chance to speak. We also have the conflict of centralizing the government in Ottawa as opposed to bringing it to the people.

These are the conflicts that have to be borne in mind when hon. members say that the committee system is detracting from the business of the House and from the importance of this chamber. I will go along with the hon. member in attempting, as he was, to be non-partisan because I do not suggest for one minute that what I am about to say here does not tar us and hon. members opposite with the same brush. The plain truth is that in theory the committee system at present is not bad.

Mr. McGrath: Nonsense.

Mr. Jerome: What can make it bad is the failure of members of this House to participate in it and make it function. That is where the indictment should lie, not on the system itself but the manner and the extent in which hon. members participate in it and make it function. Again I say I am not attempting to lay criticism at the feet of hon. members opposite that does not tar us with the same brush, because the performance of some of the hon. members on our side is no better.

Mr. Woolliams: Do not become a statesman because of your recent appointment; just carry on as you did before.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The Parliamentary Secretary has the floor.

Mr. Jerome: Of course the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) holds himself out as a paragon of virtue so far as his participation in the committee system is concerned. I am sure that if we examined the record we would find that his attendance at committee meetings is such as to be exemplary to other hon. members. However, I wish he would concentrate on other members to make sure they do as much as he does, because at present that is not the case. I am not speaking as a statesman, I am stating a fact.

The fact is that members of this House do not show up at committee meetings and do not participate in the way they should. If the hon. member for Calgary North thinks it is funny that I am talking as a statesman, that is too bad.

Mr. Baldwin: Would the Parliamentary Secretary answer a question?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Is the hon. member for Peace River seeking the floor for the purpose of asking a question?

Mr. Jerome: The question probably refers to the member's suggestion to review the committee system by referring the matter to the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization. He said that in order to precipitate this course, if necessary, he is prepared to debate every routine motion for reference to a standing committee until he has made his point about expenses. We are quite prepared to examine, with a very careful eye, the proposed expenses of the committees.

I am speaking from personal experience as the immediate past chairman of the special committee on election expenses, which sat for a very short period in the last session. One of the first subjects that we discussed—and opposition members who were on that committee will support me on this—was whether that committee needed to travel. Because there is a system in the province of Nova Scotia that would have been of interest to the committee, because there is one in the province of Quebec, because there are different electoral systems in various provinces throughout the country and, in fact, in other countries throughout the world, there would have been every justification for the committee applying to the house for permission to travel. The subject was discussed and I think hon. members opposite will agree that, as chairman of the committee, I expressed the opinion as forcibly as I could that the right thing for the committee to do was to stay here, unless members felt there was some worthwhile work that could be done.

I am happy to say that members of all parties were agreed. I submit that as an example of the proper attitude taken by committee members of all parties with respect to the expenditure of money on committees.

• (3:00 p.m.)

It is all very well for the hon. member opposite to suggest a review by the Procedure and Organization Committee, but it is only fair to put on record that at the end of last session the government was anxious that some arrangement be made whereby that committee could review all the rules of the House, and do it on a continuing basis. We still stand in support of that proposition. The hon. member opposite knows that his party has taken a position opposed to that. We have been anxious to give the committee not only the power, on an ad hoc basis if necessary, to review the rules governing committees but also, if it is preferred by the House, to give it a standing reference covering all the rules of the House. In our view this would be a sensible arrangement.

That suggestion has met with opposition from the other side of the House. Again I say we submit that the proper thing to do is to have the committee not only discuss the rules pertaining to committees but have it constantly discuss, and consequently recommend, changing and updating of all the rules of the House. Participation by members of this House is what will make the committee system function as it should. I repeat that we are perfectly prepared to have the committees' rules, along with all the rules of the House, placed under constant review by the Procedure and Organization Committee.

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I have only a few words to say concerning the motion to refer certain work to the Public Accounts Committee. Speaking as a past chairman of that committee, there are one or two observations I would like to make. I compliment the government for calling this motion at an early stage in the session, as a matter of fact on the seventeenth sitting day. I have seen sessions which have gone on for months before any work was referred to that committee. This raises another point. The Public Accounts Committee recommended to the House that its members should be appointed for the duration of a Parliament. That recommendation was acted upon and now members are appointed to the committee for a whole Parliament. Members appointed for a whole Parliament provide continuity of work and research.

We also suggested that the Auditor General's Report be automatically referred to the committee when tabled and that it should not be left to the whim of the government when to refer the report. As yet that recommendation has not been acted upon and the committee only functions at the whim of the government. As a matter of fact, if the government does not want the committee to examine the Auditor General's Report, it does not have to refer the report to it. This is one of the committee's recommendations that should be acted upon by this Parliament.

We should stop and take note of the very inadequate way in which the Public Accounts Committee must function. For that committee we have one clerk. That is the extent of our staff. This is no reflection on our clerk. We have been fortunate in the Public Accounts Committee in that we have had excellent clerks, but for example when we were investigating expenditures in connection with the *Bonaventure*, the shipping company which did the refit came before us with its whole staff and also legal counsel. We did not even have legal counsel although we were dealing with a very intricate problem.

In the United Kingdom the public accounts committee has a staff of 10 or 12 people. They do not work just while the House sits. That committee functions the year round and is equipped to do the job for which it is established. So far as our Parliament is concerned, we are only scratching the surface and I strongly urge that our Public Accounts Committee be given better facilities, better accommodation, better staff and be set up for a year-round operation.

Any government that has an expenditure of about $13 billion a year certainly warrants a good, strong Public Accounts Committee. I believe the Public Accounts Committee functions as well as or better than any other committee of the House simply because we have done our best to keep it non-partisan. Granted, at times this was difficult, but all members of the committee, regardless of party affiliation, realized they were dealing with the expenditure of taxpayers' money, be they Liberal taxpayers, Conservative taxpayers or others. Members of

the committee had one objective—that the money be spent wisely and properly. After all, Mr. Speaker, what other control have we in this House except when the departmental estimates are before us? I am sorry to say that under present arrangements, when departmental estimates are referred to committees they are not getting the close supervision that they should be getting and the publicity that should accompany them.

Once this House passes the estimates, the various government departments are given authority to spend the money granted by the House, and we must depend upon experienced civil servants to spend that money wisely and justly. When they do not, it is the responsibility of the Public Accounts Committee to call the civil servants before it and inquire why the money was not spent in a productive way. We in the Public Accounts Committee must deal with non-productive items. "Non-productive" is a hard word to define, but the committee has asked the Auditor General to list what he considers non-productive expenditures.

The House Leader of our party has called attention to the very fine report that Professor Ward made to the committee, and I recommend that all hon. members read it. The Public Accounts Committee has functioned well for the past 13 years under its present system. I sincerely hope we will able to continue on that basis, in a non-partisan way, dealing with the issues that the Auditor General brings to our attention. If the Auditor General does not have a good Public Accounts Committee to answer to, we will have a poor Auditor General, because the two go together. The committee, as it were, is his right arm. If we are to have a strong, viable Auditor General we must have a strong, viable, energetic Public Accounts Committee.

When the proposed Auditor General of Canada act comes before us, Mr. Speaker, I shall have only one plea to make. I hope this House will not do anything to curtail the powers of the Auditor General. In business, if you call in an auditor to audit the books of a company you do not say to him, "I just want you to look at that and that" and tell him what you want him to do. You do not lay before him a list of things you want him to do. You say, "There are the books. Audit them and bring to our attention anything that is not correct, any place where there has been non-productive spending, and show us what we can do to improve the operation of our business." So it should be with the business of the federal government.

• (3:10 p.m.)

I am sure that other hon. members wish to say some words on this subject. This has been a good opportunity for the House to comment on the operations of the Public Accounts Committee. I close by saying, as I did at the beginning, that I am pleased the government acted so quickly in calling the motion to refer this matter to the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, this debate has ranged over a very wide area,

[Mr. Hales.]

and I wish to make it clear that I do not intend to touch on all the aspects of the matter that have been discussed by those who have preceded me. As a matter of fact, I rise to deal with one particular point about which I feel rather strongly; but I admit that before I get to that main point there is one temptation that I really cannot resist. The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), when talking about committees and how much they cost, referred to the fact that two of the committees of the other place had expenses during the last session, or at least over whatever period he was quoting, totalling $1 million. Four hundred and ninety-seven thousand dollars were spent on the Committee on Poverty. Some poverty! Also, $515,000 was spent on the Committee on Mass Media. If you add to that $442,000 for the Committee on Banking and Commerce, and $435,000 for the Committee on Science Policy, you are reaching a figure of almost $2 million.

Since suggestions are being made about steps that should be taken to save money, there is one obvious suggestion which I thought the hon. member for Peace River would make, namely, abolish the Senate. There is no use beating around the bush; let us deal with these things directly.

Mr. Woolliams: The last NDP member who said that went to the Senate.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): You should be with some of your own up there, Stanley.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The hon. member is asking about some of my friends up there. All their lives they have been in favour of abolishing the Senate, and I trust they still are. After they have been there a while they will probably be even more in favour of doing so.

The main point I want to discuss is what I regard as the increasing importance that attaches to the work of the Public Accounts Committee. The thoughts which I have in mind I have already expressed in other ways and on previous occasions. Let me say that in my view we have not yet solved the problem of parliamentary control over government expenditures before they are made. We used to have the committee of supply. One hundred years ago Members of Parliament thought that through the committee of supply they did control the public purse, and perchance they were right. In recent decades that has not been true. As a matter of fact, we have more or less recognized that fact by abolishing the committee of supply and we now send all the estimates to various Standing Committees.

I think that most of the committees do a very good job and in some respects I think their work has been improved. However, it would be a wild and foolish Member of Parliament who would assert that the committees that examine estimates are scrutinizing public spending as the public feels it should be done. We just have not been doing the job and we have not solved the problem of how to do it. In fact, it is the one aspect of

the massive rules changes that we have made in the last two or three years which I think is still unfinished business.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want what I am going to say now to imply that we should let that go by the board. I think we should still find some way, in advance of the spending of money, for Parliament to check on it. But until we do find the way it becomes all the more important that we have this *ex post facto* check by the Public Accounts Committee. Sometimes it is argued that it is too late, that the money has been spent. The fact of the matter is that turning the searchlight on illegal or extravagant expenditures does have a salutary effect. I think that function must be stepped up, and I agree with the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Hales) that the staff and assistance to the Public Accounts Committee ought to be increased.

There is something else we ought to consider, Mr. Speaker. Often we are told that the Auditor General does more than just give a report after the fiscal year is over, more than just lay it before us on the basis of what happened after the event is all over, but that he does a running audit right throughout the year. We are frequently told that he finds many things that need to be corrected and which are corrected right on the spot. It has also been suggested that sometimes he finds things that he thinks are wrong and has arguments with those in charge of the various departments. He may or may not win the arguments.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we might step up the process by which the Public Accounts Committee gets at these matters by making provision for the Auditor General to appear before the Public Accounts Committee on a current basis and to report to that committee some of the difficulties he is encountering. I adopt the language of the hon. member for Wellington when he said that the Public Accounts Committee is the Auditor General's right-hand man. I think it is true that you have a good Auditor General if you have a good Public Accounts Committee, and vice versa.

I strongly urge that we give some thought to this matter. Let us face the fact that what we used to do in committee of supply is not being done. Let us face the fact that the only effective check on expenditures before they are made is that which is made by the Treasury Board before we ever see the blue book of estimates. I am not satisfied with that, but such is the situation. That being the situation, I think that the kind of checking done by the Public Accounts Committee has to be stepped up. There has to be more of it, and there will have to be arrangements such as I have just suggested by which the Auditor General could report to the Public Accounts Committee on a current basis.

I am repeating myself, Mr. Speaker, but let me put it this way. Precisely because we do not have the kind of parliamentary control over the purse-strings that we think we have, or at least think we ought to have, the work of the Public Accounts Committee becomes all the more important. I am glad that we have this institution of an opposition member being appointed chairman of that committee. I certainly support those who express the view that the committee has been doing better work in the last decade than used to be the case. Let us strengthen it in every way we can, because it is pretty important in this massive expenditure operation that is modern government that there be a reasonable check on that expenditure by those of us who represent the people of Canada.

Mr. Mac T. McCutcheon (Lambton-Kent): Mr. Speaker, I shall not delay the business of the House very long but I have one or two thoughts which I should like to put on the record. For many years I have been particularly concerned about the escalating costs of our committees.

• (3:20 p.m.)

As I see the responsibilities of members of this House, they fall into two main categories. The first, I suppose, is to speak up and to be heard in the presentation and passage of legislation. The second—I am not at all sure that I have these in the proper order—is that I think the people who elected me to represent them here consider that one of the duties of a member is to scrutinize government expenditures. I think that if we do not wholeheartedly carry out that part of our function, we are indeed derelict in our duty.

I should like at the outset to congratulate the members of the Public Accounts Committee. I was a member of that committee for part of the previous session and am quite familiar with its work. Its members were a pretty level-headed group of individuals. Their chairman acted in an excellent manner. In that regard I am referring to the cost of operating the committee. It is one of the few committees of this House that travelled far afield. It travelled to Halifax to look at the famous *Bonaventure,* and incurred minimum costs on the trip.

I was delighted to hear the Parliamentary Secretary expound on the benefits of the committee system. I agree with him, up to a certain point. Examination in detail, as he suggested is good; who can deny that? Here I am thinking of another committee of which I was a member last year, the Committee on miscellaneous estimates. That, too, was very well chaired and conducted a good deal of examination, although I am afraid it did so superficially. According to a report in the Toronto *Telegram* of last week that committee passed expenses of $2 million. When the matter came before this House only one voice spoke about it, that being mine. What I resent and take exception to is that—the previous speaker alluded to this matter—before you get a chance to look at these expenditures, the matter is *fait accompli:* the money is spent; it is gone.

The previous speaker mentioned the $1 million spent by the Committee on Poverty and the Committee on Mass Media.

What concerns me deeply is that the Committee on the Constitution, I am told, spent $32,000 on a trip to Manitoba. It has advertised 34 more forays that it will make. Mr. Speaker, they moved into the city of Halifax a short

while ago, 16 strong I am told, with a supporting cast of 16 translators, reporters and what-have-you. They listened to briefs presented in that fair city. Seven people attended the hearing, including the janitor. Two briefs were presented to them by two junior students of a college. The professor who coached them in their presentation did not think it was worth his while showing up. This sort of thing must stop.

On October 23 I directed the following question to the government House Leader, as reported at page 516 of *Hansard:*

> In order that the House may have better control of its activities and expenses, will the Government House Leader bring in a motion referring to the Committee on Procedure and Organization for report the need of all committees of the House to file a complete report of the expenses incurred—

The House Leader replied:

> This subject was touched upon in our debate on the establishment of the Constitutional Committee and I believe there was general agreement that we should look at this question. How we do it is a matter that I will be happy to consider.

In view of the minister's remark, "How we do it is a matter that I will be happy to consider", I wish to make a suggestion to him. Instead of sending this matter back to the Committee on Procedure, we ought to send it to the Public Accounts Committee. I have great confidence in that committee. It seems to me that there would be better ventilation of the whole affair in the Public Accounts Committee as opposed to the other committee. I say that with all respect for the Committee on Procedure, which is also a very good one.

In his remarks the Parliamentary Secretary commented on attendance at committees. I agree that in some instances the attendance at committees is not good. I have been a fairly regular attender of committee meetings. I resent going to committee meetings, participating in the examination of all matters coming before the committee and then finding, on the day of the vote, that the government has picked up a roving squad and brought it in to vote. The votes are all rubber-stamped and passed through in a very few minutes.

An hon. Member: That is terrible.

Mr. Woolliams: Often they cannot get a quorum.

Mr. McCutcheon: One other thing bothers me. Considering the way the government arranges committee meetings and all the duplications that exist, if our committees are to be properly manned with an average attendance of, say, 18 or 20 members, we will face a deficit, so to speak, of 15 members who are required to constitute a quorum in this House. We will not be able to open proceedings in the House of Commons because all our members will be engaged in committee work.

An hon. Member: That is right.

Mr. McCutcheon: Having said that, I will not delay these proceedings any longer. I suggest that perhaps the Public Accounts Committee is the committee through which a proper answer to my question of October 23 could be given.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) wants to make a statement on Bill C-174, so I shall be brief in order that he will have time for his remarks. I wish to deal with two points. I listened to the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Jerome), and I think he overlooked one thing. There is a difference between the functions of the members who sit behind the executive, the government, and the functions of those who sit in the opposition. We have to scrutinize matters in this chamber.

There are only 72 members in my party and we are always in attendance. The other parties can speak for themselves. I realize this is not a new problem. I realize that the government must keep its members busy and so it has allocated them to various committees. I am not a member merely of one committee. I am chairman of the justice caucus of our party and put a great deal of effort into that committee. I appreciate the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Jerome) saying that I attend committees. I do attend committees. But there are times when one has to be in the House. Hon. members must receive more co-operation. For instance, there are times when the Justice Committee is meeting and I have to be in the chamber on another matter.

• (3:30 p.m.)

On one occasion, I believe it was on the expropriation bill, I asked that the matter be allowed to stand because I was presenting to this House during private members' hour a bill to amend the Criminal Code in connection with persons aged seven or older who might have committed a crime under the Code. I read in the newspaper that although I had been very active in the Justice Committee that afternoon, I was not present when the vote was taken with reference to the particular proposal I had opposed so strenuously. What I am saying is that you cannot be in two places at once.

I do not want to dig back into old history, but I remember Mr. Pickersgill, Mr. Pearson and Mr. Chevrier. When we had 208 members, forming a powerful government, they would not under any circumstances allow a committee to sit while the House was sitting. They realized, and I appreciated their position, that their job was to scrutinize the government's actions very carefully, to attempt, as we did yesterday, to secure amendments to certain legislation. It is very easy for the executive to present the bills. The executive sends its members to the committee.

Here is another thing I do not like about committees. I hear committees chairmen—this was particularly true of the Finance Committee—saying, "You are each going to have three minutes to speak." Isn't that a wonderful thought? If you were defending an accused in a courtroom and the judge said you had three minutes to cross-examine a witness you might barely get started on

it. It was a wonderful statesman's speech by the hon. member. These fellows grow to be statesmen. The more power they get, the more statesmanlike they become. This is the symptom of some appointment, some recognition.

We have to deal with this problem. The practical function that I have noticed—I do not mean the idealistic or the academic approach—of government members, basically, is that the chairman will say, "Here is a bill, and we are going to put it through in its present form." The minister hands out a little amendment to make it look as though we are intelligent. We think we are making amendments and changes and say, "This is a wonderful thing; this committee business is so refreshing." Well, gentlemen, let us not fool ourselves. When I am in a committee I do not want the chairman to say to me, while I am dealing with the question of capital gains—as we were in the Finance Committee—that I have two minutes. A number of people who have not done any studying whatsoever also have two minutes, and they are sweeping everything under the carpet while I am trying to get the facts on top of the table.

My job is not to praise the government: I leave that to others; there are enough backbenchers to do that. They all do it very well. My job and my function as long as I sit here—I hope to move over to the government side one of these days, and when hon. members over there now have my function I will listen to them—is to scrutinize very carefully, oppose if I think necessary, and suggest positive changes. So when I hear somebody get up and speak with those ideals, fold their arms and look to the sky and say that committees are non-partisan, I know that is tommyrot. The chairmen are picked; they are chosen by the men in power, the executive. They know when they go in there who is going to be chairman. I can name them before they are appointed. That is the way the committee system has been working.

There is merit to the new rules in some ways. There is merit attached to the committees in the United States. There is some merit attached to all systems and something to be learned from them all. I think the New Democratic Party should have some committee chairmanships. The Conservative party should have the chairmanship of some committees. The Créditistes should have some committee chairmanships. Then we will know that they are not partisan.

When we talk about all the amendments that are accepted, I know what these amendments turn out to be, even in our committee which works pretty well because most of us belong to the same profession. When you get a group of people from the same profession they have a sort of affection for each other aside from their political affiliations; we do work pretty well together. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that if I had my way in this party, totally, and if I ran into the kind of thing I am talking about day after day, I would boycott the committees.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: I will tell you why that is not done. The press says, "Oh, it's bad; the Conservatives won't go to the committees." I never came to Parliament and, like many other hon. members, gave up my private life just to play games. And that is what is going on. The hon. member says these committees are functioning. If that is the case, let us be honest and make them function.

There is another problem. I really appreciated the action of Mr. Speaker the other day, because he showed what a gentleman he always is in the position he holds. I moved an amendment in the committee, a serious amendment affecting the ability of a citizen to choose whether to go to the court of the Minister of Justice, the federal court, or to a provincial court. However, I do not intend to get into that argument. The committee split on the question. But that amendment was ruled out of order when I desired to move it at the report stage of the bill. I am not breaking any confidences. I said to the Speaker, "If we had had one more person there, instead of having to spread ourselves in the committees so thinly, I might have won the vote in the committee, and I am sure Your Honour would not then have ruled the motion out of order."

That is why Mr. Speaker was so gracious on the argument, and I am not saying he would not be gracious anyway. The Minister of Justice was fair enough to say, "You can have your day in court, anyhow, in the House of Commons." What I am saying is that this only emphasizes the fact that committees are a farce. Until we get independent chairmen and show real independence in the committees, they will function in the way they should.

Now I am going to say something about that travelling circus, as I call it. I know something about the travelling circus I am going to talk about, namely, the Constitutional Committee which at one time I attended and which now I am not attending. That committee is crossing this country for one reason—not for the sake of participatory democracy at all, because you heard what happened in one city, but to build up a political image and aura for the Liberal party.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: The constitution is too important a subject to be playing politics with, and I say that if the people of Canada knew how much money was being spent on travelling, and knew what is going on, they would protest. I know of another case where a group of government officials practically went around the world in a jet. I want to know what that cost. They talk about members' salaries. Why, that is peanuts compared with the money being spent today in committees for a lot of nonsense, particularly the travelling circus, the Constitutional Committee. I am serious when it comes to that. I am going to place some questions on the Order Paper. What are these committees costing? Why are these trips being planned? I supposed the reason is that some of them did not get their expected parliamentary secretary appointments. I saw one member jump. He got his appointment. I am glad to see him promoted, because the hon. member has been more silent, since, more statesmanlike.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Woolliams: This travelling is sort of a pay-off. It is not something new which was thought up even by the Trudeau government.

Mr. Perrault: Shame!

Mr. Woolliams: An hon. member says, "shame". Everybody is afraid of the truth. It is a shame the hon. member will not accept the truth. That is what is going on. When they cut out that nonsense, people on all sides of the House will attend committees—because, I repeat, I did not come here to play games.

• (3:40 p.m.)

With regard to expenditure and public accounts, I hope that serious thought will be given to the suggestion that the opposition be given the right to choose the estimates of three or four departments for discussion in the House for a few days. I am prepared to give up my Saturdays if there is any question of saving time. This will enable the estimates to be scrutinized by a committee of the whole House. I am not being disrespectful to the press because they have the same trouble as members; there are so many committees sitting that the press has to run around and try to find out what is going on. The only reason this place exists is so that the people are able to be given the facts. This is why the opposition must have a voice in the matter of bringing estimates before the House.

With those thoughts I will sit down, because I want to hear the Minister of Justice speak to his bill. I hope I never again hear a Parliamentary Secretary, one of these new appointees, give us the kind of professorial, idealistic lecture that we heard today. Some of us have been around here long enough to know that that sort of thing is a bunch of nonsense.

An hon. Member: Too long.

Mr. Woolliams: Maybe I have been here too long, but I will let the people of Calgary North decide that.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

TAX REVIEW BOARD BILL

ESTABLISHMENT, DUTIES, APPEALS, ORGANIZATION, ETC.

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice) moved that Bill C-174, to establish the tax review board and to make certain amendments to other facts in relation thereto, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I do not have too much time this afternoon, but I am delighted to have the opportunity of introducing a bill that represents the first major overhaul of the legislation relating to the review of income tax and estate tax assessments by an administrative tribunal since the Tax Appeal Board was created in 1946.

Persons who are dissatisfied with the tax that a minister of national revenue has assessed against them under the provisions of the Income Tax Act or the Estate Tax Act at present have the right of having the dispute heard either by the Tax Appeal Board or the Exchequer Court of Canada. Since its creation in 1946, the present board has fulfilled a valuable and needed function. Many taxpayers have availed themselves of the right to go before the board in the first instance rather than to exercise their option to appear before the Exchequer Court. Experience has now shown, I think, that changes should be made to improve and to render more efficient the services performed by the board.

The Royal Commission on Taxation, under the chairmanship of the late Kenneth Carter, had as one of its recommendations the creation of a tax court with an appeal to a panel of three judges of the Exchequer Court. It was contemplated that the present Tax Appeal Board would be absorbed into the tax court. Those members interested should refer to pages 165 and 166 of volume 5 of the Carter report. If that recommendation were not acceptable, and the Tax Appeal Board were retained the Carter report recommended as an alternative the removing from it of the close association that it has with the Department of National Revenue, bringing it within the reporting authority of the Department of Justice. Its members should have the title, distinction and tenure of judges. It should have sole, original jurisdiction in all tax appeals, and provision should be made for discovery and production of documents. Again, members interested should refer to pages 164 and 165 of volume 5 of the Carter report.

The government and the House of Commons, by giving third reading to the federal court bill last night have adopted the primary recommendation of the Carter report that there should be a tax court, which in this case will be the trial branch of the new federal court. There will also be an appeal on the record to an appellate court, which will be the Court of Appeal for Canada. In that sense we have fulfilled that recommendation of the Carter commission.

After careful scrutiny of the work that is now being performed by the Tax Appeal Board, the government came to the conclusion that it would not be in the public interest that the board should be absorbed into the new federal court. It is our view that no good grounds can be advanced which would justify stripping the taxpayer of the existing privilege of appealing assessments either to an administrative tribunal like the Tax Appeal Board, with easy access, a minimum of complicated procedure and no power to award costs in the event that the appeal was not successful or, if the taxpayer so wished, to a court of law, the Exchequer Court or the new trial division of the federal court.

There are many cases—I think hon. members will subscribe to what I say—where what is needed is an impartial tribunal which will, in an expeditious and inexpen-

sive manner, hear and adjudicate complaints which citizens, particularly citizens of modest means, have in respect of challenging assessments made against them. In such cases, a court of law, with its formal procedure for the discovery of documents, for settlement and adjudication of issues of fact and law, would unduly hamper and hinder the individual of modest means in obtaining a judgment at low cost, an impartial review with a minimum of procedural difficulty.

In this day and age of increasing bigness, remoteness and impersonality of government, it behooves the House of Commons, I believe, to take steps to see that not only is justice done but that to the public it appears to be done. One of the most significant changes introduced by the legislation now before the House which reconstitutes the Tax Appeal Board as a tax review board is that in future all persons who are appointed as members will hold office, as do judges, during good behaviour until they attain the age of 70 years. Under the existing legislation, members of the Tax Appeal Board can be appointed for a term of 10 years only. As pointed out in the Carter commission report, insecurity of tenure was one of the obstacles to the recruitment of members for the board.

Moreover, the appointment of members to hold office until 70 years of age will, in effect, provide the board with a greater degree of independence than in the present case where members hold office for ten years only, subject to reappointment. I submit that the bill will strengthen the independence of the tribunal because it will come under the general responsibility of the Minister of Justice and will not report to the Minister of National Revenue, as has heretofore been the case. These provisions reflect the recommendations made by the Carter commission.

In other words, having a board composed of members appointed for a limited term and reporting to the Minister of National Revenue, who happens to be one of the two parties to every suit, has given some people the idea that the board is not as impartial as it should be. I am not saying that the judgments handed down have not been reasonable judgments arrived at by reasonable human beings trying to do their best. But when members are subject to reappointment by the Minister of National Revenue and have a limited term of office, and one of the parties before the board is the person who represents the people of Canada and who appoints or may reappoint the member, I think there is the feeling that the board does not enjoy the independence it should enjoy.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the new legislation specifies that the chairman and the assistant chairman must be members of a provincial bar or judges and that one or the other must have practiced law in the province of Quebec or must have been a judge of the Superior Court of Quebec. This last provision is meant to ensure at all times the presence of a chairman or of an assistant chairman who is fully conversant with the Civil Code of the Province of Quebec. This is a major aspect of the legislation, particularly when dealing with appeals about succession duties where the case at issue depends on the understanding of the rights and obligations prescribed in a will or other document whose interpretation is governed by a relevant provincial statute.

• (3:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

One of the major purposes of the bill is to provide the ordinary taxpayer with a tribunal that combines accessibility, informality and effectiveness. In other words, it must be what it was originally meant to be in 1946, a taxpayer's court. The bill also provides that no special form of petition or pleading will be necessary to institute a review or an appeal from an assessment, and that the board is not to be bound by any legal or technical rules of evidence. The board is directed by the legislation to see that all appeals are dealt with as informally and expeditiously as the circumstances and considerations of fairness will permit.

Over the past few years—and the board has been in existence for almost 25 years—there necessarily has been built up a series of precedents, procedures and rules that have tended to make the board more formal and a little more cumbersome than it was originally intended to be. What I would like to do is strip it down again to what it was originally meant to be, namely, an informal board operating in an informal atmosphere where the taxpayer is able to come in—he does not need a lawyer, he can come in with a neighbour or a chartered accountant, representing himself or having anybody's help—to explain his case to the board in an informal way.

In the past, criticism has been made that if a taxpayer won before the Tax Appeal Board, the Minister of National Revenue, if the case involved a matter of interpretation so far as the law was concerned, or an important case that might create a precedent affecting numerous taxpayers, would appeal to the Exchequer Court. In the event the minister were successful in the appeal to the Exchequer Court, the taxpayer would normally be obliged to pay the costs that were awarded against him before the Exchequer Court.

I have felt for a long time that this created an unnecessary hardship on Canadian taxpayers and discouraged many people from taking an appeal before the appeal board. As a matter of fact, I can say there have been times when I was in private practice that I suspected the Department of National Revenue—and I think they will deny this—used the Tax Appeal Board as a method for hearing the taxpayer's case on discovery, that is to say, getting the basis of the taxpayer's case, and if they lost they would go to appeal and would have all the evidence they needed on which to build up their own case. I am not sure I could document this, but I have that suspicion.

I want to ensure that the Tax Appeal Board, or the new tax review board, cannot be used just as a preliminary step for the Department of National Revenue as a way of getting the taxpayer's case on the record. The proposed tax review board bill now before the House

contains a provision for the modification of the Income Tax Act to provide that in any case where the Minister of National Revenue appeals a decision of the board to the court, and the amount of tax involved in the controversy does not exceed $1,000, the court is required, in delivering its judgment, to provide that the minister is to pay all reasonable and proper costs of the taxpayer in connection with the appeal to the court whether the taxpayer wins or loses. In other words, a taxpayer on an appeal in a matter involving less than $1,000 of tax assessed would have his appeal at the expense of the Crown, if he won in the first place.

Those are the broad areas of concern represented in the bill. I think it has to be read in conjunction with the federal court bill which passed this House last night on third reading, thanks to the courtesy of my friends on the opposite side. If the other place so provides, we will have a new federal court which will also be a court of first instance on tax matters. The taxpayer will have, and will continue to have under this bill, an alternative way of appealing tax assessments against him; an alternative way that will be less cumbersome than a court, less expensive and more informal and he will not need a lawyer.

We believe the taxpayer will be encouraged by the informal atmosphere and the opportunity to lay his case before an impartial tribunal rather than a group of men who are appointed for limited terms, appointed by the minister who happens to be one of the parties to the action. This board would be made up of men or women who may be lawyers, chartered accountants or from other disciplines. The president and the vice-president have to be lawyers, but the others need not. A taxpayer will have the chance to put his case before the board and he will have the right, of course, if he loses, to appeal to the federal court. On the other hand, if the minister appeals the case and the action involves less than $1,000, the taxpayer will not be penalized for having exercised this informal option.

I thank the House for this courtesy, and I thank particularly hon. members opposite who may have wanted to talk at great length on the matter that preceded this item. I am very grateful that I was given the opportunity of introducing the government's case on this bill.

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing the House that the Senate has passed Bill S-2, an act respecting statistics of Canada, to which the concurrence of this House is desired.

It being four o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, public bills.

[Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton).]

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

MATERNITY LEAVE ACT

EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN IN FEDERAL JURISDICTION BEFORE AND AFTER CHILDBIRTH

On the order:

Second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration of Bill C-6, an act respecting the employment of women in federal jurisdiction before and after childbirth—Mrs. MacInnis.

Mr. Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the Parliamentary Secretary rising on a point of order?

Mr. Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, we had the pleasure the other night, in connection with Bill C-3, to hear rather lengthy arguments about requirements for recommendations to the Governor General in respect of bills requiring the expenditure of public moneys.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I perceive that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Mahoney), who will correct me if I am wrong, is attempting on his point of order to refer to the procedural correctness of the bill. If the House would permit me, I would remind hon. members that on October 26 Mr. Speaker reminded members of the requirements of our Standing Orders, particularly Standing Order 62, that private members' public bills should not impose taxes without the authorization of His Excellency, which, of course, is not available in such cases. It seems to me—and His Honour mentioned this matter in his remarks—that the bill now before the House does infringe that Standing Order.

I should like to hear argument on the procedural point only, and I would ask hon. members to confine themselves to that point. If, after hearing argument, it is my opinion that the bill is in order, of course the Chair will hear substantive arguments. Having said this, I think it might be in order first for the sponsor of the bill to proceed with whatever procedural arguments the hon. lady would like to make.

• (4:00 p.m.)

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, before you give your final ruling I should like to draw attention to some features of this bill. This is the third session in which it has been on the Order Paper. There has been tremendous interest in the subject matter of the bill. This is one way in which the matter could be brought before the House for discussion. I wish to draw attention to the fact that the bill is entitled "An act respecting the employment of women in federal jurisdiction before and after childbirth".

The purpose of the bill is to provide maternity leave for women employed in any work, undertaking or busi-

ness within the legislative authority of the Parliament of Canada. Its provisions are in line with those of the Maternity Protection Convention of the International Labour organization, passed in 1919 and revised in 1952. I would point out that this legislation is of very great concern to women's organizations across this country, not only locally but nationally.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I had cautioned hon. members—I hope the hon. member who is sponsoring this bill, and others, will follow my admonition—that I hoped we would at this point hear arguments on the procedural aspect. I suggest, with respect, that the hon. member has moved away from that topic.

Mrs. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to point out that the principle of this bill has to do with the protection of women before and after childbirth, and that its provisions are much more elastic and far reaching than any provision we have had so far in federal legislation even within the public service. There are very new and important points covered in this legislation. We are urging, not only that there be maternity leave for women, with two-thirds of their previous earnings, during this time but that their jobs should be held open for them and that there be no infringement of their seniority rights.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. With great respect, I suggest that the hon. member is explaining the bill to the House. It is a very important and interesting bill. However, I had hoped I had been precise in directing the attention of hon. members to this point, that what concerned His Honour and what concerns myself relates to clause 6 of the bill and how it can be reconciled with Standing Order 62(1). I shall read this Standing Order so that hon. members will have it in their minds when they address themselves to this point:

> 62(1) This House shall not adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address or bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue, or of any tax or impost, to any purpose that has not been first recommended to the House by a message from the Governor General in the session in which such vote, resolution, address or bill is proposed.

Hon. members are aware that in this case there is no such recommendation. It would seem to be clear that clause 6 of the bill would create a tax or impost if the bill were enacted. I would ask the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) to confine her remarks to that rather narrow procedural point at this time.

Mrs. MacInnis: Your Honour, I understand the procedural point. I wonder whether it would be proper for Your Honour to allow me to leave out clause 6 entirely, because I believe hon. members would be very pleased to discuss the other provisions of the bill. The bill can stand by itself perfectly well with the deletion of clause 6. I wonder whether this would be possible.

An hon. Member: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If the hon. member is making a suggestion, which may very well be a reasonable one, she might like to address herself to that matter, or if she has concluded her remarks perhaps other hon. members would like to address themselves to this point before the Chair makes a decision.

Mrs. MacInnis: Mr. Speaker, I should like to suggest to hon. members that it seems to me this bill could stand very well without clause 6, because I understand there is other, prospective legislation in respect of the expenses involved. Consequently, this bill could stand very well without the financial clause in it. I wonder whether Your Honour would consider permitting the deletion of clause 6.

Mr. Mahoney: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think there would be a disposition to agree with the hon. member. However, I believe the procedure should be that the bill be allowed to stand and that the hon. member submit a motion to alter it. It might be dealt with in that way.

Mrs. MacInnis: I would be very glad to do that, Your Honour, with your permission.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It would seem that there is disposition to do this. I believe it would be necessary to have the consent of all hon. members. If there is a disposition to do this by unanimous consent, it would seem to be in order.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, I believe motions are dealt with on another day in such a situation.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The Chair is a little confused at this point. I wish to make sure that hon. members are *ad idem* on this matter. I understand the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway to suggest that there might be unanimous consent that clause 6 be deleted from the bill and that the bill be considered in its new form. I understand, probably incorrectly, that the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Mahoney) has suggested that this subject matter, with clause 6 deleted, should be reintroduced in the form of a new motion. I do not know whether I correctly understood the Parliamentary Secretary.

Mr. Francis: Mr. Speaker, at the present time there is before us a motion for second reading of a bill. In replying to the point of order raised, the hon. member sponsoring the bill has indicated that she is prepared to make an amendment to bring it within the rules. It would seem that the proper procedure would be that with the consent of the House the bill could be brought before us in amended form. I suggest that this should be done by way of a formal motion, and that it cannot be done in the form of verbal comment. The procedure in respect of amending a bill is much more formal than a member simply rising in this chamber and requesting an amendment.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, without becoming involved in the argument, I wonder

whether we might reach an agreement along the lines now suggested by the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis). May I ask if this could be done: Could there be an understanding that the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) would reintroduce the bill with clause 6 omitted and that it would take the position on the order paper that it now has? In other words, this would mean that the hon. member could proceed with this bill on the next day on which public bills come before the House. The hon. member probably wishes to proceed today, but I see difficulties and complications. This might be a compromise on which we could reach agreement.

Mr. Francis: That is precisely the suggestion I was making. I think there has to be a formal procedure for amending the bill now before the House. For my part, I am prepared to say that this bill should retain its place on the list and come up for discussion at the appropriate time.

Mr. Perrault: Mr. Speaker, the subject of this bill is of great concern to all members of the House. We are concerned about the subject of maternity benefits, and I for one would welcome a procedure which would enable the House to discuss the provisions of this bill at the earliest possible opportunity. I think we should attempt to remove any impediments which might exist so that the bill might be introduced in the House. I would be very content if this could be done. In other words, if the hon. member would bring in an amendment, I suggest that the bill be allowed to maintain its position at the head of the list of private members' public bills so that at the next opportunity to discuss these bills we could go ahead with it.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: If this is agreed, the matter will stand and the hon. member will have the opportunity to reintroduce the bill in such form as she feels would be acceptable under the rules. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

CANADIAN COMMERCIAL CORPORATION ACT

MEASURE TO ALLOW MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN DELIBERATIONS OF CROWN AGENCIES

On the order:

Second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections of Bill C-7, an act to amend the Canadian Commercial Corporation Act—Mr. Stewart (Cochrane).

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Before the hon. member addresses himself to the matter before the House I would enter the same reservation as I did with respect to the bill we have just dealt with, sponsored by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis). The bill sponsored by the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart) may be somewhat more sophisticated in respect of the provisions of Standing Order 62; in other words, I do not think it is quite as obvious. But I am prepared to hear argument from the hon. member sponsoring the bill and from all hon. members who would like to address themselves to the point.

It seems to me that the bill will have the effect of creating a charge or impost on the public treasury, and of course the recommendation required is not available. Therefore, I would ask that until I have had an opportunity to hear those members who would like to address themselves to the procedural aspect, the hon. member confine his initial remarks at least to that particular point.

Mr. Stewart (Cochrane): I shall speak only on the procedural aspect, Mr. Speaker. I am a little surprised that this question is raised at this time, because if anything has been said in latter days regarding private members' bills, or public bills as they are called, certainly one criticism levelled at me was not that it was not procedurally correct.

So far as any charge to the treasury is concerned, of course that is completely out of the question, as is obvious in the bill. It says in very plain terms: "One of the members other than the president may be a Member of Parliament". It does not purport to add another member to the board, and in that case add any expense to the treasury in the event he would have to be displaced from one place to the other and have his expenses paid. Therefore, that Member of Parliament would simply be replacing any other member who may be appointed to the board of directors. So as far as the procedural aspect is concerned, frankly I am at a loss to understand why this question should have been raised.

Mr. Francis: Mr. Speaker, having looked at this bill, it seems to me that there are two possible points that can be raised in regard to it. The first is whether an additional charge is placed on the treasury by the terms of the bill. I have heard the explanation of the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart), who argues that the bill merely seeks to say that within the terms in which any Crown corporation would name its board of directors, one of them would be a Member of Parliament. There would be no increase in the total remuneration paid by that corporation and there would be no additional charge on public funds. In that respect it seems to me that this bill is beyond question within the terms of private members' bills which are permitted to be considered by the House.

The second question which should be raised is the possible conflict between the Senate and House of Commons Act. As members of the House are perfectly aware, that act prohibits members of the House from accepting remuneration in right of the Crown in any other employment or in other terms. These are broad and sweeping terms indeed. The question that has to be decided by hon. members is whether the terms of the bill as it is drafted would in fact resolve any possible conflict with the other piece of legislation.

It seems to me that the hon. member has attempted to anticipate this difficulty by stating in the clause "he shall be eligible for remuneration and expenses and shall not, by reason of his being the holder of the office or place in respect of which such remuneration and expenses are payable, be rendered incapable of being elected, or of sitting or voting, as a member of the House of Commons". These are the penalties prescribed by the Senate and House of Commons Act for an infraction of this section.

The hon. member has attempted to anticipate any objections that might be raised and to provide immunity from the penalty provided under another statute. It seems to me that the terms of the bill are within the scope of the kind of legislation that can be sponsored by private members of the House.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I was interested in the point made by the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart) when he suggested that this bill should be regarded as in order because the money that would be paid to a Member of Parliament under the bill would not be new money. He argued that it is money that is already provided in a statute, and therefore it is not an additional charge upon the treasury. I am afraid I have to remind him that the rules in this respect do not stop at that point. For example, citation 246(3) of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, which is one of the citations that bear on this point, reads as follows:

> The guiding principle in determining the effect of an amendment upon the financial initiative of the Crown is that the communication, to which the royal demand of recommendation is attached, must be treated as laying down once for all (unless withdrawn and replaced) not only the amount of a charge, but also its objects, purposes, conditions and qualifications. In relation to the standard thereby fixed, an amendment infringes the financial initiative of the Crown, not only if it increases the amount, but also if it extends the objects and purposes, or relaxes the conditions and qualifications expressed in the communication by which the Crown has demanded or recommended a charge.

The rest of the sentence states that this applies to ministers as well as to private members. The hon. member for Cochrane argued that his bill does not involve any new money, but it seems to me that he is in effect seeking to amend two statutes. One is the Canadian Commercial Corporation Act, which has already laid down the conditions under which money is to be spent, and one of those conditions is the paying of expenses of certain identified people. He changes that condition by adding a Member of Parliament as a person who can be one of these people. The other act that he is seeking to amend is the Senate and House of Commons Act, and perhaps some other legislation affecting us, which says that Members of Parliament cannot get money in this way.

I concede the right of Parliament to pass a bill that would alter that condition, but since it is altering the financial situation in respect of Members of Parliament I submit that it would require the royal recommendation. In other words, it seems to me that on two counts this bill offends the principle that I just read from Beauchesne that a proposal infringes the financial initiative of the Crown, not only by increasing the amount of money involved but by extending its objects and purposes or relaxing the conditions and qualifications which have been expressed in a royal recommendation. On these counts it seems to me that the argument that it is not new money must fall to the ground.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the point of view put forward by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) with respect to the argument advanced by the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis) in terms of the bill not seeking to provide an expenditure of additional moneys. I submit that the word "additional" has no place in the consideration of whether the bill is in order in accordance with Standing Order 62(1). Your predecessors, Sir, have always been very precise and careful in interpreting Standing Order 62(1) in its broadest possible sense and, as I recall it, Mr. Speaker—when there has been any indication in a bill regarding the expenditure of what is looked upon as public revenue—has always used that to say that the bill should founder on that point. Standing Order 62 provides:

> This House shall not adopt or pass any vote, resolution, address or bill for the appropriation of any part of the public revenue—

It is not a matter of any additional part, or anything that has not already been committed; this is a bill that seeks to appropriate some part of the public revenue to pay salary and expenses to a Member of Parliament who may sit on the Canadian Commercial Corporation. For my part, I have always felt that there should be a more lax approach taken by Mr. Speaker and the House in this respect, because I think there is far too much rigidity which generally has impinged upon the desires of hon. members to bring ideas forward.

I am very interested in seeing this bill proceed so that we will be able to examine the concept whereby it is suggested that one group of politicians, namely, the government, should have the right to appoint some other politicians to a corporation such as this. There are a number of other bills on the order paper along this line. This principle should be examined with some care and I suggest, Sir, that if you find after argument that the bill does founder and does not meet the test demanded by Standing Order 62(1), perhaps the hon. member could ask the unanimous consent of the House—the House is its own master in this regard—to waive Standing Order 62 in order that the bill may be proceeded with and considered.

I think the proposal in the bill is one that should be carefully examined in full public light in order to see what other manoeuvring might be involved in this system of allowing the government to appointment its friends to particular boards and corporations.

Mr. Stewart (Cochrane): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart) has spoken once. Is there unanimous consent that he be given the opportunity to address further remarks to the Chair?

Mr. Howard (Skeena): With respect, Sir, I do not think he needs unanimous consent.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The hon. member for Cochrane on a point of order.

Mr. Stewart (Cochrane): Mr. Speaker, I do not think the arguments that have been presented regarding the procedural point are at all conclusive. First of all, it is perfectly obvious to everyone that the paragraph that was added to the bill, which will in effect prevent a member from being thrown out of the House of Commons if he should receive expenses for serving on a board, has been added simply to protect an hon. member who is appointed to a board. It is not in there with the intent that any hon. member should qualify for extra remuneration from public funds.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Stewart (Cochrane): The whole idea of adding that paragraph—and it is required—is simply to follow a precedent that was set when, for example, the bill on the International Development Research Centre was passed. This provision was included in that bill, and it was necessary in order to protect any member who at a future time might be appointed to the board. The same paragraph was included in a motion that was presented by the hon. member from Richmond Hill—

An hon. Member: York North.

Mr. Stewart (Cochrane): —who had to be reimbursed for services when he was an executive assistant prior to coming into this House. It was necessary to add this paragraph to protect him so that he would be able to continue to vote and take part in the proceedings of the House of Commons. I think that to base argument on that particular paragraph is a wrong way to proceed, because the object of the bill is simply to place a Member of Parliament on a board of the government, a public board. This is all it purports to do. He would be there as one of the members. There are a number of board members now. He would simply take the place of another member.

There is no question of remuneration other than what already exists in the bill which would go to members of the board. The House of Commons Act is not being contravened in any way, because we have added this particular paragraph which is necessary in these cases. So I submit to Your Honour that there should be no question as to the procedure in this case. There is no transgression of the rules, and I submit we should go ahead and discuss the subject matter of the bill.

Mr. Walker: Mr. Speaker, I may be able to contribute something on this point of order. I think you are on fairly safe ground if Your Honour decides to rule, on the basis of precedent, that the bill submitted is in fact out of order. I might also say that I am basing this argument almost on a reversal of precedent. I would refer you, Sir, and the House to *Hansard* of May 30, 1966, page 5705, when we proved that there is nothing new under the sun. I sponsored a Notice of Motion on this particular subject and at that time there was no discussion in connection with whether or not it came within the rules of the House. In fact, we had an excellent debate on it. However, it was talked out at that time.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Oh, no!

Mr. Walker: Yes, by the other side of the House. But the point I am trying to make is that there is a vehicle already approved by precedent for discussing this very important subject, a subject on which I would tell the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart) that I am in complete agreement in principle. That precedent was established through the way in which my Notice of Motion was handled back in 1966. If this is so, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest you would almost be creating a new rule if you decided that what was done then was not the proper way to deal with this subject matter.

Mr. Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, it is, of course, a comfort to have the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) on one's side in an argument like this and I will not reiterate the points he made. However, I will say that the suggestion of the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard), that unanimous consent might be forthcoming from the House, is not acceptable because this proposal flies directly in the teeth of the principle established in sections 10 and 11 of the Senate and House of Commons Act and I do not feel it is a principle that should be attacked obliquely. I think it should be faced up to directly.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I thank all hon. members for their contribution to the procedural point. I shall take a moment to remind hon. members, and particularly the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart) who is sponsoring the bill, that His Honour on October 20 gave all hon. members notice that he felt that private members' public bills should conform with the rules and practice of this House. Mr. Speaker at that time said that if he had doubts he would ask hon. members to establish the procedural correctness of their bills before permitting them to argue the substantive aspects.

As indicated in my initial remarks, I have very serious reservations with respect to this bill sponsored by the hon. member for Cochrane. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has referred to Beau-

chesne's citation on the interpretation of the relevant Standing Order and the practice of this House. The hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Howard) has pointed out that this practice has been followed rather strictly. I think that should be the case here, particularly in view of the constitutional ramifications of allowing the House to consider a bill which purports to charge the treasury and is sponsored by a private member in the absence of a recommendation from His Excellency the Governor General.

Having said this, I say to the House that because of the remarks of His Honour on October 20, and because of the very good arguments that have been made today, because I still have the greatest reservation about the procedural correctness of the bill I would, if I were going to do so now, rule it out of order. However, I would like the House to permit me to discuss it with His Honour and perhaps the next time this order of business is called, His Honour will be in the chair and my colleague the Deputy Chairman of Committees or myself will have an opportunity to discuss the question with His Honour and make a ruling on the point. Do I have the consent of the House?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Mahoney: Do I understand, Mr. Speaker, that this bill is to retain its place on the order paper?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Yes, it will retain its place and will be called at the time of the next similar order of business.

* * *

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD DAY ACT

RECOGNITION OF CANADA'S FIRST PRIME MINISTER BY OBSERVANCE OF A HOLIDAY

On the order:

Second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs of Bill C-8, an act respecting Sir John A. Macdonald Day—Mr. Macquarrie.

Mr. Baldwin: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if this bill could stand and retain its place so that it would be in the same position as the other bill with which we dealt.

Mr. Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, in view of the progress we have made in this hour, and in view of the unexpected moving along of the order of business, I wonder if we might call it five o'clock.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed that we should call it five o'clock?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) on a point of order.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that, spurred by the opposition, this House has made tremendous progress today, could somebody on the other side please indicate the business for Monday? I presume we will go back to the tax appeal board. But assuming the House makes the same disposition of this matter as it has with the other bills, could some kind soul on the government side indicate what business will follow on Monday, in the way of any change in the order of business as announced by the President of the Privy Council on Thursday? We have already dealt with the business indicated by him.

Mr. Mahoney: No, we have not.

Mr. Béchard: Mr. Speaker, I understand that Bill C-174 will be before the House on Monday, respecting the tax review board.

On motion of Mr. Mahoney the House adjourned at 4.38 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, November 2, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

BUFFALO AND FORT ERIE PUBLIC BRIDGE COMPANY ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING BORROWING POWER AND TERMINATION OF JURISDICTION

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (for the Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-179, respecting the Buffalo and Fort Erie Public Bridge Company.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

CONSUMER PACKAGING AND LABELLING ACT

PROVISIONS RESPECTING PROHIBITIONS, LABELS STANDARDIZATION, INSPECTION, ETC.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-180, respecting the packaging, labelling, sale, importation and advertising of prepackaged and certain other products.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

• (2:10 p.m.)

PUBLIC ORDER (TEMPORARY MEASURES) ACT, 1970

PROVISION OF EMERGENCY POWERS FOR PRESERVATION OF PUBLIC ORDER

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-181, to provide temporary emergency powers for the preservation of public order in Canada.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

IMMIGRATION PROCEDURES FOR PERSONS ENTERING CANADA

Question No. 26—**Mr. Paproski:**

1. Is it the intention of the government to tighten immigration procedures for persons entering Canada as visitors?

2. Do immigration officers currently require identification from all persons seeking to enter Canada?

3. Are persons who are or may become public charges allowed to enter Canada as visitors?

4. Are known or suspected drug users or peddlers, within the meaning of the Criminal Code, permitted to enter Canada as visitors and, if so, what is the reason for such a policy?

5. In what cases are persons prohibited from entering Canada as visitors?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. It is not the intention of the Government to make it more difficult for genuine visitors to come to Canada. An improved internal system is being developed to facilitate early detection and removal, if necessary, of those who overstay their legitimate sojourn in Canada as well as those whose immigration status is in doubt.

2. Yes.

3, 4 and 5. Categories of persons prohibited by law from entering Canada, as immigrants or as visitors, are described in Section 5 of the Immigration Act. These include persons who are public charges or who are likely to become public charges, as well as drug addicts or known or suspected drug peddlers and unlawful users within the meaning of the Narcotic Control Act.

FARM CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS TO INDIAN FARMERS

Question No. 37—**Mr. Gleave:**

Of the 48 Farm Credit Corporation Loans to Indian farmers in Canada (a) how many individuals in each province received such loans (b) what was the amount of each loan to each individual (c) what was the purpose for which each loan was made?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): The Farm Credit Corporation advises that: This question is identical to Question No. 2054, June 16, 1970, which was answered on October 5, 1970.

OLD AGE SECURITY AND GUARANTEED INCOME SUPPLEMENT RECIPIENTS

Question No. 64—**Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):**

1. How many persons in Canada, by provinces, are in receipt of the Old Age Security pension?

2. Of the recipients of the Old Age Security pension, how many persons in Canada, by provinces, are in receipt of the Guaranteed Income Supplement?

3. Of those receiving the Guaranteed Income Supplement, how many persons in Canada, by provinces, are receiving the full amount?

4. What is the average amount, in Canada, and by provinces, being received as a Guaranteed Income Supplement by recipients of the Old Age Security pension?

5. Do the answers to the above questions take into consideration persons living outside of Canada who are in receipt of the

Questions

Old Age Security pension and, if so, how many of such persons are there, and if they are considered as belonging to the various provinces what is the number of each province?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. The following answers are given as of August, 1970:

	Nfld.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	P.Q.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	NWT	Yukon
1.	31,713	12,340	70,854	53,479	401,762	624,977	94,175	92,722	114,557	197,609	808	462
2.	24,938	8,495	42,166	32.093	227,425	252,139	47,777	45,076	57,568	85,490	665	248
3.	19,408	5,394	26,092	21,157	150,077	123,587	25,621	25,344	32,471	46,172	584	203
4.	$29.64	$28.09	$28.96	$28.25	$28.45	$25.01	$27.82	$27.35	$31.53	$26.92	$31.83	$31.18

Average for Canada: $27.41

5. The figures given in 1. above include persons receiving the Old Age Security pension outside of Canada in August 1970. Some of these persons may be out of Canada permanently, others on a temporary basis. They are considered as belonging to the various provinces, with the numbers for each being as follows:

Nfld.	P.E.I.	N.S.	N.B.	P.Q.	Ont.	Man.	Sask.	Alta.	B.C.	NWT	Yukon
86	61	313	279	2,895	5,120	573	502	696	2,889	2	4

Total for Canada: 13,420

The Guaranteed Income Supplement is payable outside of Canada for only six months following departure. No data are available as to the number of pensioners receiving the supplement outside of Canada.

IMMIGRATION APPEALS

Question No. 105—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. How many immigration appeals against deportation are now pending?

2. What action is being taken to alleviate the problem?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): 1. 3,751 as of October 1, 1970.

2. This backlog of appeals pending before the Immigration Appeal Board is largely comprised of people who came here ostensibly as visitors and then applied to remain permanently. Many such applicants are found to be inadmissible as immigrants. When they refuse to leave as requested, it is necessary to order their deportation and the majority of them exercise their right to file appeals with the independent Immigration Appeal Board. The Department and the Board are fully aware of the problems created by this backlog and for some time now have been seeking solutions to them. Mr. Joseph Sedgwick, Q.C. was commissioned to study this matter for the Department and his findings are expected shortly. Numerous remedies have been suggested, including amendments to the Immigration Appeal Board Act itself, as listed in the legislative program of the current session of Parliament.

MANPOWER TRAINING PROGRAM—BRITISH COLUMBIA VOCATIONAL SCHOOL, BURNABY

Question No. 111—**Mrs. MacInnis:**

Does the Department of Manpower and Immigration pay an amount to the British Columbia Department of Education or the British Columbia Department of Labour for each Manpower-sponsored student at the British Columbia Vocational School in Burnaby and, if so, what amount is paid per student?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Yes. The Department pays the province for the actual cost of providing training. The following are estimated costs per training place. Aircraft maintenance, $1,680; Baking, $1,540; Academic upgrading, 10, $1,680; Acedamic upgrading, 12, $700; Building service worker, $140; Cook, general, $1,540; Commercial general, $700; Bookkeeping and accounting, $1,400; Commercial upgrading and advanced options, $1,680; Court reporting, 1,120; Commercial secretarial, $1,400; Drafting, mechanical, $1,400; Drafting, structural, $1,400; Appliance servicing, phase 1, $420; Appliance servicing, phase 2, $700; Electronics technician, $1,400; Meat processing, $1,120; Mechanical maintenance and repairs, $700; Stenotype Operator, $1,400; Welding, general, $1,400; Welding, upgrading, $1,400.

REDESIGNING OF PASSPORTS

Question No. 129—**Mr. Forrestall:**

Can the government indicate what progress has been made on the subject of redesigning such travel documents as the Passport, with a view to utilization of computer techniques particularly in connection with the work being done by ICAO in this field.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Some progress has been made by the ICAO panel established to investigate the feasibility of an improved style of travel document which would incorporate computerized reading techniques. As a panel member, Canada has attended the two meetings that have been held. However, much development work remains to be done. In its deliberations, the panel must take into account such matters as the security and format of the document, materials and production methods, and the costs involved, both to governments and members of the travelling public. The final decision whether such a document is economically feasible will depend on the findings and recommendations of the panel and their ultimate acceptance by ICAO as a recommended standard.

MILITARY ITEMS OR EQUIPMENT SOLD TO PORTUGUESE COLONIES

Question No. 136—**Mr. MacDonald (Egmont):**

1. Since 1960 what military items or equipment has Canada sold to Portugal and by type, at what cost?

2. Since 1960, what military arms or equipment has Canada sold to Angola, Mozambique or Portuguese Guinea?

3. Since 1960, has Canada sold any commodity that could be considered of a military nature, to Angola, Mozambique, Portuguese Guinea or Portugal?

4. To the acknowledge of the government are any Canadian arms or military equipment being used in the persecution of domestic conflicts in Angola, Mozambique or Portuguese Guinea?

5. In particular, are Canadian Sabre Jets being employed in any of these conflicts and, if so, when were these arms or equipment made available to these Portuguese colonies and from what country were they purchased?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See reply to question No. 1,617, answered October 7, 1970.

CURTAILMENT OF PUBLICATIONS DUE TO INCREASED MAILING CHARGES

Question No. 161—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. Does the Post Office Department have any estimate of the number of non-profit quarterlies, journals, magazines, newsletters which have ceased publication on account of increased mailing charges and, if so, what is the estimated number?

2. What is the estimated number of the above-mentioned which have for the same reason been forced to cut down the number of their publications?

3. What is the estimated number of letters and telegrams from groups and individuals received by the Post Office Department concerning increased postal rates for (a) publications (b) first class mail?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister without Portfolio): 1. No.

2. Not known.

3. This information is not readily available. To provide it would necessitate the expenditure of many hundred man hours which cannot be justified.

ADVISABILITY OF COMPULSORY ARBITRATION

Question No. 171—**Mr. Robinson:**

Will the government consider the advisability of providing a law requiring compulsory arbitration in order to avoid unnecessary strikes and the loss to the economy and to wage-earners when such strikes take place?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): In giving consideration to amendments that might be made to the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act, the provision of compulsory arbitration in the law has not received favourable consideration for a number of reasons, one being that, as has been the experience in other countries, it will not prevent strikes and economic losses arising from strikes.

Inquiries of the Ministry

CONTRIBUTIONS TO POLITICAL PARTIES BY CORPORATIONS AND UNIONS

Question No. 172—**Mr. Robinson:**

Will the government consider the advisability of requiring corporations and unions to obtain approval of their shareholders and/or members before making contributions to political parties?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): The Task Force on Labour Relations made some recommendations with respect to trade unions and political action. The government's position on this will be made known when the bill to amend the Industrial Relations and Disputes Investigation Act is brought forward.

NEWSTART PROGRAM—THE PAS, MANITOBA

Question No. 223—**Mr. Simpson:**

1. What is the annual budget for the NewStart Program at The Pas, Manitoba?

2. How many persons are employed under this Program?

3. Has a consultant or consultants been hired by NewStart at The Pas and, if so, what is the name of the consultant or consultants?

4. What are the duties of the position of consultant and what qualifications were required?

5. What remuneration is being paid to the consultant or consultants?

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): 1. The budget of Manitoba NewStart for 1970-71 is $950,000. Budgets for future years will be determined on the basis of the program which is approved annually by the provincial Minister of Education and the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

2. Manitoba NewStart currently employs 51 persons.

3, 4 and 5. Manitoba NewStart is an autonomous corporation and the information requested should be obtained by writing to: Mr. W. C. Thomas, Executive Director, Manitoba NewStart Inc., P.O. Box 5000, The Pas, Manitoba.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

NATIONAL SECURITY

KIDNAPPING AND MURDER OF PIERRE LAPORTE—POLICE SURVEILLANCE OF PAUL ROSE—PUBLICATION OF PICTURE

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Solicitor General whether a prime suspect, Paul Rose, was under police surveillance for perhaps as long as 48 hours between the time of the kidnapping of Mr. Laporte and his murder and that he escaped from police surveillance during that period—perhaps as late as October 16, the day before the War Measures Act was invoked? If so, did the Solicitor

General know that Mr. Rose was under surveillance and did he either approve or express any views about this?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, it is quite true that Mr. Rose was under surveillance after Mr. Laporte was kidnapped and before the War Measures Act was proclaimed.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, was the Solicitor General consulted about Mr. Rose being kept under surveillance rather than arrested at that time?

Mr. McIlraith: He knew of it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Stanfield: After the escape from surveillance of Rose, did the Royal Canadian Mounted Police recommend that his picture be published promptly and was this recommendation not acted on and was this recommendation known to the Solicitor General?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, the reason he was under surveillance and no warrant was issued for him was, of course, what must be obvious, that there was not at that time evidence against him to warrant the issuing of the warrant for his arrest.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Solicitor General whether he would reconsider and answer the question I asked? Did the RCMP recommend publication of Rose's picture and the offence, because I understand Rose's fingerprints were on an FLQ communiqué that had been received? Did the RCMP recommend at that time the publication of his picture and was this known to the Solicitor General?

Mr. McIlraith: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is making assumptions about the details of evidence in this case. I do not propose at this point to give the details of the evidence that was available in connection with the warrant that has subsequently been issued for Mr. Rose. That is a well established practice in the House. I do, however, repeat what I said earlier, that the reason he was not arrested at the time he was under surveillance was that sufficient evidence was not available to permit the issuance of a warrant.

MURDER OF PIERRE LAPORTE, KIDNAPPING OF JAMES CROSS—OFFERING OF REWARD

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): In view of the negative results of the police investigations in both the Laporte and Cross cases so far, has the government now decided to offer a substantial reward for information leading to the arrest and conviction of the criminals involved in either of these two cases inasmuch as rewards have been helpful in solving criminal cases in the past?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): I can only repeat what I sought to convey in earlier answers to the same question, that the matter of a reward is under very close consideration by the two governments at the present time and has been from day to day for some days.

[Mr. Stanfield.]

Mr. Diefenbaker: It takes them a long time to do the obvious.

Mr. Hees: As this matter has now been under consideration for several weeks and as the offering of a reward could prove very useful in solving either or both of these cases, would the minister advise the House what in the world is stopping the government from making this very constructive move?

Mr. McIlraith: It is very simple, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I hesitate to interrupt the minister as I have tried to be as lenient as possible in allowing questions and answers in connection with this matter. It seems to me that the original question asked by the hon. member was quite legitimate although it has been asked before, but his supplementary question is the same argument as has been made before. Perhaps we could hear the argument in response to it from the minister, but that will not advance the situation very much.

Mr. McIlraith: The answer is very simple. It is that the government prefers to take the advice of the police authorities responsible in this case, plus the advice of the responsible legal authorities, rather than the advice of the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings.

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker, that is the usual snide type of remark the Prime Minister makes. Can we not have a sensible answer to a constructive question on a most important matter?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Translation*]

KIDNAPPING OF JAMES CROSS—EFFICIENCY OF POLICE INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a supplementary question.

Considering that more than a month has elapsed since Mr. James Cross was abducted and that the people of Canada are concerned about the delay in capturing the abductors, would the Solicitor General satisfy this House and the Canadian public that the searches are being carried out in a truly efficient way by the various police forces of Canada?

[*English*]

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to give the House the assurance that effective police work is being done by all the responsible authorities in an attempt to solve these cases.

Mr. Woolliams: My question is not a supplementary but it is certainly related. In light of the Prime Minister's statement—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The question would have to be supplementary before the Chair could recognize the hon. member now. The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands would normally be recognized at this time unless there is a supplementary question.

QUEBEC—INFORMATION CONCERNING ALLEGED DISCUSSIONS ON ESTABLISHMENT OF PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): My question is directed to the right hon. Prime Minister. In view of the fact that the Prime Minister has confided to the press that the government has "solid information" regarding alleged discussions for the setting up of a provisional government in Quebec, the said discussions having taken place in that province prior to October 16, is the Prime Minister prepared to take the House into his confidence and give to hon. members the contents of this solid information regarding the incident in question?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the solid information I referred to, when asked by the press if I had any solid information and my answer was yes, is the facts that have been laid before the country by the person who was involved in this, in an editorial last Friday.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): In view of that—

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): As a supplementary question—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I see the difficulty of the hon. member for Calgary North and I will recognize him in a moment. In the meantime I will allow the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands a supplementary question. I will return to the hon. member for Calgary North in due course.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister if, in this solid information which the government has, there is any indication that the discussions regarding the setting up of a provisional government in the province of Quebec contemplated any unconstitutional or illegitimate actions to establish such a government?

Mr. Trudeau: None that I know of, Mr. Speaker, but they were obviously predicated on the fact that a government that had been elected six months before with an overwhelming majority of seats was now, in the mind of this person, so unstable and unlikely to last that he was contemplating a means to replace it.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I ask if this solid information, which the government alleges it has in its possession, was a factor in the government deciding to proclaim the War Measures Act?

Mr. Trudeau: I have answered this all last week, Mr. Speaker, during which time the opposition was busy spreading this rumour; the answer was no and it still is no.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Calgary North.

Inquiries of the Ministry

QUEBEC—ALLEGED PLOT TO ESTABLISH PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT—LAYING OF CHARGES

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, in light of the Prime Minister's statements today and the statements he made on Friday regarding a plot to create a provisional government in Quebec, are charges being laid against any person under the War Measures Act, the sedition sections of the Criminal Code or any other sections of the code in view of the solid information he says he has?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): None that I know, Mr. Speaker, and I would even say I think not. The solid information was the fact that these conversations had taken place. Had I in this House, when asked about these rumours, said I knew nothing about them I would not have been telling the truth. Had I confirmed them I would have been accused of spreading the rumours. Therefore I told the House I did not want to deny or confirm such rumours.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Justice. In view of the facts set out by the Prime Minister in the House today and also on Friday, has any thought been given to laying a charge of criminal conspiracy in respect of illegal discussions and agreements in the conversations the Prime Minister has discussed?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): No Sir.

* * *

BROADCASTING

PROVISION OF SECOND TELEVISION CHANNEL IN SYDNEY, N.S.

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the Secretary of State who reports to the House for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and the Canadian Radio-Television Commission. It is further to previous questions I have posed on the same subject. Has a decision been reached as yet on the provision of a second television service for Cape Breton Island and eastern Nova Scotia? If the minister has not got the information at hand, would he immediately check with the CRTC and the CBC to ascertain what progress is being made and how soon this service will be available to the many taxpayers concerned?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Yes, Mr. Speaker, the matter is still under consideration as part of the CBC's capital expenditure projects. I have followed the matter closely but, for the moment, I would like to take notice of the exact question put by the hon. member in order to give him as soon as possible the very latest information on this matter.

[*English*]

Mr. Muir: I thank the minister for his reply. At the same time would he also investigate the alternative of

providing cable television to the area in question, and report back to the House?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pelletier: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

MEETING OF GOVERNMENT, BUSINESS AND LABOUR ON PRICE RESTRAINTS FOR 1971

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Is the government planning to call in the very near future a meeting of government, business and labour to discuss the matter of price restraints for 1971 in view of the fact that the heads of the principal business organizations in Canada have stated recently that their members will not continue to practise price restraint in 1971 unless organized labour agrees to restrain its demands for increased wages and in view of the fact that in the past two or three days the leaders of organized labour have also stated they have no intention of doing so?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, although I do not accept that the submissions were made in the terms of the hon. member's question, I have already been advised by the chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission that he is still discussing these matters with the people mentioned by the hon. member.

Mr. Hees: Does the minister not consider that time has run out and that these decisions must be made before the end of the year or price restraint will cease to exist?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is now submitting an argument in support of his question and I have to presume that his submission will be taken into consideration by the minister in reaching his decision.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

MONTREAL—ALLEGED EDITING OF NEWS BY MAYOR

Mr. Pierre De Bané (Matane): I want to put a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

I should like to ask the Secretary of State whether he could check the charges brought against the CBC by one of its employees to the effect that the Corporation allows the mayor of Montreal to edit the news, to preview broadcasts before they are normally put on the air and to select the accompanying news clips. Is the minister ready to ask the CBC to find out whether these charges are justified?

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Muir.]

[*English*]

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS RESPECTING NEWS PROGRAMS

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): I have a question for the Secretary of State, Mr. Speaker, also involving the CBC. Have any special instructions been given to the CBC or Radio-Canada affecting the corporation, either in English or in French, as to the dissemination of news since the proclamation of the War Measures Act? If so, would the minister make a statement in the House, if any such special instructions have been given, as to how the news is to be reported?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I do not understand whether the hon. member is referring to instructions given by the government to the CBC, in which case the reply would be no. If he is referring to directions given by the CBC to its reporters and commentators, I would have to inquire from the CBC in order to give the hon. member a detailed reply.

[*English*]

Mr. Nowlan: Perhaps I lost the translation as I stood up, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister mean that he will inquire whether such instructions have been given and that he is prepared to make a statement to the House?

Mr. Pelletier: Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to answer the first part of the question pertaining to instructions given by the government to the CBC, the answer is no. With regard to whether the CBC itself has given instructions to the information, news and public affairs services, it is public knowledge that the president of the CBC at a certain point made public the recommendations he had made to those services to exercise restraint. I do not know of any instructions other than those but I shall inquire and answer the hon. member's question later.

ARREST OF CERTAIN NEWS BROADCASTERS UNDER WAR MEASURES ACT

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): My question is directed to the Secretary of State, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask him whether a number of news broadcasters connected with Radio-Canada were picked up by the authorities under the provisions of the regulations under the War Measures Act and, if so, have they since been released?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I know that certain persons connected with the CBC—I could not clearly state whether they were employees or merely free-lance contributors—have been arrested and later released. I could not give the hon. member the precise information he requested, but such information must certainly be available either from the CBC or the Quebec Minister of Justice, and I can make inquiries if the right hon. representative is interested.

[*English*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I think that information should be available because over a year ago the matter was brought before the House and the Secretary of State at that time apparently did not know of the existence of these FLQ people—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I do not believe the right hon. member is asking a supplementary question. The hon. member for Fraser Valley West on a supplementary.

OPPORTUNITY FOR REBUTTAL ON PROGRAM, "WEEKEND"

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State if he will investigate whether or not it is the policy of the CBC television program, "Weekend", to allow anyone criticized on that program the opportunity of rebuttal on a subsequent show, or is this privilege confined to cabinet ministers such as—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's supplementary question is obviously an argument or a grievance. I would not think it is a legitimate question. If hon. members will allow me, we will try to go to another subject at this point.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MEETING BETWEEN PRIME MINISTER AND PRIME MINISTER OF ISRAEL

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Has the Prime Minister met with Prime Minister Golda Meir today to discuss matters of mutual concern to both countries? If so, has he anything to communicate to the House about possible changes in Canada's attitude toward the Middle East situation, or anything of interest to tell the House?

An hon. Member: Or about the War Measures Act.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I had a very interesting meeting indeed with the Prime Minister of Israel. We talked essentially about the Middle East and the problems there, and there is nothing at this time that I can communicate to the House.

An hon. Member: Does she have a War Measures Act?

Mr. Trudeau: Don't you know?

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

WAR MEASURES ACT—ARRESTS, RELEASES, CONTINUING DETENTIONS AND CHARGES

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice will recall that last week I asked him two or three times how many persons were being held under the War Measures Act regulations beyond the period of seven days at the request of the Minister of Justice of the province of Quebec or of any province?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I can give the hon. gentleman and the House the statistics as I have them as of 11 p.m. last night. Four hundred and twenty people have been arrested and 286 released; therefore 134 are still detained. Answering his question of last week, I can say that none of those who have been released have been charged. No charges have yet been laid against those still detained. I still have not been able to obtain a breakdown of how many have been held after seven days but I assume that I can obtain this information at an early date. The statistics I have been given have not been broken down that way.

Mr. Stanfield: Would it be fair to assume at this date that a very substantial percentage of the 132 people being held have now been held for more than seven days?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I would not like to assume that, no.

Mr. Stanfield: Is it so difficult for the minister to obtain this information which it seems to me is highly relevant to the current situation?

Mr. Baldwin: The Prime Minister makes irrelevant statements.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): They are not irrelevant. I have received every co-operation from the Attorney General of the province of Quebec, but for this particular breakdown I have not been able to get the figures.

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): May I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Justice, Mr. Speaker. When he reports on that matter, will he also report on approximately how many people are still being sought?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I will report on this.

[*Later:*]

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Justice whether, among the total of 420 people who have been arrested, there are any who were arrested, released and then arrested again?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I do not have that information, but I will obtain it.

* * *

INDUSTRY

FINANCIAL SETTLEMENT WITH DOSCO SHAREHOLDERS—SUBMISSION TO HOUSE

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): While I have the floor, Mr. Speaker, I should like to reply to the hon.

member for Cape Breton-East Richmond who directed a number of questions to the Prime Minister and myself last week. I now have the answers, if you will allow me to give them. The hon. member asked first of all:

Prior to any government financial settlement with the shareholders of Dosco, will this matter be brought before the House for agreement?

My answer is that no settlement of the amount of compensation has yet been reached between Cape Breton Development Corporation—Devco—and the former owners of the assets expropriated by Devco on March 30, 1968. It will be a matter of government policy whether or not any proposed settlement with the former owners is brought before the House. I would point out to the hon. member, however, that there is no requirement in the Cape Breton Development Corporation Act for so doing.

His second question was:

—will the Prime Minister also inquire of the Minister of Justice whether the list of shareholders will be made available along with the dates when the shares were acquired by the individuals?

The answer is that Devco did not expropriate the shares of the companies involved in this acquisition but, rather, expropriated the physical assets of those companies which were located in Cape Breton. Accordingly, Devco has no records of the shareholders of those companies and therefore is not in a position to supply the information requested. For the same reason, Devco is unable to supply the text of any agreement between the shareholders of the companies and Dosco.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, since the minister has taken the opportunity to answer those questions, I would ask if he would take a good hard look at any arrangement that the government makes in order to save itself millions of dollars?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member is making a representation which he must assume will be taken into account.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

TAKEOVER OF RYERSON PRESS BY UNITED STATES COMPANY—FOREIGN OWNERSHIP POLICY

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Is the minister investigating the reported sale of Ryerson Press to the Canadian subsidiary of a United States company? Can he report on the present situation and can he also indicate whether the government is contemplating any action similar to that taken with respect to Denison Mines earlier this year?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, there is no law under my jurisdiction which would give me authority to investigate such a sale.

Mr. Burton: May I direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. In view of the statements made by the right hon. gentleman and the Minister of National Revenue that it will be some time before the government is able to make public or indicate its policy with respect to foreign ownership, is the government giving consideration to an interim policy to deal with problems and situations such as this one that are likely to arise?

[Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton).]

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): An interim policy—no, Mr. Speaker. There have been ad hoc decisions which the House knows very well, and in that sense I suppose these could be termed an interim policy, but as requested by the House we have hoped that all these ad hoc decisions would be replaced eventually by a more general policy. I know that the party of the hon. member is having some difficulty in reaching its general policy; perhaps we could have a race.

Mr. Burton: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Will the minister undertake to investigate the particular matter of the sale of Ryerson Press to determine what action might be taken by the federal government or other jurisdiction to save a very important industry for Canada?

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is probably referring to the Combines Investigation Act which comes under my department. There is no evidence that I am aware of connected with the sale or proposed sale of Ryerson Press to show that it is a breach of the Combines Investigation Act.

* * *

HEALTH

REQUEST FOR COMMISSION TO STUDY QUACKERY AND CHIROPRACTIC TREATMENT

Mr. Paul Yewchuk (Athabasca): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Can the minister indicate whether he has received a communication from the Canadian Medical Association recommending that a commission be set up to study and report on health quackery and chiropractic treatment in Canada? Also, can the minister indicate what action, if any, has been taken on this matter?

An hon. Member: That's a new twist.

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I believe, Mr. Speaker, that such a communiqué has been received. I am not in a position at this time to indicate to the hon. member what action, if any, will be taken with respect to the communiqué. I would hope to be in a position to advise him later.

Mr. Yewchuk: Would the minister say whether he will make a statement on motions in this regard?

Mr. Munro: Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether a statement on motions will be necessary or whether I can just advise the House and the hon. member when I have the floor in answer to another question.

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CUBA AND ALGERIA—ALLEGED PRESENCE OF FLQ ELEMENTS

Mr. René Matte (Champlain): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Has he met representatives of Cuba and Algeria in order to know if some FLQ members would now be in those countries?

[*English*]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker, we have had no such conversations with the governments of Cuba or Algeria. Of course, we did make contact with them, for example, before making our offer of safe conduct to Cuba. That offer could not have been made without the agreement of the government of Cuba.

[*Translation*]

CUBA—ALLEGED OFFER OF SAFE CONDUCT TO PAUL ROSE AND ASSOCIATES

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a supplementary question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Could he not inquire whether the Cuban authorities in Montreal have already offered safe-conduct to Paul Rose or his allies?

* * *

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

TIME OF DEBATE ON PUBLIC ORDER (TEMPORARY MEASURES) BILL—REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Government House Leader when the government intends to initiate debate on the bill introduced today by the Minister of Justice and whether it is the intention of the government that examination of the bill be undertaken by the Committee of the Whole in lieu of a standing committee?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I propose that we begin discussion of the bill on Wednesday. It is the intention of the government to refer the bill to the Committee of the Whole.

* * *

POLLUTION

WABIGOON—ENGLISH RIVER SYSTEM—ACTION TO ELIMINATE MERCURY CONTAMINATION OF FISH AND PROTECT HEALTH OF INDIANS

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): My question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry who deals also with matters of pollution. It is based on the allegation of the Ontario Water Resources Commission that mercury pollution originating from Dryden Chemicals Limited has affected fish for hundreds of miles down the Wabigoon-

English River system as far as Hudson Bay. Has the federal government entered into discussions with the appropriate Ontario and Manitoba authorities concerning this critical situation? Also, what steps have been taken to protect the health of Indians in the area who have no alternative to fish as a staple in their food diet?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, we are continuously in touch with both the province of Ontario and the province of Manitoba in this connection. With respect to fishermen, including native fishermen, we have been purchasing all the fish offered regardless of their mercury content, or making loans where the lakes were closed.

[*Later:*]

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): My question is supplementary to one asked earlier of the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry but is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. It is with regard to the alarming mercury poisoning. Will the minister inquire to ascertain whether the results of blood tests carried out on native Indians, particularly Indian children, could be communicated to the band chief in the area concerned?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Yes, Mr. Speaker. I see no objection to that.

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Fisheries. Is the minister prepared to take action under the provisions of the Canada Water Act to combat the extensive mercury pollution in the river systems around Dryden, Ontario?

Mr. Davis: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but I do not see an immediate application of the Canada Water Act.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

MIDDLE EAST—CANADIAN REACTION TO BRITISH POLICY STATEMENT

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): I wish to direct a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. It is based upon the comprehensive policy statement made by the British Foreign Secretary on the Middle East situation. Can the minister advise whether the Canadian government had foreknowledge of this important policy statement? Does the Canadian government look with favour upon the suggestions of the British for ameliorating this difficult situation?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I have doubts about the question of the hon. member, particularly the second part. However, the matter is of interest. Perhaps the minister might be allowed to reply, with the consent of the House.

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): I was not personally aware of the contents of the British statement in advance, Mr. Speaker. I will look at it to see whether I care to comment.

Inquiries of the Ministry

AGRICULTURE

PRICE OF DRESSED HOGS—ACTION UNDER AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION ACT

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. On October 27 I asked the Parliamentary Secretary if the minister or the government were prepared to initiate action under the Agricultural Stabilization Act to make payments to hog producers in the Prairie provinces in view of the fact that the price for hogs, basis dressed weight, has fallen below the support price of $22.17 per hundredweight. Can the minister now reply to this question?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Yes, Mr. Speaker. With regard to this question I may say the mandatory price support for hogs under the Agricultural Stabilization Act is calculated on a national weighted average price to producers which currently is $23.74. I wish to advise the hon. member that the national weighted price for hogs for all of 1970 and up to and including October 10 was $31.95 per hundredweight.

INTERPROVINCIAL MARKETING—REQUEST FOR REFERENCE TO SUPREME COURT

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex): My question is for the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the continued concern of provincial authorities and the agricultural industry over the conflicting views concerning jurisdiction with regard to interprovincial trade, does the government now intend to ask for a Supreme Court reference in this matter?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): No, Mr. Speaker. After conversations with officials of my own department as well as officials of the provincial Departments of Agriculture, I am convinced that the most satisfactory solution is to proceed with Bill C-176. I say that for reasons I have explained in this House many times.

Mr. Danforth: I wish to ask a supplementary question based on the answer of the minister. The bill is very complex. Can the minister indicate how soon after the passage of the bill we may expect it to have some influence on this very serious problem?

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I doubt whether the question is in order.

* * *

NATIONAL AND ROYAL ANTHEMS

INQUIRY AS TO INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): I have a question for the Government House Leader. I had no success last session with his predecessor on this matter. Can the minister indicate whether legislation will be introduced this session dealing with Canada's national and/or royal anthems?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): It is possible that the House will deal with this question this session, Mr. Speaker. I am presently considering when and how this might be done.

[Mr. Sharp.]

PENSIONS

RECIPROCAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN CANADA AND FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. It is based on assurances of progress given several times last session by the minister. Has a reciprocal pension agreement between Canada and the Federal Republic of Germany yet been reached?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Agreement has not yet been reached, Mr. Speaker. I visited Germany with my officials. Approximately two weeks ago we had a very extensive meeting with representatives of the German government. Another such meeting is planned for this month in the hope that agreement will be reached in the early part of January. If this schedule is adhered to, it will not be implemented until it has been dealt with by the German parliament.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

MURDER OF PIERRE LAPORTE, KIDNAPPING OF JAMES CROSS—ANNOUNCEMENT OF OFFER OF REWARDS

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the question period a question was directed to me concerning a reward. I answered that this matter was under very close consideration by the two governments, the federal government and the government of Quebec. I now wish to add to that answer. A reward has now been authorized and a statement has been given to the press.

Some hon. Members: How much?

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): May I ask the minister how much the reward will amount to, who authorized it and when it will be made available?

Mr. McIlraith: It has been authorized by the governments directly concerned, Mr. Speaker. There are several rewards involved, and it is up to the figure indicated in the press release. The total amount is quite adequate.

An hon. Member: Will you share the press release?

Mr. McIlraith: I will be very glad to bring the press release before the House immediately the final revision is issued.

Mr. Hees: I rise on a question of privilege. When the question was asked a short time ago the minister said this decision had not been made and gave no indication that it would be made. Now he says that a press release has been issued. Obviously the answer he gave me is in contravention of the rules of the House. It is about time you started treating this House with some respect instead of insulting it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. McIlraith: On a charge like that, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is only fair that I have an opportunity to reply. I have sought to show respect to Parliament and to the other government concerned in this matter.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McIlraith: The press release was issued at 2.40, Mr. Speaker. The information I gave in answer to the question by the Leader of the Opposition was precisely correct at that point of time. It had not been decided to issue the press release at that time for a very good reason.

Mr. Hees: If the press release was issued at 2.40, it was obviously prepared a long time before that. What was the reason for not giving this information to the House when I asked for it?

Mr. McIlraith: I would be glad to give the reason.

Mr. Hees: Well, let's have it.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Will the minister clear up something that must be in the minds of everyone? I refer to the fact that it took so long before you made this decision. Would you mind explaining to the House and the country why there was such a delay?

Mr. McIlraith: Yes, I will be glad to.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Both the hon. member for Calgary North and the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings have addressed themselves to the minister. They should address their questions to the Chair.

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated last week, this matter was under continuous consideration from day to day. As to what arose today, at two o'clock, after the bell started to ring summoning the House to meet, a new matter arose that completely changed the answer that I would have given at five minutes to two. That matter had to be checked out, and it was checked out between two and 2.40. Surely hon. members are capable of understanding a simple matter like that.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order. There are two or three supplementaries. I recognize the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands on a supplementary.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, members can understand that the Solicitor General had to have the concurrence of the government of Quebec before the decision and the announcement could be made. When did the government of Canada and the government of Quebec reach the decision that a reward would be offered; and when was the press release prepared announcing that such a decision had been reached?

Mr. McIlraith: The final draft of the press release would have been made some time about two o'clock today.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): When was the decision made?

Mr. McIlraith: The decision that a reward would be authorized, if and when the circumstances warranted it and it would not do more damage than good in view of other elements that may have arisen in the consideration of the criminal cases, was made, many days, indeed some weeks, ago.

Mr. Hees: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The Chair will allow the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings a supplementary.

Mr. Hees: Would the Solicitor General now advise the House what important information came to his attention at two o'clock to make him change his mind?

Mr. McIlraith: No, Mr. Speaker, I would not be in a position to give that information at this time. I would be very happy to give the information, and I hope I can give it soon so that the House will have the opportunity of assessing for itself how utterly irresponsible the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings is in these matters.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hees: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me we are now getting into a debate between the minister and the hon. member, and certainly that would not be very helpful.

Mr. Hees: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the minister accused me of being utterly irresponsible.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hees: I asked him a very responsible and important question and he gave me an answer contrary to the facts just announced. I asked him what had changed his mind, and he replied that I was irresponsible for asking that question.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Hees: That is the sort of nonsense that we get from this government day after day.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Before calling orders of the day, I believe the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond has a supplementary.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): I have a supplementary question for the Solicitor General. At 2.15 the Solicitor General said that the government was giving consideration to the offering of a reward. Now the Solicitor General informs the House that the government of Canada has decided to offer a reward. Am I to understand from this statement that the government of Canada does not exist, or the Prime Minister and the other cabinet ministers in the House today?

Mr. Speaker: Order. Again I suggest, with respect, that this is developing into a debate between hon. members and the minister. If the House will agree to return to the item "First Reading of Senate public Bills", I understand there is an item that should have been called at that point.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

STATISTICS ACT

ESTABLISHMENT OF STATISTICS CANADA, PROVISIONS FOR ADMINISTRATION, ETC.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce) moved the first reading of Bill S-2 (from the Senate), respecting statistics of Canada.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day. Is the Secretary of State for External Affairs seeking the floor on a point of order or question of privilege?

Mr. Sharp: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Before moving to orders of the day may I have the permission of the House to revert to motions in order to make a statement that I would have made at the opening of the House today, one that I think it is urgent to make but was prevented from doing so because of a meeting with the Prime Minister of Israel?

Mr. Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SOUTH AFRICA—ANNOUNCEMENT OF ENLARGING OF EMBARGO ON CANADIAN ARMS EXPORTS

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the government has been reviewing its policy with regard to the application of the embargo against the export of arms to South Africa. This review was undertaken as a result of Security Council Resolution 282 of July 23, 1970, which elaborated upon the terms of the Security Council's 1963 resolutions on this subject. Since the latest resolution went beyond the terms of the arms embargo as originally established, thorough consideration was called for to determine what steps the government should take in compliance with the terms of the new Security Council resolution.

The Canadian government has since 1963 applied a general embargo on arms exports to South Africa. Exceptions were made, however, to allow for shipment of maintenance spares for equipment supplied before the 1963 resolutions were adopted, as well as for export of certain aircraft piston engines and spares for them.

In light of the review just completed, the government has decided that henceforth the supply of all vehicles and equipment, and the supply of spare parts for vehicles and equipment, for the use of the armed forces and paramilitary organizations of the Republic of South Africa will be prohibited.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Sharp: In addition, certain aircraft piston engines and maintenance spares for such engines, previously exempted from the government's application of the embargo, will no longer be supplied for military use by the armed forces or paramilitary organizations in South Africa.

In complying with the recent United Nations resolution on this subject, the government does not intend that normal trade with South Africa in goods for civilian use should be affected.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): May I just say very briefly, Mr. Speaker, by way of immediate comment that I really do not believe that the government of Canada had very much alternative to the course it has just announced in view of the position taken by the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau) on British arms shipments to South Africa.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, we have long advocated this action and naturally we welcome it. We do question why it took so long and why it was necessary to wait until this time. Be that as it may, I hope the government is giving consideration to changing another anomaly in our relations with South Africa. We pronounce our detestation of the principles of apartheid, yet at the same time give special, preferential treatment to South Africa as though it were still a nation of the Commonwealth. I am wondering whether the time has not come for that part of our anomalous and sometimes hypocritical policy to be reviewed.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

TAX REVIEW BOARD BILL

ESTABLISHMENT, DUTIES, APPEALS, ORGANIZATION, ETC.

The House resumed, from Friday, October 30, consideration of the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton) that Bill C-174, to establish the Tax Review Board and to make certain amendments to other acts in relation thereto, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that, as a result of a change in the order of business, this item was called on Friday afternoon rather than today as had been announced last Thursday. Prior to the minister making his statement on Friday, I would have liked to raise the point of order that I am now going to raise with regard to another rather poorly drafted recommendation.

• (3:00 p.m.)

This is not a major point but it is one which I think strikes at the logic and consistency of a proper application of the recommendations. Your Honour will recall that the other day I had some words to say about these particular recommendations, the manner in which they were being drafted and the improprieties of them. The government must face up to the responsibility of making appropriate recommendations to this House because the

expenditure of money is only authorized by recommendations meeting the legislation and authorization given by Parliament. In this particular connection, I would draw to Your Honour's attention paragraph 2 of the recommendation which reads as follows:

To provide also that the salaries, travelling allowances and annuities payable to members, former members and widows of former members shall be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, and that all other expenditures shall be paid out of moneys appropriated by Parliament for the purpose.

The provision in this recommendation is implemented by clause 16 at page 7 of the bill. I will not go into the reading of that particular clause, but if Your Honour will turn to page 16 of the bill you will see there clause 23, subclause (2) which reads as follows:

Subsection (2) of Section 9 of the Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

(2) All benefits and other amounts required to be paid pursuant to this Act shall be paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund and, except in the case of benefits calculated by reference to annuities payable under the Governor General's Retiring Annuity Act, the Judges' Act or the Tax Review Board Act shall be charged to the Supplementary Retirement Benefits Account.

The provision in respect of these benefits, which incidentally are the supplementary benefits, the 2 per cent annual increments to cover increases in the cost of living, etc., and we all know about those, are therefore part of the statute law and are statutory estimates. They do not require a particular item in the annual estimates, yet if one reads the recommendation, one does not see the word "benefits". If you look at the definition of "benefit" under the Act one must conclude that such benefits are considered as separate and distinct from the annuities upon which they are calculated. This is made clear by Section 6 of the Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act. That section reads:

The supplementary retirement benefits payable to a recipient shall be paid at the same times, in the same manner, during or in respect of the same periods and subject to the same terms and conditions as the pension payable to that recipient.

Then, pension is defined by Section 3(1)(d) as follows:

—"pension" means a pension, annual allowance or annuity payable pursuant to an enactment listed or described in Schedule A.

I would put it to you, therefore, that benefits under the Supplementary Retirement Benefits Act are not part of the annuity but are supplementary to it. Therefore, the net result of this is that whereas the act purports to make a statutory payment out of the benefits under clause 16, the recommendation does not mention benefits and does not appropriate them to a charge on the Consolidated Revenue Fund. All I am saying is that the act purports to do one thing and the recommendation forces Parliament to do something else. I say it certainly could be corrected but I point out to Your Honour that in my submission, and I think on review perhaps Your Honour will agree, the recommendation should be amended. I am not going to hold up the passage of the bill pending this necessary amendment to the recommendations. I am certain it is not as pertinent as it was the other day in respect of the Investment Companies Act wherein the flaw in the recommendation was vital to it.

Having said that, unless Your Honour or the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) wishes to make some comment—

Mr. Speaker: I assumed the hon. member rose on a point of order at this stage. He has raised an interesting point on which the Minister of Justice might like to comment before an opinion is expressed by the Chair as to whether or not this bill should be allowed to proceed at this time.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I do not want to hold it up.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): On the point of order, I am not sure the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) is really considering it in that precise form since he has generously suggested he would not want to hold up the bill. May I submit to Your Honour that a recommendation both under the new and old rules never, so far as I can find, mentions item by item those charges on ways and means. I suggest these words found in the recommendation "salary, travel allowances and annuities" are certainly wide enough to include the term "benefit". These are generic terms general enough to include any specific items. The concluding words of the second paragraph of the recommendation, namely that all other expenditures shall be paid out of money appropriated by Parliament for the purpose, would include any specific funds already authorized other than the Consolidated Revenue Fund to be paid by parliament.

I submit to Your Honour that the recommendation in amplitude is wide enough to cover any of the specifics in the individual parts of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member for Waterloo rising on a point of order?

Mr. Saltsman: No, Mr. Speaker, not on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: My understanding of the point raised by the hon. member, as part of his submission, is that perhaps we should not hold up the consideration of the bill at this stage. Both the hon. member for Edmonton West and the hon. Minister of Justice have submitted very potent arguments. I have very often felt it should not be necessary that our recommendations should attempt to go into all the details of the bill because we are bound to get into difficulties. It is only normal that some aspects of the bill should be overlooked and in this case the recommendation becomes faulty. I have very often felt it would be sufficient for His Excellency to advise us in writing that he had looked at the bill and finds it is all right, so we should proceed with it. In my view, this would be sufficient.

This is a constitutional position and we want to know whether His Excellency thinks this is a bill with which we can proceed. If he tells us that in three words, we should take his word for it. If the law officers of the Crown or of Parliament want to go into the details trying to cover the field they will necessarily get into difficulty, the type of difficulty the hon. member for Edmonton West has just drawn to our attention.

In any event, I suggest that with the consent of the House we proceed with a consideration of the bill at this stage. The argument and position explained by the hon. member for Edmonton West will be looked into perhaps a little more closely at the time we reach another stage of the consideration of this bill. The Chair may then give a ruling and if the recommendation is found defective it can be remedied at that time.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I suggest that the amendment could be slight, requiring only one or two words. This would clear up the matter. In any event, I think I have made my point.

I should like to refer to the minister's statement of the other day, and I realize he is having to leave the House for other reasons. I hope we can welcome him back very shortly. In any event, this bill had its origin in the recommendations of the Carter commission. That commission indicated something I, too, have found over the years, particularly when I was connected with the Department of National Revenue as Parliamentary Secretary. The operations of the tax appeal board do become much too formal and very often assume the unnecessary trappings and formality of a court. Over the years it had become really a tax court, and that, in effect, is what the Carter Commission wanted. I think we are engaging in a sort of exercise in semantics or perhaps moving the men around on a chess board by saying that all the functions of the Tax Appeal Board, as it now exists shall be transferred to a tax appeal court which is part of the federal court set up under Bill C-172. I believe there is now a great deal of activity that really will be for nought. I cannot accept the minister's wishful thinking that this body, as he says, will be so informal that a mere letter or piece of paper sent in to the board will suffice to launch an appeal and that it can be done by a neighbour, accountant or someone on a very informal basis to just one commissioner and so on. This raises a great number of questions.

• (3:10 p.m.)

First of all, I wonder about precedents. Are all the precedents of the tax appeal board and the interpretations of the Income Tax Act to be set aside by this bill? Will this tax review board start afresh and say it entirely discards the decisions of the tax appeal board? If that is so, then there will be a complete revolution in respect of the Income Tax Act and the interpretations thereof. That is the first point. If there are to be precedents, then immediately I suggest to the minister and to his Parliamentary Secretary that some of the informality will be gone because expert tax accountants and expert tax lawyers will be the ones who will approach the tax review board and point out the existence of certain previous interpretations of the law.

Another point is that I think the bill proceeds *per incuriam,* that is, frankly in ignorance of the provisions of the Canada Evidence Act because in clause 9(2) it says that the board will not be bound by any legal or technical rules of evidence in conducting a hearing for the purposes of that act. I put it to you, Mr. Speaker, that under no circumstances can we circumvent the rights granted by the Canada Evidence Act or the evidence act of any particular province by such provisions setting up a tax review board act. The right granted under the Canada Evidence Act is a fundamental right. It cannot be set aside very lightly by provisions such as those in clause 9(2). That is another question I raise.

Then, I want to ask questions concerning the mandatory requirement that all hearings shall be by one member. The minister indicated that he felt the hearings before the tax appeal board had become fishing expeditions or a form of preliminary hearing. In fact the Department of National Revenue people having seen the whole of the taxpayer's case would then be able to judge whether they should go to the Exchequer Court and could prepare their case before the higher court on the basis of what had been presented before the Tax Appeal Board. With the greatest respect, I ask just how this will differ. The taxpayer, in order to try to convince the tax review board, will have to lay out his entire case.

I am sure that neither the minister nor his parliamentary secretary will say for one moment that no one from the tax department will be present before the tax review board. The case will be laid out, and the mandatory requirement is that it be before one commissioner. What a fishing expedition for the Department of National Revenue this could turn out to be, if such appearances were ever fishing expeditions or preliminary hearings. I do not think the Minister of Justice remembers all of the Income Tax Act. I believe he forgets the fact that he practised law with a firm that enjoys probably the greatest reputation in Canada as a tax advisory legal firm. Before appearing before the tax review board the taxpayer will have to lay out his case before the deputy minister because the appeal must be to the deputy minister. The assessment is varied, vacated or confirmed. If it should be confirmed, or merely varied, the next recourse to the taxpayer will be to go before the tax review board. A look at the amendments to the Income Tax Act, as put forward in this bill, would indicate that the appeal to the deputy minister has not been eliminated. Therefore, the deputy minister has the first shot at the taxpayer's case.

Secondly, before the tax review board proposed under this bill, the taxpayer will have to lay out all his cards. The tax authorities will see the strength of his case. Then, if the department is not satisfied with the decision of the tax review board, proceedings will be started in the trial division of the federal court. I admit that until that proposed stage the taxpayer has not been involved in any costs, even if he loses, apart from his own solicitor-client costs. However, if he should go to the trial division of the federal court, in the event that the amount of the tax payable is in excess of $1,000 costs may be assessed. If the amount of the tax payable is less than $1,000, then in no instance will he pay costs since under this bill there is a direction that the costs will be paid by the Crown in all appeals involving a tax liability of $1,000 or less. This is excellent but the minister, however, cannot eliminate the opportunity for a fishing expedition.

I believe the minister was quite right and that the government has moved appropriately in placing this body under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Justice rather than under the Minister of National Revenue. Successive ministries have continued to have the Tax Appeal Board report to Parliament. Mind you, the board also reports to Parliament in this particular instance. The Tax Appeal Board reported to Parliament through the Minister of National Revenue and he made the recommendation for appointment to it. To that extent, I think there was a weakness. Now, the appointments will be on the recommendation of the Minister of Justice. But I believe the federal court and the tax review board will be more under the imprint of the government rather than Parliament than hitherto.

• (3:20 p.m.)

I would have liked to have seen this bill tidy up or remove entirely the appeal provisions from the Income Tax Act, but such is not the case and, frankly, we have a somewhat bastard way of drafting the legislation. The net result is a complete lacuna in a certain sector. I will come to that in a moment. In any event, I agree that it is a constructive move to place this Tax Review Board under the aegis of the Minister of Justice.

My next comment relates to the appointment of judges to age 70 to the federal court. This provision first appeared in Bill C-172. When the minister answers questions I would like to hear him tell us whether it is now government policy that all appointments to the bench be up to age 70 and that if there are any openings under the Judges Act this year, as was forecast in the Speech from the Throne, the provision regarding appointment of judges up to age 70 in the superior courts of the provinces will apply. Is it now a general policy of the government that appointments to the courts in Canada will be only to age 70?

The minister, in justifying appointments to age 70, indicated that hitherto under the Income Tax Act, division I, appointments were for periods of 10 years, and since it was deemed insecure, the best possible men could not be obtained. I should like to disabuse the minister's mind in this regard, because I do not think any administration failed to reappoint men who were competent. Generally, all men have seen out their time. There may have been the odd exception, but I do not accept for one moment the contention of the minister that appointments for 10 years to the Tax Appeal Board have created any difficulty among persons who have been appointed to the board in the past. What the minister proposes to do now indicates a retrograde step in my opinion, in that the present members of the Tax Appeal Board will be treated differently. Under clause 18 (3) and (4) we see that those members of the Tax Appeal Board who have now reached 70 years of age will retire and will be entitled to a full pension. Those members who have not reached age 70 will complete their period of 10 years and will retire with a very small annuity. There may be only one or two in this situation, but they have given a very important segment of their lives to this work. I know the age of one member of the Tax Appeal Board, and it was merely as a result of consulting the record that I am aware of it.

It seems rather odd to me that these two provisions, which do not do the same thing, are contained in the bill. Apparently Exchequer Court judges will continue in the federal court of Canada to age 75, since such were their terms of appointment, but one or possibly two members of the Tax Appeal Board will have their appointments cut off. I think that the only decent thing to have done would have been to guarantee them a reappointment to the Tax Review Board. Strangely enough, as I recall, the one man who is most affected is one whose term expires in two or three years time. In other words, he was appointed by the administration of the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker). It is a rather strange coincidence, but all the other judges who were appointed by subsequent administrations as well as prior administrations will not be affected. It seems to me that some political axe work is going on right in this clause. The parliamentary secretary may shake his head in injured innocence but that is the result of the legislation.

I would like the minister to explain why he does not give equal treatment to all members of the board. These people came to the board in the normal anticipation, based on years of precedents, of being reappointed to the board. If the name and the constitution of the board is to be changed, why should its members not be able to anticipate reappointment? After all, the man to whom I referred, I think, may have two or three years to go. He will not go on an extended leave but will carry out the duties of one of the members of the Tax Review Board, so why not reappoint him?

I would like to revert to clause 11 (2). This is a requirement which I believe is an improvement. It provides that rules made under this section will be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, and will have no effect unless they have been published in the Canada *Gazette;* that is quite right. The wording that follows seems strange. It reads:

> —and copies of all rules made under this section shall be laid before Parliament within fifteen days after the making thereof or, if Parliament is not then sitting, on any of the first fifteen days next thereafter that Parliament is sitting.

I suggest that the word "making" is very imprecise. I do not know when the rules are made. Is it when the order in council is approved, or are the rules made when they are published? I suggest to the parliamentary secretary that consideration be given, at the appropriate time, to changing the word "making" to "within 15 days after the publication thereof". Then, we will have a precise date known to everybody. The rules must then be tabled in Parliament within 15 days after the publication thereof. There is no question that the rules do not come into effect until they are tabled in Parliament, but it is their publication in the Canada *Gazette* that is the crucial date. I suggest to the Parliamentary Secretary that the better wording would be "after the publication thereof" rather than "the making thereof" because we do not know when they were made.

I should like to make one more point. I had some difficult skating to do in and out of many clauses in several bills to get around this point. We know that hitherto all the statutory requirements concerning the Tax Appeal Board were contained in division I of the Income Tax Act. This starts with section 86, and includes sec. 104. This present legislation purports to delete merely a small number of sections in that division of the Income Tax Act. Then, the bill makes what is called consequential amendments to other parts, one of them being section 101 of the Income Tax Act. Strangely enough, however, it fails to recognize that the definition of the word "court" in that whole part of the Income Tax Act is contained in section 104, in which section "court" is defined as being the Exchequer Court. But if we go to Bill C-172 and look at Schedule B, which has the consequential amendments, section 104 is not amended. Therefore, under the Income Tax Act the Exchequer Court is still the Court. This will necessitate some changing around. I merely raise the matter at this point because I would like to have the government prepared to meet the objections to this in committee with an appropriate amendment.

• (3:30 p.m.)

This is merely a minor point, Mr. Speaker. I know it becomes a little tiresome for other hon. members when we are dealing wtih such minor dressing up of legislation, but I think it is better to give the government notice now so that it can consider my objection. If I am wrong, then when we examine the legislation in committee I can be told so, and we will not have to waste a lot of time. The government will be prepared. In a manner of speaking, we have now had the preliminary hearing on this particular bill and the government has seen my case. Having said that there are some things wrong with the bill, I must repeat that I am quite prepared to have second reading given to it and have it referred to the appropriate committee. It may be that the Justice and Legal Affairs is the best committee to which to refer the bill, because this is strictly lawyers' law. Some other bills are scheduled to be referred to that committee which might be more appropriately considered by other committees.

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, in trying to determine what is significant about the legislation before us, I think the key was given by the minister in his remarks on Friday when he said that not only should justice be done but it should appear to the public to be done. In many ways, this bill does not change anything substantially. It will make some changes which I believe are improvements, in the sense of assuring the public that not only is justice done but that it will appear to be done.

The idea of providing for judges who will hold office until 70 years of age and not just a ten-year period, is an important consideration in re-assuring any taxpayer who goes before the appeal board. It is also important to remove jurisdiction over the board from the Department of National Revenue and place it under the Department of Justice.

If I might digress for a moment, Mr. Speaker, this is much like everything else that we give to the Department of Justice. Often that department is asked to correct, through legislation, some of the basic flaws in our society. In this case the basic flaw is the tax system. If we had a better tax system there would be small need for this kind of board. As it is, this board will have its hands full, because although the white paper on tax reform started out to remove many of the anomalies that exist in the tax system, I suspect that what we will eventually get will be more of what we had previously. Therefore, the appeal board will be called upon to adjudicate many cases that it would not have to adjudicate at all if we had a proper tax system. This is part of the whole approach we take in our society of providing opportunities, either under the Criminal Code, the Department of Justice, combines legislation or in other ways, to correct basic difficulties that we are not willing to correct by tackling the fundamental problems in our society.

What kind of cases will come before this appeal board? Most of the present cases deal with allowable expenses, the question of whether somebody who has made certain expenditures can charge them as legitimate expenses. They are not cases of fraud, or cases where somebody has been caught in an embarrassing position by not declaring the full amount of his income. These cases occur in marginal areas where a taxpayer says, "This is permissible under the law. I am permitted to go to this convention even though it is taking place in the South Seas, because it is a business expense." Then the department argues, "This is not what the tax laws were designed to encourage."

Other cases concern the distinction between what is a capital gain and what is an ordinary profit, because all kinds of arrangements are made in order to try to get as much income as possible in the form of capital gain rather than as regular income, since at the present time capital gains are not taxed at all and ordinary income is fully taxed.

So long as we have this kind of system, and given the outlook and psychology of our society, it is almost inevitable that people are going to try to take their gains in one form rather than in another and thus minimize their tax liability. This has been the great difficulty facing this court. The court's decisions deal with how a person took his income, and the way he arranged his business life. The white paper on tax reform, which started out to change all this, has created as many difficulties as existed previously. Even if you accept the entire proposals in the white paper, and there seems to be some evidence that they will not be accepted in their entirety, there will still be left a distinction between capital gains and ordinary income. As long as this distinction remains, the courts will be busy trying to clean up this Augean stable. They will be busy all the time because people will try to take

their income in a way in which they will not have to pay so much taxes. I do not think courts can reach satisfactory decisions in cases like these, at least satisfactory in the sense that a taxpayer will be completely happy or satisfied that justice has been done to him.

One of the other areas of difficulty is that in many cases what is needed—again this is true in combines legislation—is an advance commitment from the tax department on how it is going to treat certain forms of income. Anyone who wants to minimize his tax liability is not likely to go to the tax department for advice on how to do it. If he is trying to take his income in one form rather than another, and looking for special ways of doing it, he might think that the tax department is not the best adviser in the world for this purpose. Many of the arguments that take place, and the tax assessments which are contested later on, arise from this situation.

• (3:40 p.m.)

We have no great objection to the legislation. We are quite prepared to give it second reading and have it go to committee. The only point we wish to make at this time is the futility of much of this legislation. In the Justice Committee we did try to correct problems that should be corrected in the tax system and, indeed, I do not envy the people who will be called upon to act as judges in these matters.

Having sat in this House for some six years now, I have had considerable experience with the income tax department and their assessments. By and large I must say that I think they have been quite fair and reasonable, that they do not wish to take a position until they have considerable evidence to support their stand. The disagreements that arise are usually disagreements of interpretation of income and allowable expenses and I do not see how this new procedure will change things greatly.

One advantage of the new set-up is that ordinary people, whatever their reasons, will have better access and perhaps feel freer to contest decisions that have gone against them. To the extent that we permit scrutiny of government decisions and civil service decisions, and to the extent that it is clearly demonstrated to ordinary people that we are trying to do this, then I think the legislation is an improvement over what is presently on the books.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Albert Béchard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to answer the questions asked by the members who participated in the debate earlier today. However, if the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) reads the speech the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) delivered last Friday when he introduced the bill, as reported in *Hansard* at page 762 and following, I think he will find the answer to almost all the questions he asked today.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): I read it.

Mr. Béchard: Besides, Mr. Speaker, at the very suggestion of the hon. member for Edmonton West, the best time to discuss some technical aspects of the legislation and the details he would like to obtain, is in committee.

I do not want to deal at length here with some points that he has raised. Of course, being an opposition member he sees in certain appointments or in the expiration of the terms of office of certain commissioners a trace of party politics. But this is not at all the case as regards Bill C-174 which is being discussed at the present time.

As the minister has so ably put it and as the two previous speakers have admitted, the legislation has been prepared with a view to speeding up procedures, increasing their efficiency and putting them within reach of the small taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to unduly delay proceedings, but I nevertheless wish to thank the two previous speakers for their constructive remarks.

[*English*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please, is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I raised a point of order at the beginning of my remarks and I wonder whether the Speaker will give his ruling with regard to it when the bill comes back from the report stage or if there is some other means whereby Mr. Speaker can communicate his ruling on this point of order. If the bill goes to committee now there will not be anything before the House, so I am just raising the question. Perhaps the committee could be advised informally, through usual channels, of Mr. Speaker's views and there we could tidy up matters. If we could have that word while in committee, then perhaps the bill could be brought back shipshape.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): I see the point raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) and it was my impression that Mr. Speaker was thinking along the lines he has expressed. When the hon. member raised the point at the beginning of his speech, from what I heard, I thought Mr. Speaker was ready to let the bill go through this stage of the proceedings with the possibility of correcting anything that needed to be corrected at a further stage.

Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Canada Co-operatives Association Bill

CANADA CO-OPERATIVES ASSOCIATION BILL

INCORPORATION, ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION SHARE STRUCTURE, GENERAL POWERS AND DUTIES, ETC.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs) moved that Bill C-177, respecting co-operative associations, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, by way of introduction to this motion for second reading of this bill and reference to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, I should like to say a few words in support of the bill entitled an Act respecting Co-operative Associations. I trust that these remarks in explanation will assist hon. members in their consideration of this lengthy piece of legislation.

As is well known by hon. members knowledgeable in the field of co-operative law, there has never been any federal legislation of general application governing the incorporation and operations of co-operative associations at the federal or national level. Going back into history and checking *Hansard*, one learns that as early as 1907 a bill passed in this House but fell in the Senate mainly because, as I read the debate, the proposed legislation did not clearly indicate that it was to be operative only in the areas in which the federal Parliament was competent to legislate. Since 1907, the co-operative movement of Canada from time to time has pressed various governments for the passage of such legislation, namely legislation at the federal level allowing for the incorporation and operation of what we could call federal co-operatives. Some years ago, the two largest Canadian co-operative organizations jointly pressed the government for federal legislation on co-operatives. The joint Senate-House Committee on Consumer Credit, which I had the honour of co-chairing with Senator Croll, in its report of April 25, 1967, supported representations made to the government and concluded by way of recommendation "that federal legislation governing the incorporation of co-operatives is long overdue".

• (3:50 p.m.)

The government of that day, headed by Right Hon. Lester Pearson, indicated to the co-operative movement that it was in sympathy with its demands. He said that he and the government would consider carefully introducing before this House a federal co-operatives bill. I am happy, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the government headed by the present Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to bring this legislation forward after a parliamentary pause of some 63 years—which is somewhat slower than Parliament usually operates. I am glad that after such a long wait the co-operative movement of Canada is now able to see before Parliament a bill which, at the national level, will allow for the incorporation of federal co-operatives.

The absence of a federal co-operatives act should not be taken to mean that no co-operative associations have ever been incorporated by the federal authorities. That is not so, as co-operative associations have, over the years, been incorporated either under the federal companies act—under what used to be the Dominion Companies Act—or by special acts of Parliament. Although the validity of these incorporations was never questioned, it was generally recognized by experts in co-operative law that the Companies Act was not the proper vehicle for incorporating co-operatives and, in recent years, we have adopted a similar policy under which no such incorporations have been allowed to take place.

An obvious question that arises, Mr. Speaker, is: why is the Companies Act unsuitable for co-operatives associations. Or, in other words, why have co-operatives not been incorporated under the Companies Act? Why do we need the special act we are considering today? The answer to this question largely rests on the distinctive nature of a business corporation and a co-operative association. There are, in effect, a number of differences between these two types of organizations, namely, the co-operative association and the business corporation. For the purpose of illustrating the point that the Companies Act is not suited for co-operative associations, I propose to discuss two of the more basic differences.

One of these differences relates to the treatment of surplus or profit resulting from operations. In the case of an ordinary business corporation, generally speaking, such surplus is distributed to the shareholders by way of dividends and there are provisions to that effect in the Companies Act. But in the case of a co-operative association, the surplus of operation is normally distributed to the members or clients of the association on a patronage basis. This means, in effect, that the share of a member of a co-operative association in the surplus of the operation is calculated on the basis of the use he has made of the services of the association. The more he uses the association, the more he receives as his share of the surplus resulting from the operation; whereas shareholders in a corporation receive their dividends regardless of whether they have used the services of the corporation or not.

The second important difference is this: it is a basic principle of co-operative law that a member has only one vote, notwithstanding the amount of his investment in the association. As hon. members know, in the case of an ordinary business corporation, of course, the voting rights of a shareholder are ordinarily dependent on the extent of his investment in the corporation, one share bringing one vote. Again, there are provisions to this effect in the Companies Act. These are but two important differences as between corporate law and co-operative law which render the Companies Act unsuitable for co-operative associations.

As I said before, a number of co-operatives have been incorporated by the federal authorities under the companies act. In doing so, it was recognized that some violence had to be done to some of the provisions of the act, in order to suit the peculiar nature of a co-operative association. That is the reason it was eventually decided that no further incorporation of co-operative associations under the Companies Act should be allowed to take place. That is also one of the reasons we are bringing this legislation forward at this time, so that co-operative associations incorporated at the federal level could be

governed by a statute of general application better suited to the special character of their organization than the Companies Act.

Hon. members are aware of the work done by the co-operative movement within the framework of provincial legislation in various fields of economic activity. A few figures might assist in placing in perspective the importance of the co-operative movement in Canada. In 1967, the volume of business for more than 2,500 co-operatives amounted to more than $2.1 billion, an increase of close to a quarter of a million dollars or 11 per cent, over the previous year. Assets totalled $1 billion, of which members' equity represented 47 per cent. Membership at 1,700 million members was up slightly from that of the previous year.

Many co-operative associations desire to serve their members on a multi-provincial or a national basis. We believe that they should have the facilities to do so under legislation of general application well suited to their peculiar nature, as is the case with other types of organizations under the Canada Corporations Act.

I would like to insist on the fact that this bill deals only with the incorporation and operations of federally incorporated co-operatives. It does not touch upon the controversial question whether co-operatives should be subject to the same taxation laws as other types of business. This question, of course, is one for my colleague, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson), in the context of his proposals for tax reform. That matter will be before this House in due course and upon that Parliament will take whatever decision it deems appropriate. That question does not arise in this debate, which is related to a bill to allow for the federal incorporation of certain entities. As I say, this bill does not touch on that question one way or the other. It does not touch on the question of the tax status of co-operative societies and has no relation to whether this bill should be or should not be passed.

I said in my introductory remarks that this is a long bill, almost an overly long bill. It contains 138 clauses of a rather technical nature. For these reasons, I do not intend to review here the provisions of the bill in any detail. I am sure that the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, to which I hope the bill will be referred, will consider each of these provisions carefully. I and my officials will be readily available when the committee studies the provisions of the bill and goes through them, clause by clause. For the purpose of second reading and reference to the committee, it might be sufficient for me at this time to mention briefly some of the more important features or principles of this legislation. Before doing so, however, I should like to briefly explain to hon. members the various steps that have preceded the presentation of this legislation.

First, there was created in 1965 a study committee to assist the government in the preparation of a bill allowing for the incorporation of co-operative associations at the federal level. This committee was headed by Mr. Louis Lesage, the Director of the Corporations Branch of my department. Also on that committee were Mr. Gordon Blair of Ottawa and Saskatchewan, who has since joined us in this House as the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton, and Mr. Francois Jobin, a Quebec City lawyer, who has since joined the Quebec Department of Financial Institutions, companies and Co-operatives, as Head of the Co-operative Branch. The work of the committee has been most useful to us in the preparation of this bill. I wish now to record our gratitude to the three members of that committee.

As a follow-up to the work of the committee, we consulted a large segment of the co-operative movement, especially those associations that had, from time to time, shown an interest in this kind of legislation. The comments and suggestions that we received, as a result of these consultations, were very precious to us.

Before putting the bill in its final form, my officials also had numerous discussions with provincial officials. We are much indebted to the provinces who have permitted us to draw on their expertise and experience in this field in preparing this legislation. Many of the provisions of this bill have been modelled on provisions now in force in one or the other of the provinces.

Finally, a special word of thanks should go to Mr. R. J. MacMaster of Vancouver, an acknowledged co-operative law expert. Mr. MacMaster's advice and suggestions have been most valuable to us throughout the preparation of Bill C-177.

You will note, in the first clauses of the bill, that a semi-registration system has been adopted for the creation of a new co-operative association. Perhaps this is my western bias coming out, but I think some form of registration system is less cumbersome to administer than a letters patent system of the type now prevailing, for instance, under the Canada Corporations Act. The ministerial discretion, however, is maintained; hence the expression "semi-registration system". Such ministerial discretion is considered normal and necessary in the case of co-operative associations in order to ensure that only "bona fide" co-operative associations be created.

• (4:00 p.m.)

One of the purposes of this bill is to enable co-operative associations to federate on an interprovincial basis, and also to enable individuals desiring to carry on an enterprise on a co-operative basis in more than one province to become incorporated under the federal Companies Act or by special acts to take advantage of the proposed act through a certificate of continuation. For example, if a co-operative association had been incorporated by a special act of this House in 1930 or 1940, it could now come under Bill C-177, by a certification of continuation. The law of general application would apply. There would be a good number of advantages for them following that course of action.

One of the objectives of this legislation is to permit existing co-operatives to federate for either interprovincial or national objects. This will be facilitated by a transjurisdictional transfer procedure which is set out in clauses 7 and 8 of the bill. This is a rather interesting provision. To be effective, such a procedure will require

the passing of a permissive act by the province concerned allowing a co-operative association to leave its jurisdiction for the purpose of its being continued or federated or amalgamated under the provisions of this bill. Even then, the transfer from the provincial jurisdiction to the federal jurisdiction could be effected only with the consent of the federal authorities and that of the province concerned. The transfer of a co-operative which ceases to operate on an interprovincial basis could similarly be effected from the federal jurisdiction to a provincial one. This procedure, I should emphasize, is only permissive and will require, to be effective, the consent of all the authorities, federal and provincial.

There are limitations as to the nature of the objects that federal co-operative associations would be allowed to have. These are very important. These limitations are found in paragraphs (a) to (h) of subclause (1) of clause 5 and relate to the business of insurance, telephone, railways, banks, etc. You cannot form a co-operative association to carry on that kind of business. In addition, excepted from the application of the bill are co-operative credit associations, credit unions or Caisses Populaires. It was not believe that federal co-operative associations should be allowed to enter a field that has so far exclusively been controlled by the provinces, that is credit unions and Caisses Populaires.

In the case of the creation of a new co-operative, at least seven natural persons are required to file articles of association, while, in the case of federations, only two existing co-operative associations may file such articles. The reason for having at least seven persons in the case of new co-operative associations is that, in the case of a co-operative association operating on an inter-provincial or national basis, it does not seem unreasonable to require that at least seven persons show an interest in the association to be formed. However, in the case of federations, the number of applicants is only two because federations are usually formed by co-operatives having a sufficiently large number of individuals as members.

Before the association is registered, certain conditions must be complied with. Only a co-operative which would not be confined to provincial objects, which will "carry on its undertaking in two or more provinces" and which will "have a fixed place of business in each province where it carries on its undertaking", will qualify.

Furthermore, and this probably goes without saying, an association will be required to operate on a "co-operative basis". As the purpose and method of operation of a co-operative differ substantially from those of other corporations, it is most important that those who operate companies for other purposes should not be able to do so under the guise of a co-operative name. A co-operative association or federation would be considered to be operated on a co-operative basis if it complies with the requirements set forth in the bill. These are, in effect, the cardinal principles on which co-operative associations are based:

(1) No member, as a rule, shall have more than one vote;

(2) No member, as a rule, shall vote by proxy;

[Mr. Basford.]

(3) Interest on share and loan capital shall not exceed a fixed per cent per annum; and

(4) The business of the association shall be operated as nearly as possible at cost and, after provision for reasonable reserve; any surplus funds arising from the operations of the association shall be distributed wholly or in part among the members or among members and patrons of the association in proportion to the volume of business which they have done with the association.

The charter of the association will be comprised of the memorandum of articles and the charter by-laws. The internal organization of the association will be governed by its by-laws, that is, its charter by-laws and ordinary by-laws.

All of the charter by-laws would have to be enacted by the board of directors and sanctioned by the members either at a special or annual general meeting of members. These by-laws will come into force only on their being approved by the minister.

Both the memorandum of articles and charter by-laws may from time to time be amended. The filing of a supplemental memorandum of articles will be required only in cases of a rather major nature. This would be so, for instance, in the case of an association wanting to extend the objects for which it has been incorporated or to further its other objects. The system of charter by-laws will have the advantage of eliminating as much as possible the need for supplemental memorandum of agreement. This is designed to simplify the administration. For example, changes in the capital structure of an association and matters concerning the membership and voting rights, borrowing powers and other subjects of a similar importance, could be modified by amending the charter by-laws.

The act provides for two types of co-operative associations, with or without share capital. Whether the co-operative is with or without share capital will be set out in the memorandum of articles.

It will be possible for co-operative associations to provide for a delegate system, the particulars of which will have to be set out in the charter by-laws.

The charter by-laws will set out the number of co-op shares to be issued as well as their par value. The members' shares or common shares are designated as co-op share. In the case of a business corporation, it is possible to issue shares without nominal or par value but, in this act, it will not be possible to provide for a co-op share or preferred share having no nominal or par value. The value of a co-op share is not subject to fluctuation and the voting rights being an attribute of membership generally have no relation to the number of shares held.

Co-operatives with share capital will have an unrestricted power to purchase or redeem their own shares. Such a power to redeem or purchase its shares is important in the case of co-operatives, as it is necessary that the control of the association always vest in members who are actually using the co-operatives.

By the effect of clause 17(2), co-operatives are permitted to reissue their co-op or common shares. This is

reasonable as co-op shares have a fixed par value which can never be increased or decreased. Preferred shares, which will also always be with par value, when redeemed, will not be, however, reissued. They will be cancelled. When further authorized capital will be required, the co-operative association will have to proceed by way of amendments to its charter by-laws requiring ministerial approval.

One clause of the bill requires a co-operative association, incorporated under the act, to include in its corporate name the word "co-operative", "co-op" or "pool". Similarly, there are provisions that associations other than associations incorporated under this act or an entity expressly authorized to use these words by provincial legislation, shall not use these words in order to avoid a misrepresentation or deception. The conditions of membership in an association are to be regulated by the by-laws of the association.

• (4:10 p.m.)

Shares in a co-operative association will be transferred only with the permission of the board of directors. This is a usual limitation in the case of co-operative associations because of the special relationship that a member has to his co-operative. The shareholder or member of a co-operative association does business with the co-operative and is not only a mere investor. For that reason, the co-operative needs to control the admission of shareholders or members. One of the fundamental principles of a co-operative is that any surplus arising from its operations must be distributed among the persons who, by their patronage, have made the surplus possible. Before the distribution is made, reserves may be set aside. The distribution of surplus will be controlled by the rules established by the charter bylaws of the association.

There are many other aspects of this bill that I have not mentioned, and which undoubtedly the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs will want to study carefully. This will be so, I would think, for instance, of the provisions relating to the preparation and disclosure of financial statements, transjurisdictional transfers, etc. I am confident that hon. members, having considered the provisions of this bill and having waited 63 years for its introduction will agree that this is a piece of legislation that deserves their support. I look forward to making myself and my officials available to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs when the bill is referred to the committee so that we can examine the bill in very great detail.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, the members of the official opposition support the principle of the bill and look forward to the opportunity that will be afforded them of examining it clause by clause during the committee stage.

We also salute the co-operative movement in Canada. We salute it for the good work it is doing and for the patience it has manifested in waiting these many years to get the bill to Parliament. The minister referred to this fact. A bill of a similar nature was before Parliament in 1908 but was defeated by the other place for reasons which it would probably not be useful to go into at this particular time. However, perhaps we will hear more of that when this bill is before the committee.

Speaking of the committee, Mr. Speaker, I note with some surprise that the bill is to be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. The minister did not seem to exhibit any undue interest in this, though one would have expected the bill to be referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs. The Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs has been assuming a greater role session by session, yet it has no standing committee of its own. The fact that this bill has had to be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs emphasizes this need, and I am surprised the minister did not make reference to it. Since there is no standing committee on consumer affairs, I see no reason why the bill could not be sent, as I say, to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

Having said that, I am delighted to note that this bill, which has been advocated all these years by the co-operative movement in Canada, incorporates in its preamble the fundamental principles of the co-operative movement as laid down by Rochdale Pioneers of England in 1844. Perhaps these principles are worth mentioning here. They are, first, open membership, which means that all who can benefit from the services may join; second, democratic control, which means that each member has only one vote, regardless of the size of his shareholding; third, limited return on capital at a modest rate set by the annual meeting; and lastly, distribution of surplus on the basis of patronage. I think it is useful to set out these principles in the bill, which is placing a special responsibility upon the federal government in a field which heretofore was exclusively within the jurisdiction of the provinces.

As the minister pointed out, associations that wish to incorporate under this bill must carry on undertakings in two or more provinces with a fixed place of business in each province in which they carry on their undertakings.

I note that the bill will set up a system of registration which will come largely under the discretion of the minister. I am not suggesting that the minister is not capable of exercising the proper discretion and responsibility given to him by the legislation, but like everybody else he is a fallible human being and I am a little concerned at the increasing discretionary powers that the minister is taking unto himself, not only as a result of the provisions of this bill but under other bills he has brought to Parliament since assuming his current office.

These are some of the points that we shall bring to the attention of the minister when the bill is before the standing committee, but I hope that, before we conclude this stage of the proceedings, the minister will inform the House why the bill is being sent to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs rather than the committee that normally deals with the minister's estimates and legislation coming within his jurisdiction.

Co-operative associations have for a long time been handicapped by lack of legislation dealing with their

national activities. Manitoba was the first province to incorporate a co-operatives act in 1887, followed by Quebec in 1906. The co-operative movement in Canada was first launched in Stellarton, Nova Scotia, in 1861, and since that time has grown to the point where, as the minister mentioned, it does business today in excess of $2 billion.

The co-operative movement in Canada has a membership of over 1.5 million people. These people are totally involved in co-operatives of one form or another under the headings of marketing and purchasing; fishermen's co-operatives in the province of Newfoundland and the other Atlantic provinces, as well as in the province of British Columbia; service co-operatives; and production co-operatives. The need for legislation at the federal level was thus quite clear and in line with the continuing needs of the co-operative movement in Canada, needs that have been manifest for the past 50 years. This prompts one to ask why it has taken so long to introduce such legislation.

I should like to find out what became, for example, of the recommendations of the royal commission on co-operatives which was set up in 1945. I do not think the minister made any reference to that royal commission, the recommendations of which have gone largely ignored, though coincidentally perhaps some of them may have been incorporated into the bill now before the House.

This bill is largely of a technical nature and will provide mainly, as the minister has said, for the operations of co-operatives in a way that is substantially different from the operations of other corporations. Hence, co-operatives will be removed from the jurisdiction of the Corporation Act. There will be this system of registration rather than the requirement of parliamentary legislation and letters patent.

There are a number of questions of a technical nature which we hope to put to the minister, his officials and the witnesses who will be called when the bill is before the committee. At first glance it seems to me that, apart from the discretionary powers referred to by the minister which he will be assuming under this legislation, it is not clear whether or not, a division within his department will be established to handle the operations of co-operative associations. Obviously this will be necessary and will automatically flow from the bill. I notice the minister is shaking his head, but unfortunately a shaking of the head is not recorded by *Hansard*.

Mr. Basford: It is a shaking of the head in the affirmative.

• (4:20 p.m.)

Mr. McGrath: I hope he will clarify this point when he has a chance to speak before the legislation passes this stage.

The question that comes to mind is, since we are setting up this type of a structure why not create the post of registrar to be responsible for co-operatives? In other words, we could have a registrar of co-operatives instead of having this power largely assumed by the minister as now envisaged by this legislation. To my mind the minister was very vague on the kind of consultation which has been held with provinces regarding some of the objections raised when the original bill was brought before Parliament in 1908, objections that were of a constitutional nature. I should like to know whether or not some of these objections have any foundation at the present time.

I salute the co-operative movement in Canada for the good work it is doing all across the country. We notice this bill will help to facilitate this work and make it much easier in terms of federal responsibility. We cannot help but wonder why it has taken Parliament so long to act on a matter that is obviously so important. In conclusion, I would again plead with the minister and his colleagues to give earnest and serious consideration to the necessity of establishing in this House a standing committee on consumer affairs in order that we might have the opportunity, not only of dealing with this particular legislation but of dealing with many important areas which come within the minister's jurisdiction, and which are so vital and important to the consumers of Canada.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of our group to welcome this legislation and say to the minister that we will be as helpful as we can at all stages of the proceedings on this bill. First, I should like to add my comments to those of the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) regarding the disposition of this bill after it has received second reading. As indicated on the order paper, the bill is to be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. My question to the minister is, why should this be so? I know that the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is something of an orphan and its measures are shifted to different committees for consideration, but it seems to me that usually the minister appears before the committee on health and welfare.

I do not think this bill should fall within the prerogatives of a lot of lawyers on the Justice and Legal Affairs Committee. Just as war is too important to be left in the hands of generals, this legislation concerning co-operatives is too important to be left in the hands of lawyers, particularly since the number of lawyers who have some knowledge, feeling and understanding about co-operatives is so small. I would feel much more comfortable, and I would hope the minister would also, if this bill were to be considered by a different committee than the one proposed.

At the outset, let me say that finally we are getting a bill which provides for federal incorporation of co-operatives. As has been said, we have been waiting some 62 or 63 years for this. I have not been waiting that long, and certainly the minister and the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) have not been waiting that long because we are not that old, but the people in the co-operative movement in Canada have been waiting that long.

Mr. Basford: It took the Trudeau government to get around to doing it.

Mr. Benjamin: Since 1908, we have had 41 or 42 years of Liberal government and 21 years of Conservative government during which time the co-operative movement has appeared year in and year out to plead, ask, beg and present briefs. The co-operative representatives always received a pat on the head and been told what a great thing the movement is, but they always got the runaround. There is no particular credit to the present administration that this bill is now before us. After the length of time that has passed, the situation has become so inordinately bad that somebody had to move. I do not think it is incumbent upon the minister or his colleagues to brag about the fact that they are the ones who finally did it.

We agree with the bill in general and will support it. There are several improvements we think it needs. It is our hope the minister and whatever committee the bill goes to, will listen carefully and with sympathy to the suggestions made by people from the co-operative movement and Members of Parliament. We hope the minister will see fit to accept what we feel will be improvements to it.

There are at least three provisions in this bill which my colleague will deal with at greater length. These fly in the face of the very principles of the co-operative movement which the minister outlined. The bill is designed to cover co-operatives doing business in two or more provinces. This is what the co-operative movement has been requesting for all these years. Provincial legislation is fairly adequate for any co-operative that confines its activities to one province. When membership and operations cross boundaries federal legislation is needed.

Particularly since the end of the last world war, co-operatives have become provincial co-operatives with activities in several provinces. For this reason, the bill is long overdue. The co-operative movement considers a federal act is necessary, not to replace provincial legislation but to complement it. This legislation is also necessary to protect the name "co-operative". We are all aware of the many instances in which the name has been abused and misused by those who would try to take advantage of a name that is held in high esteem by the public. For example, one can think of some building co-operatives which use the name to take advantage of greater access to the people to whom a builder wants to sell or rent his buildings.

The co-operative movement has been, to put it mildly, very patient. No doubt we should be grateful for that patience as well as the fact that they have not been much more militant than one would otherwise expect. In this regard I need only quote from an article in the "Co-op Commentary" number 23, under the heading "Studied Indifference". In this article it is pointed out that there are many things not available to co-operatives which might be available under federal law. Let me quote from this article:

> If, when meeting the cabinet committee last week, the CUC and CCC needed justification for their use of the phrase "Studied Indifference" in describing the attitude of Canadian federal governments they need have looked no further than this:
>
> Incredibly, in Canada federally, there is no protection in law against misuse of the word "co-operative" in a company name.
>
> There is no federal legislation limiting a member to one vote.
>
> The general meeting of members cannot take responsibility for enacting bylaws.
>
> The principle of patronage returns is not recognized.
>
> Bylaws do not have the force of a contract between the member and the co-operative.

These are some of the illustrations given by the co-operative movement itself in this article entitled "Studied Indifference" to indicate how the co-operative movement has been treated by successive federal governments.

• (4:30 p.m.)

This bill should not be looked upon as just another piece of legislation affecting one area of business enterprise. In fact, I believe that in an early clause, perhaps in the clause defining a co-operative, this bill should enshrine the principles to which co-operatives adhere. I am disappointed that the bill does not do this. I hope the minister and the committee will consider such an addition to the bill. The bill should recognize that co-operatives are something more than and different from ordinary business enterprises. I believe a full and proper interpretation of what co-operatives are should be spelled out in the provisions of the bill. The bill should clearly say that a co-operative is an association of persons working together to provide themselves with goods and services; that it has a different set of values as an enterprise, and that it operates to meet the common needs or goals of a group of people who voluntarily associate themselves in a co-op. In addition, it should say that the profit motive is not one of the principles a good co-operative follows.

There are still people in this country who would like to impede, prohibit or destroy parts or all of the co-operative movement. One has only to think of the Equitable Income Tax Foundation that comes from underneath its rock periodically to wage war on the co-operative movement. The most recent instances have been during and since the Carter report on taxation and the government's white paper on tax changes. The battle is not over yet and has not been completely won by the co-operative movement. There are many struggles awaiting co-operatives. Their growth is still impeded in too many ways. The principle of business for service is still not sufficiently recognized as opposed to business only for profit. I hope that this legislation will be a major step in assisting the co-operative movement across Canada to achieve this end. This bill can apply only to a limited number of co-operatives. No. one should think for one moment that there will be a stampede by hundreds of co-operatives, the day after this bill is passed, to become incorporated under it.

Many co-operatives will not want to, will not need to or will not be able to incorporate. But there are for example, in the first instance, the national type co-ops—I am thinking of the Interprovincial Co-operative Association—which will likely want to and be able to incorpo-

rate under this legislation. There are regional co-operatives, such as the Federated Co-operative, the Maritime Co-op Service and the United Maritime Fishermen, all of which likely will want to incorporate. All of these agencies likely will go into national organizations from the regional base they presently have. There will be the primary co-operative producers, such as Canadian Co-Operative Implements Limited, which likely will want to come under this legislation since it is presently doing business in four provinces. I believe it also wishes to expand into two more Provinces as well as into some of the states south of the border. As a result of the royal commission on farm machinery, I think it is all the more important that Canadian Co-operative Implements Limited receive every facility of government, federal and provincial, to grow, expand and provide some real and meaningful competition and better products for the users of farm machinery.

My colleagues presently in this House and many of their predecessors for many years, Mr. Speaker, have raised this question. I know that hon. members in other places have done the same thing. I think it is fair to say there is no one in this House who will be opposed to this legislation or who will try to hinder it in any way. I believe this is a remarkable improvement over what occurred in our Parliament in previous years when attempts were made to obtain legislation designed to aid and develop the co-operative movement in Canada. I hope the minister will do his best to have this bill sent to a different committee than the one presently envisaged or make an effort to get rid of many of the lawyers on that committee and substitute members who have been participants in the co-operative movement. I realize that this will be up to the parties and House Leaders, but any assistance the minister can give will be greatly appreciated by many members. In conclusion, may I say that we welcome this legislation. We hope the House will deal with it quickly and efficiently and bring about some improvements to it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I should like to say just a few words at this stage to express to the minister and the government our satisfaction to see this bill introduced during the session.

Some hon. members who spoke before me said that this bill had been expected for more than half a century; doubtless the existing cooperative associations throughout Canada will welcome it. I hope that when this bill is considered by the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, the cooperative associations will want to give evidence before it and will be invited to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the cooperative movement in Canada has a long and admirable history, because since cooperatives have been in operation, they have at times given consumers as well as producers a new direction to their lives. Very often, people are exploited by profit mongers, and co-operative associations were introduced to curb their greed.

[Mr. Benjamin.]

I remember what I read several years ago about the beginning of a cooperative association for fishermen in the Gaspé area and in the Maritime provinces.

Thus, the credit union movement first had to educate people and give them new hopes. In spite of certain obstacles, it did succeed in improving the standard of living of the Gaspé and Maritimes fishermen.

In the field of consumption, for instance, numerous credit unions have managed to compete fairly with the great chain stores that had sometimes been exploiting the consumers.

Also, in the field of dairy products, people have been known to unite and achieve what they could never have done individually.

Naturally, abuses have been committed; however, they were no fault of the credit union movement itself, but rather that of the people who managed those particular credit unions.

Adoption of this bill and its referral to a standing committee of the House will be welcome not only by Parliament but also by all credit unions in Canada. The minister can rest assured of our co-operation in order that this bill be passed as soon as possible and become law before Christmas.

• (4:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): I want to make a few brief remarks about Bill C-177, echoing the remarks made by the minister and by other members who welcomed the long awaited introduction of this bill. In effect, it will become a charter for the Canadian co-operatives that wish to carry on in the interprovincial markets. The Gods grind slowly, but I am somewhat surprised that it took the good government across the way quite as many years as it did to produce a bill to regulate the co-ops carrying on business across provincial boundaries. However, fortunately the day of reckoning has finally come; we have the bill before us and I hope and expect that it will receive a fairly speedy passage, certainly since it is being referred to a committee.

Whether this bill should go to the Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs where the minister customarily appears, or whether it should go to the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs where the motion presently directs the bill is another matter. What is important is that it go to a committee where it can receive detailed examination. If it does, then I think the co-operative associations, which are a substantial industry in Canada, will welcome it.

As the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) said, the purpose of this bill is to complement provincial legislation, certainly not to replace that legislation. On that basis, I can support the motion and the principle of the bill. I hope the bill will expand the activities of the co-operative associations in Canada and

not restrict them. On that basis, I certainly can support the bill. It should enable co-operative activity to be extended across provincial boundaries and not hinder the development of the co-operatives which contribute so much to this country. On that basis also, I can support the bill.

There are many things I could say if I wanted to expound at any length on the co-operative movement, as did the hon. member who spoke for the Official Opposition, the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath), who so aptly gave us his reading of history. It is the east that has contributed so constructively to the co-operative movement as a result of the challenge of disparity and economic disadvantage. We have had to develop new types of business organizations and new co-operative methods to compete with many of our more affluent neighbours, both in the coal mining industry and in the fishing trade in Nova Scotia. Certainly, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) knows about what can almost be called the Antigonish movement, a movement which has since gone far beyond the boundaries of Nova Scotia. He is aware of the impetus given the Co-operative movement by those in Nova Scotia who were vitally involved in it. My own constituency, the Annapolis Valley riding, has today some of the more basic and progressive branches of agriculture which are vitally involved and integrated with the co-operative movement.

I do not want to take up any more of the time of the House. In fact, perhaps the minister will get the bill through before five o'clock.

Mr. McGrath: There is no chance of that.

Mr. Nowlan: I do not want to elaborate any further, or to give facts and figures to indicate how much the co-operatives mean to my constituents and to the people of Nova Scotia. But certainly we who have pioneered in the co-operative movement in Nova Scotia welcome Bill C-177 in general, and say that perhaps it is long overdue.

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Essex): I want to make one or two short remarks on this bill. After listening to so many members talk about this wonderful bill and how long overdue it is, I wish to add that I heartily agree with them. I do so not for political reasons but as a result of my long association with co-operatives before I became a member of this honourable institution. I learned the fundamentals of democracy through my work with the United Co-operatives of Ontario in my home locality, a work that I enjoyed very much before becoming a member here. This is legislation for which we have asked for a long time. At the time I was director of the United Co-operatives of Ontario and the party of the hon. members who spoke previously was in office, we asked for this legislation, and I am glad to see it finally brought before the House.

I agree with the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) who remarked that he does not know how much the lawyers in the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs know about co-operatives.

I had hoped that at least we would have been given the opportunity to examine the bill. I just want to say that even if the minister is not persuaded that this legislation should not go before the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs, those who have some knowledge of co-operatives will be given an opportunity by the chairman of that committee to give their opinions.

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): A number of us have been asking for this legislation for quite a long time and we are very glad to see it now. I, for one, want to congratulate the minister on a piece of legislation which, so far as we can learn, is regarded very favourably by the co-operative movement. That is not to say that they do not find faults or shortcomings in it, but they certainly think it is good basis for a start.

At this stage I would like to add my voice to those of speakers who have urged the minister to send this legislation to another committee. I think that the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) made a good point when he said this is a good argument in favour of establishing a consumer committee which the minister would have all to himself.

Mr. Basford: Hear, hear.

Mrs. MacInnis: The minister is in agreement.

Mr. Basford: I do not set up committees.

Mrs. MacInnis: I do not know how we can proceed unless the minister asks or presses for it. If the minister would suggest the establishment of a consumer committee, he would receive support from many members of the House because such legislation has been referred previously to the Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs which is overloaded with many other matters. Actually, this is a consumer matter more than anything else. Certainly, it should not be a happy hunting ground for legal people. I know they have had many innings already and have probably done very well, but now this legislation should go past the legal people to those who have been concerned with co-operative principles.

The minister said something rather significant in connection with this piece of legislation. He said that the reason the government decided to bring this legislation forward after so many years is that co-operatives have been under the aegis of the Corporations Act for too long and that the Corporations Act has been distorted too often to try to make it cover co-operatives. Perhaps he will correct me if I am wrong, but that is what I thought I heard him say. If that is so, than I really feel that this is a good reason for believing that co-operatives should have an over-all act. The point I am trying to make is that this is not just an addition to ordinary business legislation. This bill is a pioneer piece of legislation in the Canadian Parliament because it is the first federal over-all legislation which aims to deal with co-operatives. Co-operatives are not ordinary business concerns in any sense of the term. They are fundamentally and basically different. Their motivation is different. Their motivation

is not competition, it is co-operation. Their purpose is quite different. Their purpose is not to make a profit for those people who engage in them. Their purpose is to provide goods and services at cost to their members.

• (4:50 p.m.)

In addition, they have a whole different set of values. Their idea is that people develop and grow, and society develops and grows harmoniously and well through people working together to achieve a purpose which is in the interests of all of them. This is quite different from the ordinary concept of business along orthodox lines as we have it in Canada. I certainly could not put it more succinctly and briefly than a little pamphlet which I have here from the co-operative movement of Saskatchewan, titled "Co-ops are People." This title is a good reason for not sending the bill to the legal committee but to the Standing Committee on National Health and Welfare if the minister is not quite ready yet to have his own committee put into operation. However, I am very pleased to know now that he wants his own committee, and a bill such as this is an important reason for establishing it.

This pamphlet reads in part:

> When a person joins a co-operative organization he automatically enters the co-operative movement, a worldwide brotherhood of people in all walks of life, all with the same basic purpose and accepting the same co-operative principles. He has become a member of a great international society dedicated to the belief that ordinary people can co-operate in managing their own economic and social affairs.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that that is the basic differentiation between the co-operative movement and all other organizations and business ventures. It believes that ordinary people can manage their own economic and social affairs.

> A co-operative is an open and voluntary association in which the members organize to supply their needs through mutual self-help. The motive of production and distribution is service.
>
> Like families, co-ops are groups of people sharing advantages and responsibilities. Co-ops form a broad "community" engaged in marketing, manufacturing, distributing, consuming, finance, service and education.

This legislation introduces something new, and the minister is quite correct in believing that the time has long been overdue for a bill of this kind which recognizes that the co-operative movement is basically different from the ordinary business concern.

From talking to people in the co-operative movement some of us have learned that the absence of federal co-operative legislation of this character has meant that the pattern of co-operative development in Canada has gone along provincial and local lines rather than federal. Now, the movement has grown to the stage where it needs co-ordination, and where it is ready for the federal umbrella which this legislation will provide. Co-operatives are not an end in themselves. They are a method to help those who participate in them to grow and mature, to improve the quality of their lives, and to strengthen their freedom and independence. The role of the government should be to help co-operatives achieve these important objectives.

I believe that the scope and consequences of this legislation will go far beyond what we may foresee at the moment. For instance, I think this legislation will help people to run and direct their own affairs. All decisions made by the members of a co-op are made by them and no one else, after discussion of the facts. One of the needs of which we are terribly conscious in Canada is to have people participate in the running of their own affairs at the local level, and all the way up to the federal level. The co-operative movement can encourage people, through practical participation in co-ops, to learn this particular skill.

In the second place, and I think this should be dear to the heart of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, the co-operative movement can become an even greater force than it is now in helping people become intelligent consumers. The minister, quite rightly, is always giving advice to consumers, telling them that if they do not want to be taken in by various marketing practices they should become intelligent and sharp consumers.

Members of co-ops learn to do this not just merely by comparing prices on shelves but by participating in group discussions on their own affairs where they learn about marketing practices, buying practices, and good consumer practices. The minister wishes that we had more Ralph Naders in Canada. By promoting co-operatives we can help with the birth, development and maturing of Ralph Naders all over Canada.

Co-operatives could help Canadians in other ways. When they are strong enough they can be an effective factor in controlling prices. These days the minister worries about methods of doing that without appearing to effect direct control.

Some years ago when I was on a visit to Sweden I learned how Swedish co-operatives, in a number of instances, had been able not only to hold prices constant but to reduce them. One specific example was that of General Electric which had a monopoly to manufacture electric light bulbs in that country. The Swedish co-ops decided to break that monopoly. They built a factory which they called Luma. Even while the walls of the Luma factory were rising, the price of bulbs began to come down in Sweden. By the time the Luma factory was producing its own light bulbs, the prices of bulbs had been greatly reduced. Other successes like this have been achieved by the Swedish co-operative movement.

The co-operative movement has been acting as a brake or steadying factor on run-away prices, and a factor in reducing prices of goods and services to the ordinary consumer.

Mr. Speaker: Order, it being five o'clock the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, notices of motions and public bills.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES OF MOTIONS

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

SUGGESTED CHANGE IN STANDING ORDERS TO PERMIT RECORDED VOTE

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River) moved:

That the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization review Standing Orders dealing with Private Members' Public Bills with a view to making a report to the House with a recommendation that such changes be made as will allow a recorded vote on some of such bills.

He said: Mr. Speaker, before I launch into the few remarks I want to make, I wish to point out that while the motion which I have placed before the House is of fairly limited application, if there is a disposition on the part of hon. members and the House generally to think that there is a good case to be made for a review of the principles and the Standing Orders under which we now deal with Private Members' Public Bills, I would be quite prepared to consent to any form of change or amendment which might mean that the whole subject of Private Members' Public Bills could be considered by the Standing Committee.

I am reinforced in my view on that because last session, during the course of an exchange, Your Honour had occasion at one time to refer to this problem and to indicate that it might well be a subject of discussion for the committee. I am always glad to call upon profound authorities to support my views. Mind you, I do not always agree with profound authorities but most of the time I do. I recognize that without the co-operation of the government members this matter will simply be discussed briefly now and vanish into thin air, possibly to be revised at some other time. Speaking generally, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I have a great belief in the contribution that individual members may make to this House through their proposed recommendations. What I have to say now is said without animosity and is a general statement, but it is because governments tend to stupidity, to deceit and procrastination that the affairs of mankind move slowly. I make these observations with regard to all governments, the aggregation of people. I realize that in the very nature of government this must happen, but it is because of the capacity of individuals to do better things that mankind moves at all. It is in that sense that I feel there is an opportunity in this House for private members to do much to improve the role of this House of Commons in dealing with the problems of society.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, let us not delude ourselves. Today in this country, as in others where there are legislative groups which meet and which constitute a forum for the debate of the problems of the people they represent, there has been an increasing feeling of the irrelevancy and the failure of these legislative assemblies to do the work for which they were designed. I do not agree with this altogether, but there is enough substance to it to give us all fear and grounds for concern.

Certainly, the opportunity for the private member to make proposals which can be advanced to the stage where a decision can be made in this House, is slight. These proposals may deal with people who are racially disinherited, the economically deprived, the young, people who suffer from inequality of any kind. There is a feeling amongst many of these people that Parliament does not faithfully produce, in a form which is acceptable to them, an opportunity to discuss, to debate and to decide. I am sure that in the United States there must be the same feeling with regard to their Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I think my motion has a remedy for this situation and I ask the House to look at it carefully. At present I have this hour available, and tomorrow there will be another hour devoted to some other aspect of a private member's business. This is a useful means of bringing forward subjects for discussion but it is highly unsatisfactory in that it does not provide that at least some of them may be brought to a stage where a decision is made. This does not necessarily mean a decision binding upon the government—I do not seek that—but an opportunity where the government may feel that what is proposed is acceptable to them; securing a decision of this House and possibly of the Parliament. There is a desperate need to do something about this, Mr. Speaker. I am not charging hon. members, but there is a measure of over-all hypocrisy in our approach to private members business. I hope we can do something about this and I have some suggestions to offer.

If we are to make ourselves useful, relevant and believable, we must make some provision in this House for a meaningful debate so that the people I have mentioned will have their day in court, that court being the court of Parliament, the greatest court of last resort in this country. Though I might feel that what I bring forward on behalf of people in my constituency is a valid case, I might not be successful in persuading even my colleagues in my own party to accept it. However, I am convinced in my experience of human nature that if the case is presented well and a decision taken, these people will have had their day in court and even vicariously there will be a measure of satisfaction. This is not the case at the moment, Mr. Speaker. What I propose, of course, is only one method of achieving this type of reform; there are many others, and it might be well to look at some other jurisdictions.

In the United States, there are a great many opportunities for Senators and members of the House of Representatives to tack on to appropriation bills measures which can not only be voted on by the House or Senate, but which can carry with them a measure of spending. In other words, under the system which prevails there, it is possible to approve expenditure on a private members bill in the Senate or House of Representatives. Of course, such is impossible here because of our constitution and because under our parliamentary system the government has the responsibility with respect to the expenditure of

moneys as well as the initiation of legislative proposals. What is done so easily and so frequently in the United States under their congressional system cannot be accomplished in Canada.

In New Zealand, Australia and some of the other commonwealth countries, there are procedures by which private members public bills can be brought on but this does not happen more frequently than in Canada. The United Kingdom, however, has a different system. For example, over the last 18 years, according to my calculations, some 170 private members public bills have been initiated, brought forward, adopted and enacted, becoming the law of the land. This is an average of slightly under ten bills per session. Obviously the government of the United Kingdom has found a formula which works. It is very interesting, Mr. Speaker, to consider the names of some of the bills and the importance of some of those measures passed in that country, all private members public bills.

I have two lists which can be secured from the research department of the parliamentary library. These show that starting in 1949 a private member was able to secure the passing of the Adoption Act, the Married Women (Maintenance) Act, the Law Reform Act, Slaughter of Animals Act, Small Lotteries and Gaming Act, National Insurance Act, Advertisements (Hire Purchase) Act, Matrimonial Proceedings Act, Divorce (Insanity and Desertion) Act and amendments. Of course, hon. members will recall that the divorce law which made the first breach in the walls of solidarity in the grounds for divorce was brought on as a private members public bill by Sir Alan Herbert. This list also includes the Fatal Accidents Act, the Clean Rivers Act, the Consumer Protection Act, the Rural Waters Supply Act, the Landlord and Tenant Act, the Oil and Navigable Waters Act, the Antarctic Treaty Act and the Clean Air Act. These are a few of the 170 statutes I have cited, which indicate the importance of some of the legislation that private members have brought forward. That legislation was debated and passed by the Commons and the Lords, and has become part of the laws of England. England has not fallen by the wayside; England has not desolved in ruins because private members have been able to bring into the house public bills which have become law. Why cannot we do the same thing here?

• (5:10 p.m.)

Although my time is limited, I wish to give some indication as to how this is accomplished in the United Kingdom, not to suggest that we slavishly copy the Standing Orders they have in the U.K. but merely to show that it is feasible, without loss of government time, for this to be done, as it is in the U.K. Over there they have 20 days allotted to private members. There are 20 Fridays, ten of which are set apart for private members public bills and ten for private members notices of motions. Polling takes place there, as it does here, but the polling is for members really, rather than for bills. If I am fortunate enough to secure a position of priority on the ballot, even though I do not have a bill, I can go to the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster (Mr. Bell), who may have a bill, and say "Take my place." As a matter of fact, that is how Sir Alan Herbert brought in the divorce bill which was such an innovation in the laws of the United Kingdom. He was not successful in the ballot, but one of his friends was; and he was persuaded to bring forward Sir Alan Herbert's bill on divorce.

Of those ten days set apart for private members public bills, six days are devoted to second reading. Twenty members draw, in a ballot, for positions on those six days. The first six drawn of course have the first slots on Friday. The seventh man has the choice of second place on another Friday, if he so wishes, and so on. The last four days are set apart for the final stages of a bill. The whole day is devoted to the bill. Having passed second reading, the bill will then go to committee, to the Lords, and then back. The last four Fridays are set apart for the final stages of dealing with the legislation. In the result we find that seven, eight or nine bills every year are enacted into law.

It seems to me that although it is very nice for us to have long lists of private members public bills on the Order Paper, and this was commented on by Mr. Speaker, I should think that most members would be prepared to sacrifice the opportunity of putting 10, 12 or 15 bills on the Order Paper in exchange for a reasonable opportunity to have one bill brought forward at least once during the four sessions of Parliament, in the gamble that it might, with reasonable expectation, become law. I am satisfied, without in any way disparaging the efforts of the government which must initiate and bring forward legislation, that the effectiveness of this Parliament in dealing with the problems of this country will be immeasurably advanced if some members are given the opportunity to bring forward matters for debate and decision which, in their view, ought eventually to become the law of the land. I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the matter should be referred to the committee in order that it may examine all aspects of this proposal.

Under our system we are limited to 40 one-hour periods, plus additional time after the 40 days have run out. When I first came to this House, we spent a full day discussing private bills. I forget how many days there were then. We faced the same problem then as now; the bills and motions were talked out. Why is it that governments are afraid to listen to useful, intelligent and reasonable proposals that are brought forward by private members on both sides of the House. The government is protected. The constitution says that the consolidated revenue fund cannot be raided with respect to costs incurred by measures introduced by private members. But where social problems are concerned today, there is every need for private members who draw on their knowledge and experience—since they are the pipelines to their constituents and the people of Canada—to bring forward reasonable proposals with respect to matters of which it may take years for the bureaucrats who live in the high ivory towers of the bureaucracy to become aware. I would therefore urge that this matter be given some consideration.

Before sitting down, I wish to say that in the United Kingdom there are other means for dealing with private members public bills. Members there can, of course, bring forward private members public bills which will not be balloted on but which will be simply exposed to public scrutiny, as is often the case here. In addition, there is what is known as the ten minute rule. Every Tuesday and Wednesday, any member who has given notice for at least one week before that date, may introduce a bill. If he has given the proper notice he may debate it for ten minutes after the question period. Any member who seeks to speak in opposition to it may also speak for ten minutes. The bill, therefore, is debated for a total of 20 minutes. If the bill appeals to hon. members, they either put the legislation through or make sure that it can be dealt with at a later stage if time permits. In other words, in addition to the balloted bills, two of these ten minute bills are available to the House each week.

Instead of our present system, there might be one under which we might limit the number of bills that are brought in so as to permit members who are given this opportunity to have the proposal which they feel is worth while brought forward, discussed and adopted. I must say that if this were to happen, Parliament would be given credit for trying to persuade the people of Canada that private members have some useful and effective role to play in this House. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because the events of the last two or three weeks in this country, and events that have taken place in the United States and elsewhere, have caused people, and particularly young people, to say, "Is democracy functioning as we think it functions and as we believe it ought to function?". I am not saying that what I propose is, by itself, the answer; but it would give this House and Parliament a meaningful opportunity to bring forward issues and decide on issues which private members think are important, and that would be done without in any sense infringing on the rights of the government. I think that would be one of the many things which would persuade people that the processes and instruments of democracy have an effective place in our lives.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Jerome: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Baldwin: I should be delighted to.

Mr. Jerome: I wonder if the hon. member would address himself to this question. Instead of bringing a specific proposal of this sort before the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, does he not think, expecially since the matter is further narrowed by the allusion to voting, that it would be better to empower that committee to deal at all times with all aspects of the rules instead of with this particular aspect?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The time of the hon. member for Peace River has expired. Does he have the unanimous consent of the House to answer?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I should like nothing better than for the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization to be given terms of reference entitling it to deal with all aspects of the rules and for this reason: the first "attempt" we made at changing the rules two years ago was at the request of the government. It was to enable the government to expedite its business, and the result brought considerable loss, in my view, to the democratic process. It is high time that those rules were looked at which deal with the rights of private members. I would be delighted if this were done. However, my fear is, and I base it on experience in the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization, that unless these general terms of reference are also clarified by requests to look at certain specific problems, it is likely that those things which concern the private members most may not be dealt with.

• (5:20 p.m.)

I am prepared to have the motion amended to provide that the committee be authorized to look at all aspects of the existing Standing Order, but with special reference to priority of certain items. If not, I am convinced that many members from both sides of the House will feel that those matters which are important will never be dealt with or discussed.

Mr. Grant Deachman (Vancouver Quadra): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to see this motion brought into this House by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) dealing with the subject of the private members' hour and handling of private members' public bills. I am sure all members of this House share with him a feeling of frustration with regard to the way the business in the private members' hour is handled. Too often we see bills talked out on the floor of this chamber which seem to have merit and which should perhaps have received a better fate.

I think when some younger members of this House first listen to the private members' hour they come to the decision that it serves no real purpose because when the government business is completed, they disappear from the chamber. They do not take part in the discussion during this hour. Nevertheless, over the years it has been an excellent opportunity for new members to get to their feet and find out what it is like to debate in this chamber while members talk to each other, pace back and forth, read their newspapers or disappear from the chamber.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Deachman: That is a very unnerving situation for a young man entering this House. Up until that time the few people he is able to gather in his constituency to listen to his speeches, mostly his solid supporters and many of them pensioners, listen to his words avidly. They meet him at the door and shake his hand afterwards. They tell him they hope he will repeat that message when he gets to Ottawa. When he gets to Ottawa he faces a phalanx of empty chairs. Therefore, the private members' hour is an excellent opportunity for the young parliamentarian to rise to his feet to speak.

Mr. Whelan: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I point out to the hon. member that the only person now in the press gallery is reading a paper.

Mr. Deachman: I suppose they sometimes have to read them if they are going to write for them.

The private members' hour is not all futility. Many propositions in the form of bills have been debated in the private members' hour and, although they have been talked out session after session, they have gradually molded opinion in this chamber and played a role in molding opinion in the country.

When I first came to the House of Commons in 1963, I think it would have been impossible to have a divorce bill passed. At that time, the divorce was the basis for various private members' public bills and motions, and they were debated in this chamber. At that time the private members' hour was a public sounding board. It was one way of hearing a topic debated and of testing public opinion. From time to time, these debates provoked newspaper articles, comments and editorials. They gave light to a proposition again and again as this subject was debated in this chamber. The private members' hour was as instrumental as any other device in the molding of public opinion which eventually led to the passage of reformed divorce legislation in Canada. It served a very useful purpose in that instance.

Although technically it did not take place within the private members' hour, it was a private member's bill which was used to introduce the subject of reform of capital punishment in order that members of the House of Commons on both sides might have an opportunity to have a free vote on that subject. It was a private member's public bill, introduced by an individual member during the private members' hour, which changed the name of Trans-Canada Air Lines to Air Canada.

When the Canada Elections Act was massively overhauled last session, the subject matter of a considerable number of private members' public bills dealing with various amendments to the Canada Elections Act were referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections. One bill for which I was responsible was referred to that committee. The bills were not referred to the committee, only the subject matter.

By this device a member was able to appear before the committee to debate a particular point of change that he wanted brought about in the Canada Elections Act. I was interested in students who had been disenfranchised in the 1965 election due to a peculiarity in the act. A change was made and this will not happen again to students. This resulted directly from a private member's public bill.

Despite some of the frustrations we may see in this hour, it is not entirely futile. It serves a good purpose. It would indeed be a worthy improvement to our rules if this hour could be made more effective. Perhaps the vast number of private members' public bills could be reduced to a meaningful number which could receive more debate and progress from second reading to third reading in the manner described by the hon. member for Peace River.

The hon. member referred to the number of bills passed in the United Kingdom parliament. I understand that these bills tend to be non-contentious. The government allocates ten days in the course of a year for debate on private members' public bills. It is apparent that a subject that is non-contentious in nature and which, for example, amends a piece of government legislation in a manner that in the eyes of the government is desirable, stands a very good chance of moving through during the private members' period. In fact, by letting such debate take place the government is extending its own time; it is using the private members' period to carry a bill that otherwise it might have desired to place on its list of government orders. So in reality one wonders how many of the bills that go through the British House are really bills that are initiated by a private member to explore new areas of legislation, or are simply a device to permit a private member to carry through in private members' hour a bill that might otherwise have to be handled under government orders and in the government's own time.

• (5:30 p.m.)

I think we should look carefully at the very great value there is to be had from exploring, in private members' hour, new ideas—new ideas in social legislation, new ideas that need testing in the House before they become law. Of particular interest, of course, is the current concern over the subject of amending the law of abortion. This is a sensitive area in the mind of the public, for many reasons, and is one well worth exploring in private members' hour. The idea of a guaranteed annual income is another subject of considerable sensitivity, one that needs exploration in debate by private members. One can think of many more subjects worthy of debate and of broad consideration by private members in this hour.

It is therefore worth while this afternoon to consider the motion of the hon. member for Peace River, which moves in the direction of suggesting that we should find better ways of employing the time used in this chamber to carry on debate in our own way without the guidance of a motion by the government. I would welcome any suitable reference for sending on to the Committee on Procedure and Organization leading to a general consideration of the way to handle this period more effectively. As the Parliamentary Secretary mentioned a moment ago, I think the motion now before the House may be on the narrow side and that what we should look for is a general reference to enable us to discuss in broader terms the rules of the House and our evolving procedure in a way that can make private members' hour more meaningful.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra (Mr. Deachman) on his catalogue of achievements that have resulted from the use of private members' hour by the members of this House. I think he

gave a legitimate defence, though I confess I should like to add a few items to his list.

Mr. Whelan: So would I.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): So would another hon. member. Legislation respecting motor vehicle safety is a good example of a subject that has been brought forward for discussion by private members in private members' hour in the form of bills or resolutions. I would also point out that for many years the Order Paper had on it bills respecting all the various aspects of the Labour Code. I hasten to add that they were not all my bills; there were bills moved by Liberals and Conservatives too, depending on which party was in power. In this way we have through the years popularized several ideas in the area of establishing a federal Labour Code.

In addition to this, we put through income tax deductibility for trade union dues some years ago through the use of private members' hour. We also had accepted the right for recipients of unemployment insurance to continue to draw unemployment benefits once they became sick—provided, of course, they had started to draw the benefits before the sickness occurred. This is a matter we are now trying to extend in committee.

I am not suggesting, any more than the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra was, that the bills or resolutions brought in in private members' hour were passed; when it came to legislation it was usually in the form of a government bill. But I think it is fair to say that through the use of this hour, private members popularized an idea which it sold to Parliament generally and to the government in particular.

Many pension matters have been dealt with over the years in this way. Hospitalization was one subject, and so was medicare. A few bills did not succeed: I have yet to get rid of the Senate by means of a private member's bill, though at least last year we had a vote and a few good men and true from the other side joined us on the vote. So at least we are on the way.

I do not wish to take more time since other members want to speak, but I give my wholehearted support to the motion put forward by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). I appreciate the goodwill and the good intentions of the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Jerome) and the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra in their suggestion of a broader reference; but judging from my own experience on the Procedure and Organization Committee during the last two or three years, I do not think this would work. We had a broad reference last time, and under this broad reference some of us raised the question of doing something about private members' hour. However, we were told that other matters had higher priority. I am afraid that on a committee with a government majority and with a reference that covered everything, we would again be told there are proposals of the government that take top priority.

I would not mind my hon. friend's resolution being broadened to include further matters of concern to private members; but I think I speak not only for the members of the opposition but also for the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart), the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Whelan) and others when I say that in addition to bills and resolutions we could do other things under the rules to strengthen the position of private members.

We are not trying to take away the power and initiative of the government in so far as the introduction of legislation is concerned. But we do think that something better than just talking out private members' bills in this hour should be found. I am glad the hon. member for Peace River did not put specific proposals in his motion, though he did indicate some of the things that might be done. It seems to me that at this point, rather than giving a general reference which would result in priority being given to matters of concern to the government, in the name of the private members on both sides of the House we should have a study made by the Committee on Procedure and Organization on ways and means of improving the lot of private members and improving the chance of getting their proposals properly considered by the House of Commons.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak to this motion because I had understood via the "grape vine" that it was going to be accepted. It now appears the motion is going to be talked out, though I stand to be corrected on that. The fact it is going to be talked out is, surely, proof in itself of the futility and the failure of private members' hour. Here we are, discussing a motion that all hon. members who have spoken so far seem to agree with, yet it is not going to be accepted on any terms. As I say, that in itself is an indication that private members' hour is not working.

I am not going over the history that has been very well outlined by previous speakers. Members on both sides of the House have been involved in the private members' hour and there is a record of some success in respect of various subjects that have been introduced not only in bills but in motions. I deplore the lack of attention that is given private members' hour by ministers of the Crown. I recall the day when a certain minister—I do not think I should hesitate to mention his name; he was a former Minister of Justice, Hon. Stuart Garson—never failed to speak on a motion that had any connection with justice. We all gave him considerable credit. In many cases he talked the bills out, but it showed the importance he attached to private members' hour.

• (5:40 p.m.)

During the years, this hour has fallen into a different position of importance here. I gave the government considerable credit last year when it started to refer some of these bills to committee. I thought this was a step in the right direction. It was rather mysterious that most of the bills seemed to be from the government, but nevertheless it was a move in the right direction. I only hope that this very commendable motion does get before the committee in a very forceful and definite way.

There are just two brief suggestions I have to make. I was quite surprised that the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart) put so many bills on the Order Paper this session. This brought home the fact that there should be a limit on the number of bills a member can put on the Order Paper. The table knows I have campaigned for three or four years for such a limit. There should perhaps be a limit on the position that each member gets in the draw, similar to as the practice in the United Kingdom.

Mr. Francis: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question? I wonder whether he would agree with the suggestion that each member should have the privilege of submitting two bills for what we euphemistically call the ballot, and that any other private member's bill should go to the end of the list. In other words, there would be a maximum of two for any individual member that would be in fact assigned to come up for debate.

Mr. Bell: I think this suggestion has some merit. Perhaps we could make a choice as to which suggestion is acceptable. I am not an authority on the British House, but I think in some way these measures are brought forward by unanimous consent. I think if there ever was a time when there was unanimity in this House, it was when these matters of interest were brought forward. This would have to be done by unanimous consent. I know there is disagreement as to the final outcome of this procedure, but it is worthy of consideration. A bill of current and important interest might in some way be brought forward.

If we adopted this suggestion the interns we have in the House could work very well. They are really conscientious young fellows. This system came about through a private member's motion and I think it is worthy of commendation. There has been discussion about the interns, or a group of them, interesting themselves particularly in the private members' hour. It might not be very thrilling to pass this subject off to some of them, but they might take it on as their special interest. There might be one from each party to see that we do a better job, by giving us a little of their thinking of the situation as viewed from the gallery. In other words, by appointing them to study the private members' hour we might ourselves benefit.

I commend the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) for having the fortitude, perseverance and insight to bring forward this motion. I am quite sure the luck of the draw was involved, because it was one of the first to come forward. That is the only good sign I can see, because as I look across the Chamber I sense that the motion will be talked out.

Mr. Ralph Stewart (Cochrane): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be able to speak on this subject, but it is unfortunate I have to do so during private members' hour. We are wasting an hour of private members' time, just as we wasted an hour on Friday talking about procedure, when private members have all kinds of ideas which should be brought before the House. This is a matter which should be discussed by the committee. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) says he has been sitting on the Committee on Procedure and Organization for years. I cannot help wondering why this subject has not been discussed in the committee before now. I cannot understand why a number of these questions have not been discussed by that committee.

The fact that a young upstart from Cochrane put 40 private member's bills on the Order Paper seems to have upset the whole applecart around here. It seems that up to now nobody thought these ridiculous rules needed to be changed. They not only need to be changed with regard to the number of bills each private member may have; they also need to be changed with regard to the number of bills put forward per party in the House. This was something I was trying to offset because of the silly unbalance we had before.

It seems to me that in respect of this question of private members' bills and their number there have been some very good suggestions by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). If there is an allotment and a limitation according to the number of members in the House, it could not help but be in line with the number of members in each party. In that case, I think this is a good suggestion.

What I cannot understand is why there is so much consternation among some members of this House, and even on the part of the Chair, when a number of private members' bills are introduced according to the rules. I cannot understand why the rules have not been changed before. Why should it take a young upstart to bring this matter to the attention of the House? How long will it take and how many more upstarts will have to get up and speak about the ridiculous spectacle of a Speech from the Throne being made to a half empty Senate, with 264 Members of Parliament fighting to get through the door, before something is done?

How many other stupid rules do we have in this House just because some of the old fogies who sit here feel they have to continue with the old traditions of Parliament? There are 100 young members in this House—I have raised this matter on a number of occasions—who did not come here to sit and look at the old-fashioned ways of doing business. We came here with the intention of bringing forth ideas to reform this place.

Just as the leader of the Liberal party said during the last election, we are going to reform the rules of Parliament. There are some of us who want to reform those rules. I wonder if it is necessary to go to the extremes we have had to in order to bring about reform. I suggest that a subject such as this should be constantly before the Committee on Procedures and Organization. There are any number of rules of this House that should be changed. Why do we make statements on motions? We call them motions, but they are statements. We call public bills private bills, and private bills public bills.

There are any number of things which to the uninitiated who might walk in here would cause them to say that we in the House of Commons are a bunch of nuts. How many Canadians come here and say that, because of the

illogic of some of our procedures? We say we maintain these rules and procedures because of tradition. That is a lot of nonsense. We are more British than the British. The British change their ways, but we do not. This is like being more Catholic than the Pope.

It seems to me that subjects such as this should not be debated during private members' hour. Private members' hour is a time when we should be able to bring forth good ideas. When I had my 40 bills covered, 38 on one subject, at least one of my reasons was to show how stupid these regulations are. Another reason was that we must use every means at our disposal to bring a good idea before this House. This is almost impossible to do. As other hon. members have said, whenever a member comes forward with a good idea, it is talked out.

• (5:50 p.m.)

I remember an occasion when I had a good idea which had a good deal of support in this House. It had to be brought forward in a way in which it could receive a little more attention. Another idea I put forward during private members' hour was that our flag be presented in this House of Commons. There again it was a matter of a young upstart coming forward with an idea which nobody had thought of before, and therefore no attention was paid to it. That particular question is one which I am sure would receive the approval of just about every member of this House. I refer to the placing of the flag of Canada in the House of Commons, as is done in the legislatures of other countries.

This idea is now away at the bottom of the list, where it will remain, never to be discussed. Such a suggestion should not have to be made in the form of a private member's bill. It could be done without a private member's bill. If Mr. Speaker wanted the flag in the House, he could have it put in. But oh, no; this is an idea originating with a young upstart who has been here only two years. I believe it is time we changed our rules, because some of us are becoming fed up with this situation and with some of the snide remarks that are made when one attempts to take the bull by the horns. I am fed up, and there are many other members who are fed up. I suggest it is time the few people holding the reins in this Parliament decided to take the bull by the horns so that discussion might be opened up on some of these ideas. Something certainly should be done about the basic rules of this House so that they might be more meaningful to the individual member.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce): Mr. Speaker, I enter this debate merely to support the motion put forward by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), and the remarks made by the hon. member for Cochrane (Mr. Stewart). I do not want to talk out the motion, and therefore I shall sit down right now if I have the assurance of this House that the motion will be permitted to come to a vote.

An hon. Member: Then sit down.

Mr. E. F. Whelan (Essex): Mr. Speaker, as members do we have not the right to grant unanimous consent to this bill maintaining first place on the list? I think it is too important a subject for a member having to stay seated in order to not take up time discussing it. I remember what I went through in an effort to have a private member's bill discussed in this House. If we can have unanimous consent, I shall not say anything further.

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, for perhaps 4½ minutes let me add my views to those already put on the record. As I indicated earlier in my question, the particular aspect I wish to discuss for a few moments concerns the powers of the Committee on Procedure and Organization to explore the rules of this chamber. I particularly address myself to hon. members who participated in this debate and spoke about the subject of reform of the rules of this chamber, because that indeed was one of my major objectives in coming here as a new member in 1968.

I felt very honoured indeed to be appointed to the special committee which sat during the first session of this Parliament under the very capable chairmanship of the hon. member for Grenville-Carleton (Mr. Blair). That committee worked very hard during long hours. The sponsor of this motion was a member for the committee as was the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) who has participated in this debate.

I think any member would support me when I say that the accomplishments of that committee were numerous and very significant. In fact, the only change recommended by the committee that met any serious opposition in this House was in connection with the rule dealing with the programming of debates in this chamber. There was a very searching examination and full recommendations by that committee which brought about changes in several of the fundamental functions of this chamber, not the least of which was the approach to money resolutions and the elimination of the resolution stage which all members embraced as a worth while amendment.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question? Would he not correct that sentence? Did we not agree to some rules affecting the programming of the business, and was there not just one particular aspect about which we did not agree?

Mr. Jerome: The answer to that question is a little complex. The hon. member who asked the question sponsored a compromise position on the programming rule which set up the possibility of a decision in respect of the business of a committee of the House being made on a majority basis. One of the difficulties that has been widely discussed in this House since that time is that within the special language of the rule it does not contemplate that the government must be a member of that majority, although the hon. member has graciously accepted in the past that that was his intention at the

time. I know he does not now associate himself with that position.

Within these limits, the hon. member is perfectly right. It is just that aspect of programming that has raised itself as a difficulty and an impediment to some of the package which the government wanted to see introduced in the House of Commons in order to expedite the business of this chamber as well as the business of the Standing Committees.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hour for the consideration of private members' business has expired.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

PUBLIC ORDER (TEMPORARY MEASURES) BILL—REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have the leave of the House to deal with this matter. In the question period I stated it was the intention of the government to send the emergency powers bill to Committee of the Whole. No objection was taken at that time, but in order to clarify the situation I should like that to be made an order of the House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is it agreed that this be made an order of the House?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is so ordered.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADA CO-OPERATIVES ASSOCIATION BILL

INCORPORATION, ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION, SHARE STRUCTURE, GENERAL POWERS AND DUTIES, ETC.

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Basford that Bill C-177, respecting co-operative associations, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, when this debate was interrupted at five o'clock I was outlining some of the conditions in Canada that might be affected by the co-operative movement coming under the umbrella of this new federal bill. I was going to mention the fact that nowadays we are greatly concerned about people in low-income groups, including people in our urban centres and native peoples, and about ways and means in which they can be helped to control their living conditions and their financial situation. We do not want these people to live in poverty and despair and to depend upon social allowance for their livelihood.

The Co-operative Union presented a brief to the Senate Committee on Poverty earlier this year, in which they pointed out the value of the co-operative movement to people in these groups. I know that in my own city of Vancouver—which is also the minister's city—there is among low-rent housing tenants in one project, at least, a co-operative buying club which is applying the co-operative principles. The tenants of the housing project are taking part in this co-operative endeavour, with very good results in reducing the cost of their groceries.

Also in this brief which was presented to the Committee on Poverty, the Co-operative Union of Canada mentioned the good co-operative work that is going on among the Eskimos, the Indians and the Métis. I do not intend to deal at any length with this matter, but I just wanted to mention the fact that co-operative associations will have an ever-increasing impact on our way of living in Canada. Their purpose is not merely to reduce the cost of consumer goods but also to help the people who are using the co-operatives to gain control of their own affairs.

There is one further aspect of this question that I would like to mention. We are greatly concerned today about the question of participation in the processes of democracy and how we can keep them alive and vigorous. I do not think we have begun to realize what the co-operative movement can do in that direction, what its nature is and how it can grow under this new bill which will deal with nationally incorporated co-operatives and ones that do business in more than one province. I do not think we have begun to realize the effect this can have on democratic processes and on furthering them in this country.

It would be far better to put this point in the knowledgeable language used by a leading member of a co-operative association. Some time ago an article was published by J. T. Phalen of the Co-operative Union of Canada. I want to read a couple of paragraphs of it, because he describes so well the way in which co-operatives can help to handle the question of the tight, monopoly control of industry and also the importance of the participation of people in our democratic government processes. The article reads in part as follows:

> We insist on democracy in dealing with each other in political terms but we are slow to accept the fact that democracy in economic dealings also has validity and purpose.
>
> The present trend toward greater and greater economic power in the hands of fewer and fewer people must certainly be a source of concern to all of us. Our neighbours to the south are now facing a situation where each of a number of giant American corporations controls more wealth than the United States government. A spokesman of one of these is reported to have said what is good for my corporation is good for the United States.

The co-operative movement's answer to this is that the ownership of productive assets should be in the hands of the users. This will result in a diffusion of earnings among the people and the democratic nature of the organization will put the power in the hands of members. In this case it might be said that what is good for the organization is good for the country. If it wasn't, the people have the method and the right to change the situation.

Further on he says the following about participation:

Each of us must answer for himself an important question: "Am I satisfied to let others plan for my welfare—deciding what is good for me, how much money I should make and how I should live. Or do I wish to participate in and thereby influencing the whole range of activities that have a bearing on my well-being?" In political terms a benevolent dictator decides all of these things for the citizens and by definition in their best interests. In our society we reject "out of hand" the idea of turning so much power over to one or a few individuals. We prefer to deal with the political situation democratically. We haven't been as careful about our position in the business world. Here we are allowing tremendous power to pass into a few hands and not necessarily into the hands that might be described as benevolent. Most of their decisions are based on how to get more out of the public rather than how to help meet the needs of people. Are we to be spectators in our world—at best, orchids that depend upon the gardener for protection and pampering or at worst objects to be exploited and hoodwinked by those who have their own selfish interests at heart?

The co-operative structure provides the method by which people can participate in the economic decisions which have an important bearing on social conditions and personal well-being.

There is one more short paragraph that I would like to quote. It reads as follows:

The reasons for supporting co-operatives and encouraging others to understand and participate are complex and at the same time quite simple. In political terms our total society subscribes to the principle of democratic action. We are simply saying that the same principle is valid in economic activities which in turn has a direct bearing on our social system. We wish to have power of all types controlled democratically. The democratic system demands participation and responsibility. If we are not prepared to accept responsibility, the system is not the right one for us. If we do accept the responsibility, the economic and social opportunities are unlimited and the opportunities for personal development will unfold like the pages of a book as we go about the task of meeting human needs as brothers rather than as competitors.

• (8:10 p.m.)

This is something of the philosophy underlying the co-operative movement, and this bill is designed to further it. As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, the co-operative movement feels that this bill represents a good starting basis for federal legislation. In Great Britain special co-operative legislation was introduced a long time ago, in fact as far back as 1852, but at the outset it simply gave co-ops a legal status on which to exist and there was a long struggle before the distinctive characteristics of co-operatives were recognized in law. It will probably take a long time before this legislation in Canada is made to fit exactly the needs of the co-operative movement.

People connected with the co-operative movement are worried about several points in the bill. This afternoon the minister stated that under this legislation, as a rule no member of a co-operative shall have more than one vote. But the interpretation given in clause 3(1)(d)(i) is as follows:

—except in the case of an association the charter by-laws of which otherwise provide, each member or delegate has only one vote—

In other words, a large exception is written right into the legislation. A few years ago the Co-operative Union of Canada laid down the principles which it stated were important for incorporation into any forthcoming federal legislation. They said quite clearly that the principle of one member, one vote should apply and that the legislation should provide for a system of delegate voting with all the usual provisions required by co-operatives. This is a cornerstone of the co-operative movement. I contend that the co-operative movement is justly worried about this legislation, which breaches the principle of one member, one vote by providing:

—except in the case of an association the charter by-laws of which otherwise provide, each member or delegate has only one vote—

This definition will require a great deal of explanation in committee. The matter of proxy voting is also worriesome to the co-operative movement. Again today the minister explained that no member as a rule shall vote by proxy, but in the interpretation section of the legislation we find the following provision:

no member may vote by proxy except that a member of an association may vote by proxy for the election of directors if the charter by-laws of the association so provide—

The Co-operative Union of Canada recommended that voting by proxy should be prohibited. This is one of the matters to which attention must be directed when the legislation gets into committee. The co-operative movement is very pleased to see safeguards provided regarding the use of the words "co-op" and "pool" where they form part of the name of a co-operative association. Other features of the legislation fall in line with co-operative thinking. When the legislation goes to committee I hope the committee will hear representations from the co-operative movement on a large scale.

In conclusion, I appeal to the minister to change the referral of the bill so that it may be sent to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs instead of to the Justice and Legal Affairs Committee. We do not have a consumer affairs committee. Let him do with this bill what he has done in recent times with the subject matter of his other legislation, namely, send it to the health and welfare committee. It is true that that committee has a lot of work to do, but co-ops essentially deal with people; they come under the heading of consumer matters. Sending the bill to the health and welfare committee would save the minister the trouble of taking all the lawyers off the legal committee and putting consumers on it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-177 is certainly extremely detailed and

very interesting to read. But there is no need to study it in depth to see that it should make it possible to control quite well the operations of these associations.

[*English*]

It was interesting to note the comments made this afternoon suggesting that reference of this bill be to another committee. The minister has stated he does not have a committee under his department, but the minister on his left tonight, whose responsibilities have been greatly reduced, could put half a committee at his disposal; and, really, consumer and corporate affairs seem to be much more important. It is also interesting that there are four ministers in the House tonight, Mr. Speaker. It is not very often we see so many here.

It is my understanding that the Co-operative Union of Canada has had consultations with officials of the department urging passage of legislation of this general type. I understand there are some objections concerning its details, but these things can be ironed out in committee. As was pointed out by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) and others, basically we have no objection to this bill. I understand that co-ops in general now fall under provincial legislation, and if they operate in more than one province they come under the Corporations Act. Bill C-177 deals with the interprovincial co-operative movement. I am glad that the bill will provide protection to co-operatives which use the word "co-op" in their title. Many so-called co-ops have sprung up in recent years, such as housing co-ops and other, but they really are not co-operatives in the true sense.

This bill provides the framework within which the co-operative movement can expand, but as I read the 107 pages of the bill I see the word "minister" far too many times.

Mr. Basford: But he is a good minister.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Alexander: That is the overstatement of the year.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Mr. Comeau: The minister has to stick up for himself; nobody else will. What bothers me a little is that the word "minister" seems to be in there too many times. The bill appears to give to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs—not particularly this one, but whoever it may be—detailed powers and, quite frankly, I do not understand why all the regulations have to go through the hands of the minister. In that sense the bill is too dictatorial and this aspect of it must be well scrutinized in committee. I will give the minister the benefit of the doubt and hope that this will be exactly the type of legislation that the co-ops want, but it seems to me that the minister has too much control under the bill as it stands.

I should like to know whether the existing co-ops have the choice to opt out. I know there is a clause in the bill about transmission, and so on. As I understand it, at present the co-ops operate under the Corporations Act, and I wonder whether they can still do that and whether there are any real advantages in operating under this new bill. It would be interesting to see the type of bureaucracy set up to deal with a bill as detailed as C-177. Although the word "minister" appears in every second paragraph, I am sure the minister cannot be expected to attend to every little detail. Therefore, it will be interesting to see exactly the type of body established to deal with this legislation. I hope it can be done without too many civil servants.

Mr. Baldwin: Don't kid yourself.

Mr. Comeau: The hon. member asked me not to kid myself, but I just mention this to warn the minister not to set up the type of bureaucracy we see so often around here.

Mr. McGrath: The fastest growing empire in the west.

Mr. Bell: Like the Prime Minister's office.

Mr. Comeau: I have very high regard for the co-operative movement, which is certainly important to the community life in Canada—to the Atlantic area, the west and indeed to all provinces of Canada. The Maritime Co-operative, for example, which is involved in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland, has done a tremendous amount of good in the communities and has been very successful. The United Maritime Fishermen has also done an effective job and I hope it will be able to continue its good work under this bill. I have a very high regard for these co-operative movements and hope this bill will give them a boost and generate the interest of the public.

As was pointed out this afternoon, the co-operative movement was started in Nova Scotia. We have now a very extensive program at St. Francis Xavier University in Antigonish, Nova Scotia, and the work being done there is to be praised. A few Canadian universities offer courses on co-operatives and some conduct extension work in this field. None of these, however, offers a course as extensive as that of St. Francis Xavier. Since the early 1930s it has offered an extension program to organize and assist co-operatives, and in more recent years a variety of courses have been developed to train people in the work of co-operatives. Some of these are short courses for directors and managers of existing co-operatives and credit unions; others are offered as an integral part of university work. In addition, special courses are offered for visitors from other countries who wish to learn about co-operatives in Canada. There is the Coady International Institute, for example.

I believe that the co-operative movement is to be encouraged, but we must be careful about the type of bureaucracy set up to deal with this legislation. I hope the committee will scrutinize the bill and make sure there is not too much control by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, whoever he may be at the relevant time. An interesting point was brought out by the hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacIn-

nis). That is the well-founded rule, when dealing with co-operative movements, of one member, one vote. The hon. member pointed out exceptions to this rule on page 2 of the bill, and also raised the matter of proxy voting. These are questions that will have to be answered by the committee.

In general, however, Mr. Speaker, I think that the objectives of the bill are good and we will support it, but I hope the minister will be very careful in administering this type of legislation.

Mr. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the minister for bringing forward this bill on co-operatives. It is another important measure to bring social justice and economic power to the people of Canada. During the twenty-seventh Parliament I sat on the Joint Committee of the House of Commons and the Senate on Consumer Prices with the minister who at that time was one of the joint chairmen.

Mr. Bell: He was never there. Senator Croll did all the work.

Mr. McGrath: The minister just took the credit.

Mr. Allmand: Someone said that the minister was not there. I should like to make it very clear to this House that the hon. member who was the joint chairman of the committee with Senator Croll was there morning, noon and night working persistently—

Mr. Baldwin: How many nights?

Mr. Allmand: —with the committee to bring out what I believe to be one of the best reports of any parliamentary committee. During the hearings before that committee there were many requests from consumer groups in Canada for legislation to assist co-operatives. One of the principal recommendations of the committee report was instrumental, I believe, in leading to this bill.

Ever since my days as a student at St. Francis Xavier University in Antigonish, Nova Scotia, I have been an enthusiastic supporter of the co-operative movement. I note that the hon. member who spoke before me referred to that particular university. In Antigonish I had the good fortune to observe the work of Coady, Macdonald, Boyle, Laidlaw and many others who worked with fishermen, miners and farmers in Nova Scotia and taught them, in the words of Monseigneur Coady, how to be "masters of their own destiny" through the work of the co-operative movement. As the hon. member who spoke before me pointed out, in Antigonish at the Coady International Institute people from all over the world are being taught about the co-operative movement. I found it a thrilling experience going down there two weeks ago.

• (8:30 p.m.)

An hon. Member: Nova Scotia is always great.

Mr. Allmand: I agree with the hon. member. I was there with the Committee on Constitution and at that time I had an opportunity of examining the work of the Coady International Institute. I was thrilled to see that a movement begun by the people of Nova Scotia to help other people had spread to the far corners of the world.

May I also say that several years ago I had the opportunity to be involved in a study program in India. We visited a small town in India where they decided to show a group of students from all parts of the world a film on the co-operative movement. The film they showed us in that small town had been prepared in Antigonish, Nova Scotia. The film was being used in that village project in India to teach people how to gain economic power for themselves through the co-operative movement.

I think that the pioneers of Rochdale and those of the Antigonish movement to which the hon. member referred, as well as those in Scandinavia and many other parts of the world, have proved that through co-operatives people can to a great extent be masters of their own destiny. They can have greater influence over their economic circumstances through means of their influence over production, marketing, investments and savings.

Co-operatives have been extremely effective in breaking monopolies and in keeping the opposition honest, to use a football phrase. They do not always need to correct injustices. Merely by being there they keep those with whom they work "on the level" and keep the market honest. Co-operatives in Canada and elsewhere have been successful in the area of production. This is particularly true in respect of farmers, fishermen, people with orchards and others engaged in basic types of production. They have been extremely successful in the field of the consumer, right in my constituency in Montreal. There, many people with low incomes are organizing consumer co-operatives in an attempt to overcome ever-increasing prices of consumer goods. I have personally encouraged them to carry on their work, although it is difficult at this time for people in cities to organize and keep the co-operatives together.

I have also been impressed with attempts that have been made over the years to establish co-operatives in the field of housing. Again, one should look at examples in Nova Scotia where I believe there have been successes in the field of co-operative housing. Credit unions are another type of co-operative venture. Caisses populaires in Quebec have also done much to help their people in this regard.

On the whole, Mr. Speaker, I think this is very good legislation. The co-operative movement in Canada has been requesting it. Many of its details will be examined in committee, but in principle the basis of this legislation is sound. I do not wish to speak too long; I merely wish to say that I am gratified the bill is before the House, because I worked for some months with the Joint Committee on Consumer Prices in 1966 and 1967 and I have been waiting for this legislation to come forward. I congratulate the minister for bringing it forward at this time.

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to have the opportunity to participate in the

debate on the federal co-operatives bill because I feel that this is a historic day for the co-operative movement in Canada. There are many people in my own constituency of Regina East who are very much interested in the success and future of the co-operative movement. I might say that one characteristic of the co-operative movement which is present in my constituency, and which has been present in the co-operative movement all across Canada, is that it has gained support from many quarters of the community. It has gained support from all ethnic groups, from different religious groups and from people of varying political philosophies and outlooks.

The co-operatives, in this sense, have served as a unifying force throughout the community. They have been the vehicle for a useful and important role in furthering community action and in bringing about better conditions and improvements in communities across Canada. My interest in the subject of co-operatives is well known as an active member of co-operative organizations and as a former director and one-time employee of a co-operative organization.

I found it of interest, Mr. Speaker, to refer back to my first speech in the House of Commons, my maiden speech in this chamber on September 23, 1968. Speaking in the debate on the Speech from the Throne, the reference I made to the federal co-operatives bill was as follows:

> There are, of course, some items in the Speech from the Throne which I welcome.

That reference is to the 1968 Speech from the Throne. I continued as follows:

> The long-awaited federal co-operatives act will be welcomed by most people in Regina East. This act, which has been just around the corner for so many years, will enable co-operatives to play a more adequate role in the national economy. I trust that the promise of such legislation in this session will not meet the same fate as similar promises for such an act on numerous occasions in the past.

As a matter of fact, that promise in that session met the same fate as the promises of previous years. Nevertheless, since we now have the bill before us we can say, "Better late than never". I certainly hope that it will be carried through to final passage and royal assent.

Co-operatives, Mr. Speaker, have played a very important role in the development of my province of Saskatchewan. The story of the co-operative movement is part of the very fabric of the history of the province of Saskatchewan. Indeed, as was pointed out by the previous speaker, the movement played an important role in the province of Nova Scotia. I mentioned that it is a unifying factor in the province. It has welded together people of varying political outlooks, varying religious outlooks, varying ethnic outlooks as well as people with widely diverse backgrounds. The co-operative movement has brought them together. Thus, it has made a very material and important contribution to the development of my own province, Saskatchewan, and to Canada as a whole.

Throughout the history of the development of the co-operative movement in my province, it has concentrated much of its activity in the rural scene. This is where much of the original impetus for the development of the

movement took place; and this was probably quite natural because of the nature of the problems that were faced on the rural scene in Saskatchewan. However, in recent years we have seen a transition to a greater interest and participation in urban affairs. I think it is quite evident that the change in population patterns in Canada, the influence of technology and economic developments have all forced co-operatives to change and to develop a new, broader and more extended outlook.

Some reference has already been made, Mr. Speaker, to the length of time it has taken to introduce this legislation into the House. Finally it is now before the House, and I should like to make a passing comment on that matter. I think it is a tribute to the co-operative movement that they very rigidly adhered to the democratic process in terms of their demands and request for this type of legislation. I think it has been stated, and stated accurately, that co-operatives are the very bulwark of democracy and that they enhance and further democracy. I think it is well to remember this particular point during these times of stress in Canada. I think there are lessons to be learned from the patience that was shown by the co-operative movement in pressing for this very important piece of legislation that was so important to them. The lesson is that they have faith in democracy.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we should take note that there is a need to show a quicker response to economic and social needs in Canada in dealing with our problems at the present time and in the future. Nevertheless, I think it can be said, to the full credit of the co-operatives, that they have adhered and will continue to adhere to the democratic process in carrying on their activities within Canada.

I hope that this legislation will be passed before too long. It will, of course, pose new challenges to the co-operative movement. They will be called upon to fill a wider role in Canadian society and to come up with some answers regarding the needs of society. They must grow correspondingly in areas of need and in terms of their own efficiency of operation. I hope that the bill now before us is evidence of a growing federal interest in the co-operative movement and the role that can be played by co-operatives in dealing with our social and economic problems.

We should examine the present role of co-operatives in Canada and the new role that we see for the co-operative movement. As I mentioned earlier, the co-operative movement has played a traditional role on the rural scene. That is where some of the roots of the movement are, particularly with respect to those people engaged in the agricultural and fishing industries. Today there are new roles that have to be played by the co-operative movement. They illustrate why this legislation is necessary and overdue. In the area of urban needs and today's consumer economy there are many needs that can be filled more effectively through the activities of the co-operative movement.

We also have to consider the situation and the condition of the urban poor. There are many things which need to be done. The co-operatives are interested in playing a role in dealing with the problems of the urban poor. They have placed proposals before the government of Canada and various committees and agencies stating how they might help in tackling the problems of urban slums, and so on.

The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) referred to the role played by co-operatives in dealing with the problems of our native peoples. I think it is to their credit that co-operatives have pioneered in certain work among the Indian and Eskimo peoples of Canada. It might be noted that the philosophy of the co-operative movement and approach is very amenable to people with Indian and Eskimo backgrounds.

Thirdly, I refer to the role that can be played by co-operatives in international development. This matter has already been referred to by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand). Co-operatives are suitable for many types of activity in the job that must be done on the international scene—helping to erase inequalities that exist among nations of the world. Overall, co-operatives have a very fundamental and important role to play in dealing with the whole problem of poverty. They can play a crucial role in eliminating many of the conditions of poverty in the world today. After all, the co-operative movement works with people. As well, the co-operative movement can help to overcome much of the alienation that is so prevalent in our society. It is important to remember that the co-operative movement is based upon service, not upon profits.

In my view this bill establishes a very important principle. We must keep in mind that co-operatives are a different way of doing business. That principle is recognized by the very existence of this bill. It has been correctly concluded that co-operatives cannot be dealt with adequately, in terms of public controls and the legal framework within which they have to operate, through ordinary company law embodied federally in the Canada Corporations Act. A special act is needed. This special act must be suited to the needs and principles of the co-operative movement. It should be parallel to company law with respect to some of its mechanical provisions and with respect to various questions of public interest. It should be adapted to the special nature of the co-operative movement so that co-operatives can carry on their operations without being unduly restricted and without having to give in on points of principle about which they feel strongly.

If the principle is established for the legal framework of operation such as we have in this bill, I hope it will establish a principle with respect to other areas of law, such as tax law. The Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) has pointed out that tax law is not involved in this bill. I note that co-operative representations have been made both in respect to company law and tax law. They are not asking for special favours. They are only asking that they be allowed to operate as co-operatives consistent with their principles and within the framework of a determination of the public interest. This is set out in some of the material prepared by the Co-operative Union of Canada wherein it is stated:

> Generally speaking, what co-operatives want is legislation that will permit them to conduct business by well recognized co-operative principles and methods, which the present Canada Corporations Act does not provide for. Entrepreneurs and investor-oriented groups applying for incorporation based on joint stock company rules have appropriate legislation in the Canada Corporations Act. Canadians who wish to incorporate a business based on co-operative rules and practices do not have a legislative vehicle appropriate to their needs.

I wish to refer briefly to the study of tax law made this year by the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, of which I am a member. This committee considered certain proposals made with respect to the co-operative movement, taxation of co-operatives and also some of the proposals placed before them. I will quote briefly from one section of the majority report of this committee. This point was approved by all members of the committee. I mention this matter because, as is known, the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Saltsman) and myself submitted a minority report with respect to the white paper study. All members of the committee approved of this one sentence. It illustrates the principle involved in dealing with this legislation, although applied to another area. It reads as follows:

> The committee recommends that the basic principle to be followed should be that co-operatives, caisses populaires and credit unions should have no tax advantage in the tax system but that adequate provision be made to ensure that the operations of such organizations are not unfairly hampered and to ensure that they do not suffer a tax disadvantage.

The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway has already raised several points with respect to the bill now before us. Many of these points can more adequately be considered in the committee. I wish to deal with a couple of the very important and fundamental points involved in this bill.

Under the list of definitions in clause 3 of the bill, reference is made to "co-operative basis". Subclauses (d) and (d)(i) provide as follows:

> (d) "cooperative basis" means the carrying on of an enterprise organized, operated and administered in accordance with the following principles and methods:
>
> (i) except in the case of an association the charter by-laws of which otherwise provide, each member or delegate has only one vote—

• (8:50 p.m.)

As correctly pointed out already, this deals with one of the fundamental points of operation for the co-operative movement—one member or one delegate, one vote. I suggest it is a very poor principle when you are writing this very fundamental feature into the definition to leave a wide-open door to any association, at its discretion through the passage of a bylaw—subject, of course, to certain controls—to vary its rules from this particular provision of the legislation. It seems to me that if a case can be made for an exception to the rule of one member, one vote, that exception should be spelled out in this clause of the bill.

The only possibility that occurs to me is that there may be instances where co-operative organizations are completely owned, or principally owned, by other co-operative organizations. I have in mind organizations such as a central co-operative organization or a manufacturing plant which is jointly owned by a number of different co-operative organizations. There may be some room in such circumstances for making an exception to this particular rule, but it seems to me that any such exception should be spelled out in the legislation. The second qualification in defining "co-operative basis" reads as follows:

(ii) no member may vote by proxy except that a member of an association may vote by proxy for the election of directors if the charter by-laws of the association so provide—

As pointed out, this feature of the subclause is contrary to the request of the co-operative movement that no proxies be provided for in the legislation. As noted, there may be room for providing for a system of delegate voting; but it seems to me that this is different from providing for a proxy structure within the farmework of this legislation. The third qualification in the definition of "co-operative basis" reads:

(iii) interest or dividends on share or loan capital is limited to the percentage fixed in the articles of incorporation or application for continuation, or by-laws of the organization—

Again, it seems to me that here is a very important point to keep in mind. One of the very important principles of the operations of co-operative organizations is that there be a limit on the amount of dividends or interest paid on share capital. Possibly loan capital requires other considerations. It seems to me there is a need for further widening of this particular clause to spell out the maximum interest rate in the legislation, as is in fact the case in some provincial acts, though I concede there is a case against spelling out a specific figure of 4, 5, 7 or 8 percent. One alternative might be to give the minister discretion to set a maximum rate. But it is important that a maximum rate be spelled out, particularly with respect to interest or dividends paid on share capital.

I suggest one possibility is to authorize the minister to set a maixmum rate based on a formula such as that used in establishing rates in certain other legislation, such as the Farm Credit Act, fisheries legislation, and so on, where the maximum rate is related to the bank rate through a suitable formula. One further point I should like to make with respect to the definition of "co-operative basis" is that we underline the importance of the fourth subclause, which begins with the words:

(iv) the enterprise is operated as nearly as possible at cost after providing for reasonable reserves—

The subclause then goes into detail. This is an important feature of co-operative organizations which needs to be kept in mind. There are other aspects of this legislation which will be considered in the committee study. I certainly hope this bill meets with a better fate than previous attempts to pass a federal co-operatives act. I have been pleased to see the degree of support for the measure that is present tonight on both sides of the House. I hope the bill does not meet with the same fate in the other place that was the case on one or more previous occasions.

[Mr. Burton.]

Allusions have been made to the reference of this bill to the Justice and Legal Affairs Committee. I am open to discussion on this particular point. I think there is no need for rigidity in referring the bill to the Justice and Legal Affairs Committee. I do not need to remind the minister that last year the Canada Corporations Act was referred to the Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs Committee of the House. I am not raising this point in terms of myself, as a member of the committee, looking for any further work. However, it seems to me that the important thing is to get on with the job and put this legislation through the House as rapidly as possible in a committee composed of hon. members who are quite prepared to see this type of enterprise or business given its place in Canadian society and recognized by the laws of Canada. That is an important point. I hope that everything possible will be done to expedite passage of this bill.

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, I should like to add a sentence or two in support of this bill. This past weekend I was in my constituency and while in Saskatoon I noticed a sign at a service station which read "100 per cent Canadian owned". This station was a co-operative service station. I should like to deal with this aspect of co-operatives in my support of the bill.

I feel that co-operatives are one way to deal with the problem of foreign ownership in Canada. We have in Saskatchewan today industries that have become big business because little people have joined hands to build collectively a business of which they can really be proud. I have in mind the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool which is one of the largest grain handling organizations in the world. There are many retail and wholesale outlets in Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan also has an oil refinery built by the businessmen of the province. Credit unions and other co-operatives function in the province very well. Dividends from these organizations are paid to Canadians. There are no arguments about money leaving Canada in the form of dividends to foreigners, and I think this is one reason we should encourage the growth of co-operatives in Canada.

One other problem that arises when foreign companies in Canada decide to close down their plants is what to do with the employees who worked for them. These co-operatives have evolved a pension plan under which an employee, after five years, service with a co-operative, will receive a share of his employer's contribution to the plan should he decide to leave. In effect, this means a truly portable pension. After the employee has worked with the co-operative for ten years, he receives not only the total amount contributed by his employer but his own contribution as well should he decide to leave his employment. I think this idea could well be used by other industries in Canada. It has proved quite effective and is a scheme that a Canadian co-operative has evolved.

• (9:00 p.m.)

This is a system we should consider in connection with firms which decide to close down a Canadian plant. In an age of automation and change, this is something which should be considered in connection with all industry. Many people would move from one industry to another readily if they knew they could take their pension, which they no doubt earned, from the company. I do not want to belabour the matter but, rather, just to mention the Canadian ownership angle which is good for all of us. For this reason, we in this group will support the bill.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I must advise the House that if the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) speaks now, he will close the debate.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words in closing the debate. First of all I think hon. members who have contributed to the debate, for the points they have raised. In so far as the technical points raised very ably by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) are concerned, I think it might be better if I deal with those points in the Standing Committee, where they can be discussed back and forth with answers given in detail, rather than on the floor of the House.

I do want to make reference to the fact that much has been said during the debate about the appropriate committee to which this bill should be referred. First I want to say that I, of course, do not determine this question or say to which committee a particular bill should be referred. That is a job for my colleague, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen).

An hon. Member: You mean its all his fault?

Mr. Basford: I am not blaming him at all. I am giving him credit for this decision. Having listened to the hon. member for Regina East (Mr. Burton), I know that if the bill gets to the committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs, he is so fond of talking that it will never get out. Surely there is merit in having it go to the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. This is the decision of my friend the President of the Privy Council, and as House Leader for the government I think he has made a very wise decision. We have heard much this afternoon about the Antigonish movement and the co-operative movement at St. Xavier. We heard from a number of distinguished graduates from St. Xavier. I wish we could have heard from one of the more distinguished graduates we have in this House, and perhaps the most distinguished lecturer, the Government House Leader.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Basford: That hon. member has throughout his life exhibited sympathy for the co-operative movement as well as support and great leadership. We do not do this very often, because we cannot, but I compliment him for the support, guidance and friendship I have had in steering this bill through interdepartmental and cabinet discussions. It was the decision of the House Leader that this bill should go to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

I would agree with the remarks of my very close friend, the hon. member for St. John's East, that we should have in this House a standing committee on consumer affairs. I should like nothing better than to have such a committee, but there are a number of committees of the House now and they are determined by a committee of this House. We have had numerous committees considering the rules of this House. They have been all-party committees and they have come in with recommendations. Not one of those committees has recommended the establishment of a standing committee on consumer affairs.

I wonder where the members of the Conservative party were when these committees studied the rules of the House. Where were the members of the NDP when these committees considered rule changes? These committees never recommended a committee on consumer affairs. Were these members sitting silent on those committees? Do we only hear from them here on the floor of the House? I wish they would get busy on the committees which study these matters and bring in a recommendation. I assure them that—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I take it that the minister's references to the committee are relevant to the question of to which committee this legislation is to be referred. If I am not correct in that assumption, I think the minister might very quickly bring his remarks back to relevancy.

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your bringing the House to order, and I appreciate the fact that you did not have the benefit of hearing the debate this afternoon. It was suggested that this bill be referred to a standing committee on consumer affairs, but there is no such committee. I was addressing myself to the suggestion that there should be such a committee and why there was not, namely, because the opposition members have not done their job on the various committees. This House has had a considerable number of revisions to the rules, and it is a House committee that decides what committees we should have.

I am quite happy with the motion before the House that this bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. There have not really been any valid arguments presented as to why it should go to another committee, or which suggest there is any greater expertise on co-operative matters in any other Standing Committee. The Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs, for which we must all have the greatest esteem, has no greater expertise on co-operative matters than has the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. The Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs has no greater expertise in these matters than the Justice and Legal Affairs Committee. We do not want to get into

competition between committees as to where bills should go, but I do want to point out—

Mr. Baldwin: Why not the External Affairs Committee?

Mr. Basford: It could well go to the Committee on External Affairs as suggested by the House Leader for the opposition. If he had been listening to the debate he would have learned about the great contribution the co-operative movement has made to developing countries. This would be a matter of very great concern and interest to the External Affairs Committee.

We all know that in this House it is the party whips, of whom there are four, who determine the membership of committees. I hope this bill will be referred to the committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. If the official opposition whip wants to change the party membership on the committee in order to have some members with expertise in the co-operative movement on the committee, he is free to make that change. To effect such a change, all a party whip has to do is table a piece of paper. This applies to the NDP, the Ralliement Créditiste and the government party.

We have to select the committee for the bill to go to. I feel the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs is a good one. Let me point out that last spring that committee dealt very expeditiously with a bill proposing a change in the Bills of Exchange Act which came into effect yesterday, November 1. This has changed the rights of every consumer who has signed a time-payment contract. I think that committee can deal expeditiously and equitably with Bill C-177. If there are any problems about the membership on the committee from the opposition's point of view, then the whips should change the membership on the committee.

• (9:10 p.m.)

I want to make only one other point before I sit down. It is with reference to some remarks by the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) who suggested that the co-operative movement may well have some amendments to suggest to the bill. That movement may very well have such amendments to propose. We have tried to consult them. We have had working on this question various lawyers who are expert in advising the co-operative movement.

We hope the bill meets generally the wishes of those who are involved in the co-operative movement, concerning the kind of general legislation we should have at the federal level to govern the incorporation and operation of co-operatives. No bill is perfect and the government does not suggest that this bill is perfect. Every bill can be improved. I am not the judge, nor do I govern the committee; therefore, I do not know whether or not the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs will call witnesses.

I would hope that I, as the sponsor of the bill, would not be surprised by any amendments which might be brought forward. If people have amendments and changes to suggest in respect of the bill, concerning how it might be improved in any way—I hesitate to suggest this would be probable, knowing those who drew up the bill, but possibly it can be improved—I would ask, as I think anyone sponsoring a bill must ask, for sufficient time to consider such changes so that we are not taken by surprise.

For example, there are very complicated constitutional issues involved in this bill. If there should be suggested changes which involve these constitutional issues, we should have time to consult the law officers of the Crown and consider whether as a government we can accept or reject them. So I would go along with the hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre in respect of his suggestion that there may be improvements which could be made to the bill.

I do not know whether the committee will hold public hearings. That is up to the chairman and the members of the committee. However, if changes are to be suggested, or if improvements are to be made, I hope those changes and improvements will be discussed with me and my officers so that we will not be taken by surprise and will have time to consider them carefully and in depth to determine whether we should accept them.

With these remarks I commend this bill to the House and the committee with the confidence, unlike the feeling of some members of the opposition, that it will be dealt with equitably and expeditiously.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs.

* * *

FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING AGENCIES BILL

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL MARKETING COUNCIL AND AGENCIES

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture) moved that Bill C-176, to establish the National Farm Products Marketing Council and to authorize the establishment of national marketing agencies for farm products, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

He said: Mr. Speaker, Bill C-176 to establish a National Farm Products Marketing Council and, hopefully, marketing agencies is essentially the same—indeed, almost exactly the same—as the bill that was considered by this House during the last session. Then, of course, it was Bill C-197.

A great deal of discussion took place during the last session concerning this new departure in respect of federal government legislation. For a number of reasons I do not intend to repeat the arguments advanced during those debates in this House and, indeed, in the Standing Committee on Agriculture during the last session. However, there have been some very useful discussions—and I appreciate the discussions I have had with spokesmen of all parties in this House—concerning the need that is

becoming more apparent every day, to set up the kind of structure that is envisaged under Bill C-176 in order to resolve some of the very severe marketing problems in relation to agricultural products in the country.

A great deal of evidence was given by witnesses who were called by or volunteered to appear before the Standing Committee on Agriculture during the past session. While the committee during that period did not reach the clause-by-clause study of the bill, I believe the time spent, even while the House was not sitting, was very useful. I again wish to express my appreciation to the House Leaders and to the agricultural spokesmen of all parties for the kind of attitude they have shown me in respect of getting on with the passage of this bill.

During the discussions which have taken place on this subject I have been asked how some of the marketing plans that would be set up may or, indeed, could operate. Mr. Speaker, I have had prepared in some detail the principles that would be involved in the marketing plans that would be proposed, not only for the members of the Standing Committee on Agriculture but also for the provincial governments which also have a great deal of interest in this bill, because it is designed in such a way that the marketing agencies that would be established under its authority could also receive similar, delegating legislation from provincial jurisdictions.

I wish to advise hon. members that when Bill C-176 reaches the committee I will be prepared to give a detailed outline of how we anticipate some of these marketing plans could operate. In addition to that, I would advise that I have agreed to some suggestions that have been made by some of the farm organizations across the country, as well as to some of the suggestions made by members of the opposition. First, I am prepared to accept amendments to this bill respecting the provisions in the clause which deals with the definition of agricultural products to the extent that cattle and calves would be excluded from the provisions of the bill.

I am also prepared to consider and, indeed, accept amendments to certain other clauses to make much more explicit the appeal procedure that producers would have in the event they felt aggrieved or wished to complain about marketing orders made by the marketing boards that would be set up under the legislation. I am also prepared to consider favourably amendments to other parts of this bill that would provide statutory provision for membership and the relationship of that membership to certain interested groups, particularly the producers, on marketing boards, commissions or whatever other structure is set up under this bill in the clause that deals with membership of these boards.

Mr. Speaker, as I have said, there is a great deal of direct interest by the provincial governments in this bill. It may be useful for the committee to consider some method by which various types of provisions are provided in the legislation relating to specific commodity marketing boards. I say that because I do not believe the marketing boards and, indeed, the regulations would be identical for all commodities. I realize that it may be necessary to have different kind of structure and perhaps different types of rules contained in the regulations with respect to marketing agencies that are dealing, for example, with potatoes, honey, maple syrup, tobacco or any other agricultural product that may be involved.

• (9:20 p.m.)

It seems to me that we should have enough latitude in drawing up those regulations, which will really be the by-laws of any particular marketing agency, so that there can be an input by the provincial governments, which have an important role to play in this marketing legislation, as well as by producer groups that are particularly interested in a specific commodity. I think that is necessary because in practice until this year, 1970, many types of marketing structures have been set up for various commodities. In my view, they should at least be respected as we move forward in trying to co-ordinate the provincial legislation so that it is applied reasonably and uniformly across the country for a specific commodity.

I want to suggest, also, that we reinstate the evidence respecting marketing legislation that the committee heard in the last session. This evidence was heard from the witnesses only about four or five weeks ago, and in my opinion it is still valid. I hope hon. members will feel disposed to reinstate that evidence in this session of Parliament so that we can achieve two things: first, save time and, second, save the expense of the witnesses who travelled long distances to Ottawa to give that evidence.

I conclude by expressing the hope that we will send this bill to the committee very soon, and that we will get down to the clause-by-clause discussion of it which we did not achieve the last time. Then we can amend some of the clauses that members have expressed an interest in amending and bring the bill back to the House for final approval.

Then we can discuss specific marketing plans for particular commodities with the provincial governments and the farm organizations involved, so as to put these plans into effect as soon as possible. This should be done as quickly as possible because in my view, while a number of suggestions have been made on how to come to grips with some of the very severe marketing problems that we have today, by putting into effect the provisions of this bill and by beginning to solve some of the problems through agreement between the provincial and federal authorities, we will find the most useful and productive way of dealing with those problems in the interest of the producers.

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the minister for having put forward Bill C-176 in this session, and I commend him for his part in the consultations which have taken place among all parties in the House. We all realize that this is a very important measure and that it could serve as a useful tool in some of the trying circumstances in which agriculture finds itself today.

The fact the minister has indicated that the government is prepared to accept some major amendments to this bill is, I think, a vindication of the stand taken in

this House when the bill was introduced in its original form and when opposition members said it should not have a hasty passage because of its complexity and the necessity of giving ample time to various agricultural commodity groups, not only to study the regulations contained in the bill but to study the implications it might have on the entire agricultural industry.

The minister has been very optimistic about the bill and the power which it would give, as well as the answers it would provide to many of the problems facing Canadian agriculture today. The various groups that appeared before the Standing Committee on Agriculture during the summer varied in their approach from almost complete support of the minister and his contentions to the other extreme, almost total opposition to this bill. Although the bill has a great deal to offer the Canadian producer, I have grave reservations whether it will provide all the answers so earnestly sought today.

I am particularly interested in the fact that the minister has indicated both inside and outside the House that the reason the bill should receive speedy passage is to help solve, in the immediate future, the pressing questions of today regarding overproduction of two or three commodities in two or three of our major provinces. He has indicated that this measure will in itself provide a ready answer to what we consider to be a constitutional problem, that is, whether the provinces or the federal government control interprovincial trade.

We are well aware that under the terms of the BNA Act, trade between provinces comes within the federal purview, but as a result of recent action taken in various provinces, the provinces—through the powers that are inserted into the regulations—have seized, to a large extent, control of interprovincial trade and have in some instances erected effective barriers against the free flow of trade between provinces. We on this side of the House are curious why the government has not immediately referred this matter to the Supreme Court of Canada in order that there might be an early determination regarding the power of the provinces to stop or restrict this free flow which we consider to be an erosion of federal powers.

To rely on a bill of this nature to solve such a constitutional problem leaves many questions in the minds of the official opposition. Indeed, together with the assurances of the minister that this bill could be a vehicle by which to settle these perplexing problems, there has been tremendous pressure exerted by two or three of the main commodity groups in Canada, and by some provincial governments, for speedy passage of the legislation in order to arrive at a solution to this problem.

We have grave reservations, on two counts: first, that this bill could provide any kind of solution to this perplexing and legal problem and, second, that the very complexity of the bill will make it almost impossible, once the bill is proclaimed, to set up the necessary machinery to put the bill into effect and to provide ready aid to agriculture.

The bill as presented to Parliament today is, in the minister's own words, an almost exact replica of Bill C-197. No doubt there are many very pertinent facts which have made it necessary for the bill to be introduced in its present form. But I, and many of the leaders of farm organizations across Canada, wonder why the minister did not take advantage of the recess and of all the information of a highly technical nature that was so ably presented to the Standing Committee on Agriculture by commodity groups with years of experience—information which they presented after months of preparation. We wonder why he did not direct his department to take advantage of this pertinent information which outlined the weaknesses in the bill and the areas where it was thought the bill would cause hardship to producer groups, and so bring in a brand new bill that would solve many of the perplexities that were presented to us when the original bill was introduced.

• (9:30 p.m.)

There may have been good and sufficient reason why the minister did not follow that course of action. Perhaps time was a factor; perhaps there was not sufficient time to redraft a bill of this nature. But if time was a factor, that makes it all the more necessary for us to take time in committee when dealing with the bill. This bill is so serious and important to the agricultural industry of Canada that it must be the very finest bill that the government, backed by its civil servants and with all opposition parties working together, can produce in order to try and solve some of the perplexing problems of present-day agriculture. This is a necessity, and therefore the bill will not have rapid passage through the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

The minister indicated that he would like to have all the evidence presented to the committee last session referred to the new committee. I have no opposition to this, provided one or two safeguards are put into effect. The first safeguard must be that the government does not intend to shut off the presentation of evidence, based on the contention that we already have the evidence before us. If a commodity group or an interested party that has not made a presentation requests an opportunity to do so, they should have their voice heard. The second safeguard is that if an interested group which has already presented evidence thinks it has something further to add, or wishes to change some of its recommendations, it should be allowed to do so. If there is no restriction in these two areas, we on this side would have little difficulty supporting the minister in his request to have the evidence that was presented last session made available to the committee.

I was encouraged to hear the minister speak of some of the amendments that he is prepared to consider. Some of the basic objections that we had are in part met when an attempt is made by the government to allow some—I do not say in total, but some—primary producer representation on the agencies. It may not be possible to have direct primary producer representation on the council itself, due to the fact that the membership must be limited and that all sections of Canada must be represented on it. But this does not hold true for an agency which may be dealing

with a small region or regions. In that case we could expect active representation by the producers.

We should never lose sight of the fact that when we are dealing with agriculture we are not dealing strictly with the primary producer. We are dealing with all the marketing facilities that must be taken into consideration; and when we discuss food we must never forget that other segment of Canada's population that is so important in this context, the consumer segment. We must see to it that the consumer has something to say about the way these proposals will control and distribute food in Canada.

One of the things we were very upset about in connection with the previous bill was that it did not seem to put any direct power in the hands of primary producers in making decisions as to whether there should be agencies set up dealing with the product with which they were concerned. But when listening to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) I gathered the impression that he was prepared to consider ways and means by which it could be ascertained whether or not a major portion of the primary producers concerned did require an agency, and a determination on how the agency should be set up.

The minister also indicated that his department had been working very seriously to incorporate appeal procedures in the bill, through which any primary producer, or group of producers, could appeal against any regulation made by an agency which seemed to be working a deliberate hardship on that producer or group of producers. This will meet a major objection of producers. Although such a procedure may have existed in the original bill, it was so skilfully hidden by legal verbiage that the ordinary producer was not convinced that he had recourse to appeal. This part of the bill will require intensive examination. If it shows that an appeal can be taken against direct government action, the bill will have less difficulty before the committee.

In my opening remarks, Mr. Speaker, I said I was not optimistic that this bill will provide everything that the primary producers and the agricultural industry in general feel they need, because in the main one of the basic purposes of the bill is supply management. I think this is necessary. I think the bill was introduced to try and obtain a better and more regular price for goods and services provided by the agricultural industry.

Mr. Olson: That is right.

Mr. Danforth: This seems to be the entire basis of the bill. In order to do this it will be necessary, and it has been proven necessary in the Wheat Board and the National Dairy Commission—the forerunners of this council—to introduce supply management. But here again, Mr. Speaker, grave doubts arise. In order to introduce supply management successfully in respect of a primary product in Canada, it is only natural and logical to believe that the agency or farm council will direct its attention to a forecast of domestic consumption and normal international trade and consider this a goal for total production. This is a prime objective. It would indeed be Utopia, because then we could allocate production on a quota system, although there could be tremendous problems in trying to allocate quotas interprovincially. But once we knew the amount necessary for domestic consumption and the international export picture, the government would know what could be allocated to the provinces.

The thing that could upset this principle is the fact that we have no indication of any power in the bill to control imports. I am well aware, Mr. Speaker, that there are powers in other bills and in other sections of government management with regard to the control of imports. However, experience has shown it to be very difficult indeed to create an impediment to the flow into this country of imports of food, because immediately you come into direct conflict with consumer hopes. This is because you may be creating a managed market and a price fixing market, and because nations which trade with Canada and buy Canadian products normally take a very dim view if there is any curtailment imposed upon the products they ship into Canada.

• (9:40 p.m.)

We are very vulnerable in this country, Mr. Speaker, because even with our major resources for production we import anywhere from $800 million to $1 billion worth of food. To curtail this importation would be extremely difficult because then we would be running contrary to the GATT agreements and to what might be considered the best interests of the consumers of this country. Nowhere in this bill is there an indication of implicit power in an agency, council or even in the minister himself, to control imports. This is a major weakness. If you cannot control imports, it renders almost valueless attempted supply management, and when you do not have supply management you must wonder how much can be accomplished under the terms and provisions of this act. I see this as one of the basic weaknesses.

The second basic weakness is the fact that one should have supply management, and once you have an indication of the total supply that would normally be necessary in Canada you come up against the very difficult problem of allocating quotas either provincially or regionally. It is all very well for the minister to state that this can be done by arbitration and agreement among provinces or regions, but there are other extenuating circumstances which enter into the picture which make such agreement almost impossible.

Province "X", if I may use that designation, having been delinquent in the production of a certain product over the years has through economic necessity found that it must do something about it and has in the past poured tremendous sums of provincial money into the production of that commodity. These are the very products we can be in trouble with today, Mr. Speaker, and there is no indication that such a province or the representative of such a province would easily or voluntarily accept restriction in the production of the commodity in the face of their efforts to increase it. Therefore, it seems very difficult to appreciate that any progress whatsoever could be made. This is another of the weaknesses of the bill.

The third weakness—I hesitate to call it a weakness but it is one of the pivots on which the bill must turn—is that because marketing has been, and is, under provincial jurisdiction, in some instances there cannot be any national marketing agency unless with the complete co-operation of provincial governments. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it may be that they will have to turn over much of their legal jurisdiction to federal authorities. Through the years experience has shown that provincial governments very jealously guard their provincial jurisdictions and are loath to turn them over to federal agencies. There are many provinces in this country, and it would require the abstention or opposition of only one of the provinces concerned with the major production of any primary product to almost invalidate and render the agency useless on a national scale.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have this very precarious position: the success of this bill must hinge upon co-operation of the provinces and proper utilization of their powers. It is further complicated by the fact that the provincial legislatures differ greatly, and there would have to be a meeting of minds and uniform legislation among the provinces before a national agency or even a farm council could function.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I think you have some indication of the complexity of this bill. It is not a simple piece of legislation, and the powers envisaged under the regulation are great. Indeed, in his evidence before the committee I think the minister indicated it would be necessary to negotiate a contract, almost, between the federal government and the provinces with respect to some commodity groups in order to achieve any success.

Since the success of the measure hinges on the voluntary entry by a province into the terms and regulation of this bill—there is nothing compulsory—you see how nebulous a vehicle we are dealing with and how precarious and long the negotiations could be. The negotiations must be done by men of good will, Mr. Speaker, men with the determination to make an agency work; and they must be done on a provincial basis, almost setting aside provincial aspirations.

I am rather inclined to follow those who believe that the enactment of legislation of this type, rather than solving on a national scale the marketing problems of primary producers today will have the opposite effect. I think it will almost force provinces to become ever more self-sufficient in regard to production within their own borders. If this takes places, Mr. Speaker, the bill will bring about a result exactly opposite to that intended.

As legislators, it is not for us to determine whether the agricultural industry of our country should have this legislation; that should be determined by the primary producers themselves. I believe that our responsibility is to see that if the majority of the producers of this country wish this type of vehicle to promote their ends, then by close scrutiny, by inquiry and questions we must provide the best possible bill that we can, with the least possible government interference into the normal course and trade of the agricultural industry.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Danforth.]

Mr. Danforth: We must have the end in view of solving some of the problems facing the commodity groups today on a national scale. We will not be able to accomplish all this, of course. It is impossible under a single vehicle to deal with the majority of products in many provinces with different conditions. It is impossible to bring about Utopia. But if we make some progress we shall have served our end as parliamentarians and rendered a service to the industry.

• (9:50 p.m.)

We shall try to work, in co-operation with the government, to produce as fine a piece of legislation as we can. We know, after we have done this, that the bill will not be perfect and that it will need to be brought back to the House in future for amendment. We hope we can provide this service to the agricultural industry, to our consumers and marketing agencies. It is an experiment which must be undertaken. It must function in order that we may see where the weaknesses are, and so we may either cure those weaknesses or eliminate this type of legislation altogether. Whether it will serve its purpose we do not know. It appears to me and to my colleagues that the legislation must be enacted, that its powers must be illustrated, so to speak, and brought to bear on the industry for a period perhaps of several years in order that we may determine whether it is successful.

We feel that we are gambling with the future of the agricultural industry by bringing in legislation of this type. But we also feel that if the primary producer is seeking this type of legislation, he ought to have the opportunity of working under it. We therefore hope that along with other parties of this House we shall be permitted to bring in amendments before the Standing Committee on Agriculture. We want the opportunity to bring in amendments, in a solemn and serious manner, which will be designed to make this legislation workable. We shall co-operate with all other parties in their amendments when they have the same goal in view as my party. I was very much impressed when the minister said tonight that the government is prepared to accept this type of approach to the bill.

An hon. Member: He is learning.

Mr. Danforth: He feels that perhaps amendments are necessary and that the government should consider them. With an approach such as this, I think we shall see a measure of success in the committee stage of the bill.

Mr. Thomson: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question? When he referred to management control of farm produce, was he suggesting that the federal government should become involved and should control produce through these boards, in the way it has become involved with the Canadian Wheat Board and the National Dairy Commission?

Mr. Danforth: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to hear the minister set out some of the

changes which he would welcome to this bill when it is considered in committee. Some of us are quite prepared to reinstate, as you might say, the submissions that were made to us in the previous session with regard to how the bill should operate. Those submissions came from many organizations and individuals who expressed their point of view and their position with regard to the commodities they were producing.

I would also say that if it appears to the committee that there are reasons why one or other of those witnesses should be recalled, that should be done. If it appears that there are others who have something new to offer, who have new points of view to place before the committee, the committee ought to be willing to consider hearing them. We for our part will be placing considerable emphasis, when the bill is in committee, on the necessity of seeing that the producers are adequately represented in respect of a bill such as this which will become marketing legislation.

I believe one can scarcely justify giving powers as wide the very real protection of being in control of what the agency does and how it does it. I do not accept the philosophy that is becoming current, that farmers and those in the agribusiness, packers and consumers, are all as these to a marketing agency unless the producer has one big, happy family and that the farmer should be quite willing to sit down, pretty much like a sheep among the wolves, and be prepared to be a good fellow. The sad thing about the farmer and the producer is that he has been a good fellow for too long and now he is being plucked like a chicken.

An hon. Member: The vanishing American; that's what he is.

Mr. Gleave: The vanishing American is a good term for the farmer. You find this situation is the butter industry and the egg industry. The rapid transition of the industry has taken it out of the farmer's control. We are also very concerned about another aspect of the bill, that is, the method of setting up commodity marketing boards and the question of how effectively they will operate. One matter we ought to have concerned ourselves about in the bill, and on which we have not touched at all, is the question of a marketing agency such as this bargaining directly with the government for support prices or price maintenance. We have not dealt with the point at which the government comes in; we have left this to the Agricultural Stabilization Act.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, that there does not seem to be disposition to continue any longer tonight.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Speaker, before the House is adjourned may I ask, on behalf of the opposition House Leader, what the business is for tomorrow and Wednesday? There was a hiatus in that regard in last Thursday's announcement.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I gather that one or two more members wish to speak on the bill that we have been discussing. If that is the case, we would call it first tomorrow and then continue with the business I have already announced, which is the packaging and labelling bill. On Wednesday we would call the emergency powers bill.

At ten o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, November 3, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. KAPLAN—DENIAL OF SPECIAL KNOWLEDGE OF REASONS FOR IMPLEMENTING WAR MEASURES ACT

Mr. Robert P. Kaplan (Don Valley): I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. Last Friday during the question period while I was absent from the House the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) attributed to me a statement to the effect that ministers had given me information not available to the public about the reasons for the implementation of the War Measures Act. Over the weekend I spoke to the hon. member and he referred me to an article which appeared in one edition of the Toronto *Telegram* reporting on a public meeting at which I spoke in Toronto. The hon. member's comment was justified by the headline of the article. In fact I made no such statement. On the contrary, I said at least twice that I had no special knowledge that was not available to the public, and I was quoted to that effect in the body of the article. I might add that I made no reference to caucus that evening.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS ACT

PROVISION FOR EXAMINATION, PUBLICATION AND SCRUTINY

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (for the Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-182, to provide for the examination, publication and scrutiny of regulations and other statutory instruments.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

NATIONAL SECURITY

PROVISION OF PERMANENT LEGISLATION TO DEAL WITH EMERGENCIES—SUCCESS OF EFFORTS UNDER WAR MEASURES ACT

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. Yesterday the Minister of Justice introduced a bill of a temporary nature of which I approve, as the right hon. gentleman is well aware. Can he inform the House what the intentions of the government are with regard to permanent legislation relating to emergencies of a somewhat different nature, perhaps, than that for which the War Measures Act would be appropriate? Can the right hon. gentleman inform the House whether the government intends to introduce a bill to change the permanent law of the country in this regard?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, it will be necessary to consider this question and settle it in due course. In the present circumstance, one in which tensions are not quite abated and one in which the recent events in Quebec have caused, shall I say, emotion and passion to come into the debate, the government has found it advisable to wait until this period is over, until in a moment of relative calm Parliament could look at longer term legislation which would be somewhat stronger than the Criminal Code and somewhat weaker than the War Measures Act.

Mr. Stanfield: Arising out of the right hon. gentleman's answer, could the Prime Minister or an appropriate minister make a statement tomorrow about the progress of efforts under the War Measures Act with regard to the situation in Quebec and the success of these measures? I may say that this question arises out of the right hon. gentleman's answer in which he indicated that a period of tranquility is required to enable a permanent measure to be introduced. Would the right hon. gentleman make a progress report tomorrow?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I understand the intention of the Leader of the Opposition. When the debate begins tomorrow on the legislation to replace the regulations we will, of course, explain the situation as we see it now. I am not quite sure what else the Leader of the Opposition wants.

Mr. Stanfield: Would the right hon. gentleman make a report or have a report made tomorrow on where matters stand, including what charges have been laid and the reason why more charges have not been laid? I think there is considerable apprehension on the part of the public arising out of the fact that some 400 people have been picked up and apparently very few charges have been laid. I ask the Prime Minister whether he will say something tomorrow to allay the general concern of the public in this regard, or have an appropriate minister do so?

Mr. Trudeau: I will take that into consideration, Mr. Speaker.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*Translation*]

WAR MEASURES ACT—COMPENSATION TO THOSE ARRESTED AND RELEASED

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister.

In view of the fact that the Quebec and federal governments have offered some $150,000 in rewards to informers on the criminals who kidnapped Mr. Cross and murdered Mr. Laporte, I would ask the Prime Minister whether the government is considering establishment of a fund to compensate those persons who have been arrested without cause under the War Measures Act, in order to vindicate their reputation with public opinion and with their employers.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I must admit that we have not considered such a step for the present. The hon. member knows that the subject of compensating persons arrested under any legislation has already been brought up in the House and elsewhere. I will just repeat that in most instances such compensation is a matter to be looked into by provincial governments responsible for the administration of justice and consequently for any errors which might be perpetrated, generally speaking.

Mr. Asselin: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question.

Has the Prime Minister contacted the provincial authorities to find out whether, following errors made, they were ready to offer compensation to persons arrested and detained?

Mr. Trudeau: No, Mr. Speaker. I did not contact any province in that regard nor about compensation which could have been paid following arrests made under the Criminal Code or any other legislation. I do not think this is a particular case. In any administration of justice, errors will happen and I think that some provinces or countries have provided compensation. But, I repeat, this does not come essentially under the federal government and I do not intend to take the matter in hand.

Mr. Asselin: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question.

Does the government intend to make a definite and explicit statement so that the people who have been arrested may clear their names and no longer suffer serious damage from certain Canadian citizens?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the hon. member is somewhat late in asking his question. The other day in reply to a question from the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) I gave a definite and concrete reply which I repeated on a televison broadcast over the week-end. Therefore I do not feel it is my duty to say any more for the moment.

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. member for Shefford wish to ask a supplementary question?

Mr. Rondeau: No, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Trudeau.]

[*English*]

REPORTED FLIGHT FROM COUNTRY OF THOSE SOUGHT FOR MURDER AND KIDNAPPING

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Is the Prime Minister in a position to tell the House whether any or all of those for whom warrants have been issued for their arrest for murder and kidnapping have left the country, as was reported last evening by the British Broadcasting Corporation when it was stated that the Canadian government had communicated with all the 107 nations that are associated with Interpol? Can the Prime Minister give us some information on this point?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not have any such information. I take it that it is a normal police precaution, when they are looking for suspects of this kind, to communicate with Interpol just in case the suspects might have left Canada. I have no particular information to the effect that they have.

[*Translation*]

MURDER OF PIERRE LAPORTE AND KIDNAPPING OF JAMES CROSS—EFFICIENCY OF POLICE INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister.

Considering the time it is taking our police forces to find the kidnappers of Mr. Cross and the murderers of Mr. Laporte, do the Ottawa and Quebec governments intend to call upon other police forces, such as Scotland Yard or the F.B.I.?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): We have not considered such an action, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

APPREHENDED INSURRECTION—CRTC REQUEST TO OTTAWA PRIVATE RADIO STATIONS TO PROVIDE CERTAIN TAPES

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is really for the Secretary of State who unfortunately is not here today. I would ask the Prime Minister to take it as notice or, if he knows now, to tell the House if there is any relationship at all with the telegrams from the CRTC to four private radio stations in Ottawa requesting them to deliver to the CRTC, within two weeks, 12 days of 24-hour tapes during the relevant period when this unfortunate crisis developed? If he does not know, could he find out whether the Secretary of State would make a statement tomorrow in view of this rather unusual request by telegram?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I believe it is the object of the CRTC to monitor the performance of radio and television in various parts of Canada on various events. It is possible that they have sent these telegrams. I will transmit the question to the Secretary of State and if he sees anything that can be answered I am sure he will.

QUEBEC—INFORMATION CONCERNING ALLEGED DISCUSSIONS ON ESTABLISHMENT OF PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister. Yesterday the Prime Minister said that all last week members of the opposition had been spreading rumours—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): —with respect to the discussions regarding the establishment of a provisional government in the province of Quebec. Last night a number of members of the Press Gallery appearing on a television show said that rather than getting these rumours from the opposition they got them from persons highly placed in the government. In view of the serious nature of these rumours, is the Prime Minister prepared to have either an investigation by a committee of this House or an independent inquiry made into the source of these rumours in order that we may know who is actually responsible for disseminating them?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Listening attentively to the question, it would appear to me that last night the press began spreading some more rumours, and the hon. member is now repeating them.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact there is a growing suspicion that these rumours were disseminated in a clumsy attempt to explain the government's imposition of the War Measures Act, may I ask—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me that the hon. gentleman is now making a speech. I appreciate that he may have a supplementary question and I would invite him to put it.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, in view of that may I ask the Prime Minister if he can assure the House that none of these statements have come from any of his colleagues in the cabinet?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the hon. member is asking me seriously to control everything which is said, not of a secret nature, by all my ministers, but that is not my way of proceeding.

* * *

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SOUTH AFRICA—EMBARGO ON EXPORT OF ARMS—REPRESENTATIONS BY CANADA TO GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, I should like to put my question to the Prime Minister.

Following Canada's decision announced yesterday in the House to no longer sell aircraft piston engines and spare parts to South Africa on account of its apartheid policy, has the government considered the possibility of making representations to the British government to ensure that it will abide by the United Nations policy towards South Africa?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the House knows of course that I was in touch with the British government some months ago in respect of this matter.

Mr. Rondeau: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

Could the Prime Minister tell us whether or not he has received any reply from Great Britain in this connection?

Mr. Trudeau: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have been told in quite a general way that my representations would be taken into consideration.

* * *

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION

ADMISSION TO CANADA OF BLACK PANTHER MEMBER, RAYMOND HEWITT

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. It has to do with a revolutionary by the name of Hewitt who describes himself as minister of education in the Black Panthers. He is to speak in Winnipeg later this week to a group within the University of Manitoba, and objection has been taken by various officials of the university to the admission into Canada of this person. In view of all the circumstances existing today, is the minister prepared to direct Hewitts' return when he arrives at the frontier instead of allowing him to come into Canada and stir up potential bloodshed by his advocacy of revolution?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, in reply to that question I think I should say two basic things besides saying that I am not sure that the events of these days should too much colour our judgment in regard to all of these matters. First, it would be one thing in any case to be sure how the minister could direct such a thing in terms of practical possibilities while at the same time welcoming the many American visitors who come to this country. Second, it has tended to be the policy of the department and the government not lightly to turn away people who are coming to this country at the invitation of a responsible body, which in this case I understand to be the Student Union of the University of Manitoba. On the basis of the information known to my officials I do not think it can be said that the gentleman in question is in a prohibited class.

Mr. Diefenbaker: This is one time that the minister speaks the language of the NDP. May I ask the minister whether it is a fact that the RCMP got in touch with the Department of Immigration with a view to having this man prevented from entering Canada?

An hon. Member: How did you find that out?

An hon. Member: Never mind; he did.

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I cannot confirm that as a fact. There may have been some contact by some police officer with the department, but I am not at all certain that it was the RCMP. I have checked and have been informed that there was no such request from the Attorney General of Manitoba.

An hon. Member: The city police, then?

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): As a supplementary question I should like to ask the minister if someone entering this country from another country, particularly from the United States, who fitted into the picture of the new crimes created by the War Measures Act would be treated any differently than a Canadian is treated today?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me the question is a question of principle—

Mr. Woolliams: It is a good question.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member suggests it is a good question and it probably is. However, the hon. member is asking a rhetorical question and in that sense it is not in order.

Mr. Woolliams: I wonder if I might rephrase it, Mr. Speaker, because I was not trying to put a rhetorical question, with the greatest respect. We have already had some of these people enter Canada so it really is a practical question. I am asking this simple question: Does the law apply to those people coming in who fit into the picture the same as it would apply to a Canadian who has been detained without right of counsel and without being charged?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, while the hon. member has tried, I think he has rephrased his question in another form of hypothesis. All I can say is that there is the law and there are the regulations and these are what we seek to apply.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member for St. Boniface rising on a supplementary?

Mr. Joseph-Philippe Guay (St. Boniface): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

I should like to ask the Minister of Immigration whether he has been in communication with the Attorney General of the province of Manitoba in regard to this Black Panther and whether the Manitoba minister approves the policy of the federal government to allow Ray "Masai" Hewitt into the province of Manitoba to speak on Friday?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, as far as I know there has been no communication to us from the government of Manitoba.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

ASSISTANCE TO RYERSON PRESS TO PREVENT TAKEOVER BY UNITED STATES INTERESTS—POLICY RESPECTING TEXTBOOK PUBLISHERS

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Did the government entertain a request from the Ryerson Press publishing house for assistance which would have prevented that company having to sell out to United States interests?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems to me that question was asked yesterday. If I am wrong, perhaps the minister can reply to it.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, with great respect, the question was not put in the same manner yesterday. My question is, was a request for assistance made to the government and why did the government not entertain such a request?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I can only say that such a request did not come to me. I will find out if other ministers received one.

Mr. McGrath: May I ask what stand the government is taking in view of the alarming number of takeovers by United States companies of Canadian publishing houses involved in the publication of Canadian textbooks?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has asked the minister to make a statement of policy. I do not think he can do this at this time.

Mr. Baldwin: He has no policy.

FOREIGN OWNERSHIP OF CANADIAN COMPANIES—AMENDMENTS TO COMBINES INVESTIGATION ACT

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Government House Leader. Can the President of the Privy Council indicate when the amendments to the Combines Investigation Act will be introduced in the House in order that we might give further consideration to steps to prevent the takeover of firms such as Ryerson Press by foreign concerns?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot indicate the time when that legislation will be brought forward.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister. In view of the great importance that school texts in particular have in the thinking of young Canadians, would the government give immediate consideration to putting the publishing industry in the same category as banking and broadcasting in terms of requiring Canadian ownership?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should know that banking and broadcasting are within federal jurisdiction and that therefore we have a particular responsibility toward the policies developed therein, but this is not the case, obviously, with publishing.

WITHDRAWAL OF TAX EXEMPTIONS GRANTED TO CHURCHES

Mr. David Anderson (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Finance. In light of this further example that Canadian churches operate according to normal commercial practices, may I ask the Minister of Finance whether he intends to withdraw the tax exemptions which organized religions enjoy in his country?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): No, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

NUCLEAR PLANNING GROUP MEETING—CONCLUSIONS REACHED ON CONTROL AND OPERATION OF WEAPONS

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. Can the minister give the House any information as to the conclusions reached by the group of ministers and chiefs of staff of a number of NATO countries who met here last week to study the control and operation of nuclear weapons within the NATO alliance?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member will recall, although when he himself was Minister of National Defence the Nuclear Planning Group did not exist, it has not been the practice for security reasons to indicate the specific conclusions arrived at. There was, however, a discussion at that meeting of the political criteria which should apply to any decisions by Governments concerning possible defensive use of nuclear weapons. There was a further refining of these criteria and, in particular, there was a consideration of atomic demolition munitions, the point being clearly made that their use would be preceded only by a political decision.

Mr. Harkness: Was any consensus arrived at as to a greater share in the control of the use of nuclear weapons by the alliance as a whole instead of having that control rest, as it does at the present time, almost entirely in the hands of United States?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, one of the purposes of the Nuclear Planning Group is to exercise broader political control over these weapons. The basic terms of the agreements remain unchanged. However, this particular group provides the basis upon which general political criteria governing their possible use can be worked out.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the minister whether there was a reaffirmation of the general principle that the seabed will not be used for the proliferation of nuclear instruments of any sort?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, as to whether that particular question was discussed or not I do not think I can say, because of the generally accepted principle of not discussing individual items.

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. During the meetings, was there any discussion concerning the use of the surplus CF-5 aircraft? If so, what decision was reached?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Mr. Speaker, I might remind the hon. member that the name of the group is the Nuclear Planning Group, which of course would not deal with aircraft with conventional support capabilities such as the CF-5.

* * *

GRAIN

SUBMISSION OF PRODUCTION AND RECEIPTS POLICY TO AGRICULTURAL CONGRESS—REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the minister in charge of the Wheat Board. In view of the fact that the second agricultural congress is scheduled to meet in Ottawa, later in November, and in view of the fact that the proposals for a grain production and receipts policy for the western grains industry in some ways conflict with and in some ways complement the proposals of the task force, is it the intention of the minister to put this policy before the congress at that time?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the congress is essentially within the responsibility of my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture. However, I understand that the proposals which I laid before the House several days ago are likely to come before the congress in one form or another. I will certainly welcome discussion of them on that occasion.

Mr. Gleave: In view of the wide implications of these proposals, is the minister prepared to refer them to the Standing Committee on Agriculture so that farm organizations and other interested parties can appear before the committee to discuss these proposals in advance of their implementation?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, we will certainly welcome extremely wide discussion of these proposals. It is our hope that before very long they will be presented to this House in the form of legislation. At that time there will be an opportunity for detailed examination before the committee.

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): My supplementary question is in connection with the timing of such legislation. Can the minister give a date when such legislation, based on the announcement made the other day, will be introduced in the House?

Mr. Lang: No, Mr. Speaker. We do not have a specific schedule in mind, although the matter is of some urgency if the proposals are to be in the form of concrete legislation and in effect for this crop year.

Inquiries of the Ministry

PRODUCTION AND RECEIPTS POLICY—PAYMENT OF STORAGE DURING CURRENT CROP YEAR

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): In view of the proposals the minister tabled in the House, is it the intention of the government to continue to pay storage on grain during the current crop year as provided under the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, the proposals indicate an intention to eliminate the payments being made under the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act. The exact form of elimination will appear in the legislation when it is brought forward.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

ESTABLISHMENT OF INCOME STABILIZATION PROGRAM FOR MILK PRODUCERS

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Following the announcement made by the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board that effective August 1, 1970, the government would propose a stabilization program through which producers would be paid the difference between their eligible returns and the average eligible returns for the five previous years—the equivalent of providing western producers with a guaranteed income—is the minister in a position to state before this House whether the government intends to set up a similar program for stabilizing the returns of dairy producers of Eastern Canada?

[*English*]

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Not in exactly the same terms, Mr. Speaker, although I am sure the hon. member will agree that the $115 million that we now provide to the dairy industry promotes the same cause in many respects.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Agriculture.

Since the amount mentioned by the minister concerning the grant made to the Canadian Dairy Commission is insufficient at present, does the minister intend to reexamine that question in order to give a stable income to milk producers as he did for western farmers?

[*English*]

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of consideration and review now going on with respect to the future types of dairy policy which will be most useful to the dairy farmers. I am sure these are well known to the hon. member.

[*Later:*]

[*Translation*]

DAIRYING—REVISION OF POLICY RESPECTING GRANTS

Mr. André Fortin (Lotbinière): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Agriculture.

[Mr. Lang.]

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Lotbinière wants to ask a supplementary question. Is it about the previous question?

Mr. Fortin: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Since the minister stated recently in this House that the balance is established between production and consumption of dairy products and that he intended to carry on studies in order to review this policy, could he say whether he expects a real change in this policy in the near future?

[*English*]

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I do not recall saying that a normal balance has now been established. What I did say was that the policies or amendments to the policy that was introduced on April 1 of this year had been helpful in restoring the balance, in other words, decreasing overproduction. There is a great deal more that needs to be done with the co-operation of the provinces so that the over-all production of both manufactured and fluid milk will be in balance with domestic consumption.

* * *

FINANCE

CANADA SAVINGS BONDS—PURCHASE BY BANK OF CANADA

Mr. R. N. Thompson (Red Deer): I have a question for the Minister of Finance. Can the minister inform the House what portion of the current issue of Canada Savings Bonds is being or has been purchased by the Bank of Canada?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the Bank of Canada does not purchase Canada Savings Bonds.

Mr. Thompson: Will the minister explain to the House why in advertisements which have been appearing in recent weeks in the newspapers it is indicated that a certain percentage of these savings bonds have been reserved for the Bank of Canada?

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, I would like my hon. friend to show me the advertisements to which he is referring. When Canada Savings Bonds go through the Bank of Canada, it is a redemption of bonds coming back to the treasury.

Mr. Thompson: Can the minister inform the House how soon he expects to reduce the current interest rates charged by the Bank of Canada?

An hon. Member: After the next election.

Mr. Benson: I presume the hon. member is referring to the bank rate which has been reduced three times in the last four or five months. The decision as to the reduction of the bank rate lies with the Governor of the Bank of Canada.

[*Translation*]

POLLUTION

GASPÉ—LEAKAGE OF OIL FROM TANKER "ESSO KOBE"

Mr. Alexandre Cyr (Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Transport.

Has he been advised that the tanker *Esso Kobe* is now experiencing some difficulties at the Mont-Louis wharf in the Gaspé area, after striking a reef, and that oil is escaping from one of its compartments? If so, are the officials of the Department of Transport supervising pollution control operations?

[*English*]

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, a preliminary inquiry began yesterday into this particular oil spill. The evidence so far indicates that some oil leaked from the vessel while it was being unloaded. Divers discovered that there was a rupture in one of the tanks. That tank was emptied. The oil that actually seeped on to the surface was destroyed by chemicals.

* * *

CANADA SHIPPING ACT

SUGGESTED REFERENCE OF AMENDING BILL TO COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): May I ask the Minister of Transport what success he has had in connection with the undertaking he gave to the House to have Bill C-2, amendments to the Canada Shipping Act dealing with pollution, referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications instead of the Special Committee on Environmental Pollution as it now stands?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): I think this is a matter for the House or House Leaders to discuss. I have not been personally involved. I indicated that I am quite prepared to have it go to either committee.

* * *

NAVIGATION

SEABED OUTCROPPINGS IN NORTHWEST PASSAGE—LIMITING OF USE UNTIL INSTALLATION OF MARKERS

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. In view of the newly discovered outcroppings from the seabed which extend to within 50 feet of the surface in the Northwest Passage, will any steps be taken to limit navigation in these waters until some new type of suitable navigation marker is installed?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): At the moment there is no indication of any sizeable increase in the amount of traffic through the Northwest Passage. I agree that this has created an additional hazard. The officials are examining it. Obviously that portion of the passage will now be marked, but there is a necessity for a much more comprehensive hydrographic survey of that region in order that these unknown obstacles will be identified if and when the passage is used on a regular basis.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REMOVAL OF BUDGET FREEZE—COMPLETION OF DESTROYER CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. I welcome him back to the House. I hope he had a good trip west. Has the minister either directly or indirectly requested the government to release the current freeze on the budget of the Department of National Defence?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for his kind remarks. I want to say how much those of us who attended the Nuclear Planning Group appreciated the hospitality we received in the west, which I am sure would have been matched in the east. As to the hon. member's question, the answer is no.

Mr. Forrestall: I have a supplementary which is of some consequence, Mr. Speaker. Since the minister is apparently not in a position to tell us the result of the review of the DDH-280 program, would he indicate how in God's name he will be able to pay for it unless he gets some more money?

Mr. Speaker: Order. To the Chair, at least, that sounds like an argument—the initiation of a debate.

Mr. Forrestall: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to this important matter the minister has my full support. I want him to have more money.

* * *

FINANCE

SUGGESTED INTERIM INCOME TAX CHANGES TO ASSIST PENSIONERS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Having regard to the delay which is being experienced in bringing in over-all income tax changes, is the government giving consideration to an interim measure which would remove some of the anomalies and unfairnesses faced by persons whose only income is their pensions?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): If there are to be changes in taxation they would, of course, be the subject of a budgetary statement in the House. If there are to be changes in other measures affecting older people, they would be announced in the House in due course.

Inquiries of the Ministry

HOUSE OF COMMONS

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMITTEE TO EXAMINE STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS AND REGULATIONS

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the President of the Privy Council. In giving credit to the government for bringing in legislation dealing with the scrutiny of regulations and statutory instruments, I should like to ask whether it is the intention shortly to introduce a proposal making effective the committee's companion suggestion to set up a scrutiny committee of the House to examine regulations?

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): This matter is alluded to in the bill mentioned by the hon. member and presumably we shall act on it further.

Mr. Baldwin: In view of the fact that the objectivity of such a committee might be enhanced if its chairman were not from the government side of the House, and in view of the obvious fondness of the government for governing by Order in Council, will the government consider appointing an opposition member as chairman of such a committee or, at least, recommending that an opposition member be appointed?

Mr. MacEachen: If it were possible to find an objective opposition member.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member for Wellington rising on a question of privilege?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

* * *

INDUSTRY

AUTOMOBILES—CANADIAN AND UNITED STATES PRICES

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In this period of adjustment of the prices charged by car manufacturers for 1971 models, can he assure the House that Canadians will be able to buy Canadian made cars at the same prices as Americans buy these cars?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): I would hope it would be a lower price, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: When is Christmas?

Mr. Hales: Is the minister assuring us by his answer that Canadians will be able to buy these Canadian made cars at the same prices as Americans?

Mr. Pepin: On a number of occasions, in answer to questions, I have spoken about the reduction of the gap which exists between American and Canadian manufacturers' prices. I have drawn attention to the fact that this gap was slowly decreasing. I also recall saying that expectations that it will disappear altogether are not in existence at the present time because, apparently, there are costs in Canada which are special to our situation here.

Mr. Speaker: We are running short of time; perhaps the Chair might recognize the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby, and then we could go on to another subject.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To go beyond the frivolity of the answers we have been getting from the minister for the past two years—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I mentioned a moment ago that we were running out of time. The hon. member has taken more than his share already.

Mr. Broadbent: I will come right to the point, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister inform the House whether he has held discussions with the automobile industry within the last two months on this question?

Mr. Pepin: I would have to check before I could give the hon. member the date of the last occasion on which I met with representatives of the industry to see if it is a little more or a little less than two months. But it is well known that I meet with the industry regularly to discuss this and other matters.

* * *

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL PARKS

POLICY RESPECTING PERPETUAL LEASES

Hon. Marcel Lambert (Edmonton West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

A month ago the minister promised to make a statement on motions regarding the policy on leases in national parks. He then asked for a 15-day delay. As we have been waiting for a month, could the minister tell us if he will make it this week?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I hope to make a statement on leases in national parks this week.

* * *

[*English*]

NATIONAL REVENUE

INQUIRY AS TO CLOSING OF SYDNEY TAXATION OFFICE

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): My question is for the Acting Minister of National Revenue; I hesitate to raise this type of question now, but I do so because there is an urgency attached to it which may not be obvious to Your Honour. Can the minister advise us whether his department plans to close the national revenue taxation office at Sydney?

Mr. Speaker: Obviously the hon. member can well understand that the urgency of the matter is not apparent to the Chair. However, the question having been asked, perhaps the minister might reply quickly.

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Acting Minister of National Revenue): I should like to point out that the Minister of National Revenue will be in the House tomorrow.

* * *

POWER

SKAGIT RIVER—ACTION TO PREVENT FLOODING OF VALLEY

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): My question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Is he or some other minister planning to announce any government action in the near future relating to the flooding of the Skagit Valley in British Columbia?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): The matter is under consideration by the government but no announcement is planned for today. If an announcement is to be made it will be made in the House in the normal and proper fashion.

Mr. Rose: Since west coast news sources indicate that a judicial inquiry is imminent, can the minister tell us whether such an inquiry is, in fact, contemplated?

Mr. Greene: The entire matter is under review, including any aspects in which the federal government has a proper constitutional role which it might or should take under consideration. If any action is contemplated, it will be announced in the proper manner.

* * *

FINANCE

REDUCTION IN DEPARTMENTAL PUBLIC RELATIONS BUDGETS BECAUSE OF OPERATIONS OF INFORMATION CANADA

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the President of the Treasury Board. In light of the announcement yesterday that Information Canada will be taking over the organizing and developing of each individual public relations program in the various government departments, can the minister tell us whether he expects there will be a reduction in the individual budgets of each department accordingly?

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): What do you think?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): As a consequence of setting up Information Canada it would be expected that economies would be achieved in the operation of individual departmental information units.

An hon. Member: You are not serious.

Mr. Bell: Will the minister check? Will he make certain that he gives us the size of the reduction within each department, because everybody in the Press Gallery who wants a job in the government is now getting one?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING AGENCIES BILL

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL MARKETING COUNCIL AND AGENCIES

The House resumed from Monday, November 2, consideration of the motion of Mr. Olson that Bill C-176, to establish the National Farm Products Marketing Council and to authorize the establishment of national marketing agencies for farm products, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned yesterday I was commenting on some of the amendments which the minister suggested might go forward in connection with this bill. One of the most important suggestions was that the bill might be amended so that any possibility of marketing beef cattle or calves under this legislation would be removed. It seems to me rather strange that the minister would indicate he is in favour of emasculating the bill by removing from it the potential to achieve the very objectives which he has repeatedly said in the committee and in this House are the objectives of the legislation.

• (2:50 p.m.)

On being questioned in the committee, the minister stated that one of the objectives of this bill is to correct the present balkanization which is taking place and has taken place in agricultural trade in this country. He said it is designed to correct the situation where one province can say to another: You cannot bring this product into the province. When he was asked about taking this problem to the Supreme Court for decision, he said he did not propose to go to the Supreme Court to correct the situation.

The minister has deliberately brought in a piece of legislation which eliminates one of our main agricultural products, and informs the House that he has the answer to the situation which exists. How do we know whether a year or two years from now one of the provinces of Canada will not decide that it does not choose to allow the sale of beef cattle or calves from other parts of Canada in that province? Should that occur, there would be no possibility of dealing with the situation under this act if the proposed amendments are made. These are the clear implications of this amendment.

I refer to a copy of the proceedings of a press conference in which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) stated the policy of this government in reference to the possibility of solving the present problems of marketing agricultural farm products between provinces. The prime minister said:

> I don't have the reference to what Mr. Olson said, but the federal position is that of course we have no objection to a reference to the Supreme Court as a matter of principle, but we don't think it would be the right solution in practice, because the reference would take a lot of time and if the bill on marketing legislation which is now before the federal parliament, and which was prevented from passing by some opposition members before the summer adjournment, if we can get it through when parliament reconvenes, it will be much better than going through the Supreme Court—

This is an awkward alternative presented not only by the minister but by the Prime Minister and the government. The government expects the opposition, which it has condemned in this statement and charged with obstructing the bill, to seriously consider this bill in committee if and when it is referred, although the government has emasculated and hampered it and will have made it partially inoperative before it even receives the sanction of this House. The government expects us to seriously consider its honest intent to bring the marketing of farm products in Canada under the control of marketing agencies in order to enable producers to do an effective job of marketing. I wonder who is being kidded. Anyone who is aware of the implications and interactions in respect of the marketing of farm products knows the various exchanges and the competition that exists between the producers and the consumers in the marketplace.

Following a constitutional conference there was a communiqué which indicated there was a consensus among the provinces that beef cattle and calves would be excluded. Yet following that communiqué the minister of agriculture for the province of Manitoba appeared before the Standing Committee on Agriculture and stated clearly and without equivocation that his government was opposed to the exclusion of beef cattle and calves under this legislation. The minister also said as follows:

> It is our understanding that in the opinion of the government of Canada the current frictions between provinces over interprovincial trade in agricultural products will be more speedily resolved through speedy passage of Bill C-197 than by reference to the Supreme Court of Canada. In our opinion the act will only achieve that goal if the proposed legislation is amended to clarify and reaffirm the principles which shall govern interprovincial trade in Canada.

The brief goes on to say that they are in favour of a system of orderly marketing of farm products and are in agreement with the intent of the legislation proposed in Bill C-197. The brief states:

> We are concerned, however, about recent statements that amendments to the act are being considered to exclude cattle from the jurisdiction of the proposed National Farm Products Marketing Council. The fact that the chaotic conditions prevailing in the marketing of some farm products are not present in the marketing of cattle is not sufficient reason for explicitly excluding cattle from a national marketing act which is, after all, enabling or umbrella legislation. Beef is an important farm product which is produced, marketed, and consumed in competition with other farm products; it cannot be said that there are no problems in the marketing of cattle which, at some future date, producers may want to tackle through action under a national marketing act. It is fairly well agreed that as long as producers do not express the need for a national marketing agency for cattle, no such agency will be established under the act.

That is fair enough, but the decision as to what products will come under the act will, hopefully, be made by the producers of those products. Let us hope this will be a decision of the producers rather than of provincial governments. This act is designed so that the producers, in co-operation and co-ordination with governments, can make the decisions. If this act becomes nothing more than a sort of convenience for provincial governments to solve internal differences in marketing between provinces by setting up quotas and regional areas within which they shall function, it will not accomplish very much.

The minister, speaking last May to the Canadian Food Processors Association, as reported in the *Globe and Mail* for May 14, said:

> —without "some form of intervention in the marketplace, the farmer does not have fair and adequate power."

• (3:00 p.m.)

Now, does this apply to all products except beef? Is the minister, by virtue of excluding it, saying we need not be concerned. The packing companies now have substantial feed lots which they can use effectively in two ways. The packing companies can go on the market and purchase feeders and then, when those cattle are in condition, they can be brought back on the market in periods in which it would be advantageous to do so, thus enabling the companies to stay off the public market? Is the minister not aware that this is part of the picture? He apparently is aware that the situation exists because he so stated in May when he was speaking to the Canadian food processors. But is he saying to this House that this situation does not exist in this particular part of the farm industry and will not exist. That is what he is saying because he wants to rule out even the possibility of the producers of beef products coming under this legislation. He wants to place them in the position where, if they do have difficulties, they will have to come to whoever happens to be the minister at that time and ask him to open up the act and go through the exercise all over again.

I tell the minister that it is altogether unacceptable to our party that a measure as important to the farmers as this is should be dealt with in this shabby manner. Speaking at that same meeting the minister said:

> Thus, while many food processors have objected to marketing agencies and their powers, they themselves have in effect adopted different techniques to much the same ends.

The minister says that this situation exists. Then he says, let us go ahead, but let us not make it possible for one of the major sectors of the agricultural industry to participate in this marketing agency. I think the minister, and possibly his government, are aware that there are presently rapid changes going on in the farm industry; that is, we are accelerating the trend toward larger units. The trend toward integration is also being accelerated and a situation where the processor integrates with the producer, where controls are exercised over the market place and where the ordinary free marketing system can not effectively operate. So long as a free marketing system operates effectively, the farmer then is in a position to obtain the price the demand creates and to get what may be termed a fair market price. But once certain interests are powerful enough to influence that market, to control the rate at which the product goes to that market as well as how it goes to the consumer, then we are in imminent danger of both the producer and the consumer getting a pretty raw deal.

When this bill reaches the committee, Mr. Speaker, I assure the minister we will require answers to the questions I have posed. If the minister can assure the committee there is no possibility of a need for cattle and calves

coming under this bill, then of course we will be satisfied. However, I should like the minister or officials of his department to appear before the committee and tell us what percentage of that product now goes through the public yards, what percentage of that product comes under the auctioneer's hammer and what percentage of that product goes direct to the packing houses and bypasses the public yards altogether.

I am concerned when a broker at the public yards in Saskatoon, the third largest market in western Canada, informs me that the volume of product coming into those yards is becoming less every year. It is not impossible that we may see a time when those yards will not be able to effectively establish a price and where the percentage of livestock going around the yard is a bigger factor in establishing price than the amount going through the public auction. These are the situations with which we need to be concerned. We do not consider the passage of a bill here as an exercise. This bill, if and when it comes into force as an act, is supposed to be able to do a job for the farmer. It is supposed to permit the farmer, rancher or producer to do a job for himself. It is the responsibility of the committee and this House to see that when the act is finally passed it is adequate to do this job. If it should be merely a façade, a structure which does not permit the effective intervention of the producer into the market so that he can act effectively on his own behalf, then this bill and the act which will follow it will be a failure and we will have wasted our time.

I do not wish to carry on any further, Mr. Speaker. I have made the points which I think are important in this House. The further discussion of these points can take place during the meetings of the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, I pointed out a number of times the anxiety existing among farm people, especially in Quebec. And at the present time, this feeling not only remains but increases on account of the dangerously deteriorating situation.

In fact, almost 6 per cent of the Quebec workers, namely the farmers, get only 2 per cent of the Quebec income, which is much below the essential minimum. Moreover, this very small income is very badly divided, which explains why many farmers survive only through chronic debts and social welfare allowances.

A detailed analysis of the many reasons for the gap between the farm workers' income and that of urban people would be difficult. Let us point out only that it was far too long considered as the result of a low level of education. Yet, within 20 years, that so-called inferiority did not prevent the Quebec farm workers from increasing their production capacity by 300 per cent.

The level of education does not give the reason for the level of income and schooling is not everything, I believe, especially in the agricultural field. Knowledge and know-how can often be learned more rapidly through other means when people are open to progress, even when such progress does not provide them with an adequate compensation.

The statistics of the governments of Ottawa and Quebec, as well as the Economic Council of Canada data, which set at $4,000 the income required not to live in squalor, make us realize that only 13,000 of our 80,000 farms allow farmers to avoid poverty and enjoy an income comparable to that of other workers.

From 1951 to 1956, in Eastern Canada, 31,000 family farms were abandoned or sold for ridiculously low prices, which barely allowed second, third or fourth generation farmers to pay off their debts.

From 1956, the phenomenon was accelerated, the seriousness of which goes far beyond the tragedy it represents for the farmer who is forced to abandon his forefathers' farm. Those people who knew only one way of life, that of their own village, have no trade and cannot provide for the needs of a large family. However, they are nonetheless good workers, honest and respectable, and without a doubt mainstays of our social economy.

Agricultural conditions, because of the present system, force them to move to the poorer city neighbourhoods, and therefore to add, though they want to be useful, to the number of unemployed and ill-paid labourers, with all the social implications the situation entails, especially when it is not deserved.

It is unfortunate to see the farmers, who as a group fulfilled their role well and fed humanity, being relegated to the rank of herds sent from one pasture to another, increased or decreased, according to the whims of certain financial controllers.

Today, by introducing Bill C-176, the government is seeking the authorization to establish a National Farm Products Marketing Council which, in my opinion, will do nothing but add to the list of the Canadian government agencies, which are costly, heavy, cumbersome, and which take away the time, the energy and, especially, the freedom of citizens.

Under the flood of laws, boards, commissions, councils, the free enterprise system goes under. Referring to page 13 of the bill, one can read, and I quote:

> The objects of an agency are to promote a strong, efficient and competitive production and marketing industry for the regulated product or products in relation to which it may exercise its powers, having due regard to the interests of consumers of the regulated product or products.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that to promote competitive production, privileges will be granted to those more clever in securing certain grants, namely big businessmen, those who can offer a return to certain political organizers. Thus, the weaker will fall and will have to leave their land.

The bill makes no mention at all of compensation in these cases and one knows that the government has no appropriate employment to offer at the present time.

I come to that premature conclusion because other agencies of the government give us that proof at this time.

• (3:10 p.m.)

And the best example of this is provided by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, which

gives peanuts to small firms and preferential grants to large companies which could easily do without them.

The same applies to the field of housing. The Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, which had been created with the best of intentions, now practices discrimination by charging high rates to people who want to build homes for themselves and reduced rates to people who build apartment blocks.

Clause 23 of the present bill, under "Objects and Powers", reads as follows:

Subject to the proclamation by which it is established and to any subsequent proclamation altering its powers, an agency may

(a) purchase any farm product, wherever grown or produced that is of the same kind as the regulated product in relation to which it may exercise its powers, and package, process, store, ship, insure, export or sell or otherwise dispose of any such product purchased by it;

Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of this clause, the government has become a merchant and these are alarming powers since it does not amount to an experiment or to the expectancies before an experiment but merely to the implementation of a method which is in force in Communist countries.

As I said, the government has become a merchant. We know what were the results of such measures in other countries. I have visited Poland, other members have seen Egypt and others Russia. We all know that governments make the worst kind of merchants for they replace the efficiency which stems from work and private initiative with the carelessness and hesitations of civil servants.

We can see further on in Clause 28 a provision which is no less disturbing and reads as follows:

The Minister of Finance may, out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, on the requisition of the Minister, make grants to an agency not exceeding in the aggregate one hundred thousand dollars to enable the agency to meet initial operating and establishment expenses.

Then the farmers will have to foot the bill, meaning that once the one hundred thousand dollars have been spent to allow the establishment of the agency, farmers will have to pay levies on their products for the upkeep of the bad tradesmen who will have been selected by the state.

This may not be 100 per cent totalitarian, Mr. Speaker, but I feel this is just short of it. It may happen that incompetent purchasers put in bad orders which will require changes at the producers who will automatically be squeezed between order requirements and the obligation to obtain expensive new farm equipment. And the more so because for the majority of them the changes required will be practically impossible to make since their present equipment is not yet all paid for.

Another matter that we should not overlook, Mr. Speaker, is importation. Unless a revision is effected in this sector, the few results expected from this bill will simply be obliterated. If the government absolutely wishes to impose a control, it should not start by planning production but by controlling imports.

[Mr. Godin.]

At this stage may I quote a few excerpts from a brief submitted to the Standing Committee on Agriculture and printed in Minutes of Proceedings No. 50 of September 30 last—by representatives of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, the Catholic Farmers Union and the Agricultural Federation of Ontario.

On that occasion the executive secretary of the Canadian Federation of Agriculture stated as follows:

The point that Mr. McMaster and Mr. Harris made to us over and over again was that legal experience with these acts which are regulatory acts is that the courts will not presume intent. They will not regulate unless it is laid down exactly what the act is intended to do, with a considerable amount of precision, and that is really the thing that we are after. It is not to change the intent of the proposed act. I think that the wording of the proposed act... makes it clear that the intent is to regulate, but we are worried that we will be able to do what the proposed act intends.

I continue with my quotation:

We are not trying, however, to define rigidly the exact representational system to be set out in the proposed Act. We think that, in fact, with commodity questions and the kind of institution you are setting up, and the purposes which it is to serve, which I will come to, can vary, it is very important not to have inadequate flexibility in approach under this proposed Act.

The view of our organization is that it would be better to leave the authority to appoint agencies and council members with the Governor in Council, but with the requirement that the rules and procedures for this be officially set out, and that there be a legal legislative requirement that these be developed in consultation with producers, so that the thing is dealt with in an orderly way and the methods by which membership is achieved in these agencies and in the Council are set out in a public way.

Let us now refer to page 5 of this brief for a more accurate study. A rather short article can be found here on the purpose of the bill. It is outlined that paragraph 17 of the proposed bill is absolutely essential. This quite accurate article describes the aim of the bill within the framework of the provisions relating to the regulations and further on Mr. David Kirk, the executive secretary, says:

This is regulatory legislation in most of its purposes, and we are advised that there should be, in fact, a place that says:

> The purpose and intent of this Act is to provide for the promotion, control and regulation in any or all respects of the transportation, storage and marketing of farm products in interprovincial and export trade including the prohibition of such transportation, packing, storage and marketing in whole or in part.

We think it is very important that this fundamental section go in and I should make the general statement so I will not have to repeat it over and over again, that a great many of these recommendations really have more to do with the precise definition of the powers.

Further on he adds, and I quote:

With respect to the powers of the agency under Clause 23 (1) (d), where there is the power to:

(d) undertake and assist in the promotion of the consumption and use of any regulated product... the improvement of the quality and variety—

We are all in favour of this, but we think it should be promotion of the "production, marketing and consumption". We think it very possible that in some commodities there will be a place for an agency that does not market the product and does not regulate the product, but serves as a very good means of carry-

ing on fundamental industry programs of promotion, development, improvement, market development, and we want this Clause 23 (1) (d) broadened to be sure that things that are useful for the industry can be done by an agency outside the regulatory field.

All these statements referred to the bill tabled last year.

And the secretary of the Federation goes on to say:

Paragraph 40, page 21—there must be a power, we are advised, that specifically says that an agency may make regulations and orders—may make them; you have to actually say that. That is what we are advised, and it is not precisely said in the act.

Mr. Speaker, on the whole, the farmers, through their officials in various organizations, are informing us of their wishes. This legislation interests them but they request more details. The bill now before the House is a two-edged device. In order to avoid any misunderstanding and dangerous application of this legislation, I hope that the people who drafted it will take into consideration the remarks that were made before the Standing Committee on Agriculture, which will be re-examining this bill.

• (3:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: If the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) speaks now, he will close the debate.

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I wish to deal only briefly with some of the matters raised by hon. members who spoke in the debate on this bill. One of the concerns expressed by the hon. member for Kent-Essex (Mr. Danforth) was that there would be a great deal of difficulty in attempting to regulate the supply of any particular agricultural commodity with respect to domestic producers unless we were to provide authority in the bill for a marketing agency to impose equal or perhaps even more severe regulation on importations into Canada of the same commodity.

In my view it is not a proper function of this Parliament or of the government to transfer automatically to any board that may be set up the right to impose duties or in fact erect non-tariff barriers with respect to international trade. There are a number of reasons for that. Of course one reason is that there are some international agreements to which Canada is party, which the government has an obligation to respect, and in doing so we have made certain commitments. One is that we will not impose restrictions, for the kind of purposes outlined in this bill, on imported goods if we do not apply the same restrictions on our domestic production. I am sure the hon. member for Kent-Essex is well aware of this principle.

I can also advise the hon. member, and I am sure this will relieve some of his anxiety with respect to the matter, that under these international agreements as I understand them, although there is some complexity about this, we can impose the same kind of supply management provisions on imports as are in fact applied to our domestic producers. That is the case with respect to some of the international agreements. It seems to me that here is a balance which allows us, first of all, to take into account the interests of our domestic producers and also allows us to respect the international agreements we have made.

I am not suggesting that it will be easy to do this in all cases, because of course different points of view are taken from time to time depending on a country's own interests. However, I would like the hon. member to understand why it would not be possible to transfer automatically to a marketing agency, set up under this bill, the authority to deal with imports. It must remain the responsibility and prerogative of the government to change tariffs, or to change the impediments if you wish to call them that, to trade coming into Canada. I suggest that one can be made compatible with the other.

I was very interested in the remarks made by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar (Mr. Gleave), even though he expressed a great deal of dissatisfaction with the remarks I made last night respecting the exclusion of beef, calves and beef products from this bill. I must say to him that as far as I can tell, although there is provision in existing provincial statutes to set up beef marketing boards, there are no beef marketing boards in existence and there is no agitation anywhere in the country to set up beef marketing boards.

What the hon. member says is true, that if the majority of beef producers in the country indicate to us, or to the council that will be set up under this legislation, that they wish to have a national beef marketing board or agency established, then the legislation would have to be amended. He is correct in that assumption, but I think he will respect the assertion I made that the exclusion of beef from the provisions of this bill at this time does not really do any damage to the immediate purposes we have in mind. When I say "immediate" this could mean extending over two, three, five years or more, because until and unless such time arrives as there are beef marketing agencies set up under provincial legislation then this enabling legislation, to co-ordinate the operation of those agencies, would not become operative.

I can understand the problem. I can tell the hon. member that in the province where I am producing beef, the producers some years ago demanded to be excluded from the statutory provisions under provincial law because they did not want any beef marketing board. But when they wanted a beef marketing commission so that they could make some levies for the purpose of promoting the sale of beef and that sort of thing, they went back to the provincial government of Alberta and asked to be included in the legislation so that they could do that.

It is valid to suggest that beef producers would want that kind of marketing commission all across the country, but there is no authority given under this bill to co-ordinate the activities of such commissions set up under provincial legislation, and to that extent the bill is a deterrent to having them set up on a national basis. But if this were desired by beef producers, they could seek a simple amendment to the act after it has been passed.

To bring my remarks to a conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would advise the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Godin) that there is provision in the bill for only $100,000 for each commodity agency that would be set up, or $1 million in total. That means that there could be ten different commodity agencies established. It has been very clearly stated, at least in the remarks I have made before the committee and before the House, that this is for the purpose of establishing the marketing agencies and from there on their activities will be financed by their own operations. If Parliament and the government decide or suggest further subsidies, that would be another decision separate and distinct from the decision we would be making in passing this bill. He called for a flexible attitude with reference to the members of the agencies. Certainly, producers and other groups will be consulted with respect to nominations to the agencies. I agree with him that flexibility is needed, at least in the initial stages of setting up a marketing agency, so that we can, without legal impediment, seek out and appoint to these boards people with the competence to do a good job on behalf of the industry all the way from the producers through retailing and to the consumer as well.

• (3:30 p.m.)

I was pleased to hear him speak of the need for consultation and also the need for the promotion of markets and that sort of thing. This is provided for in some of the clauses of this bill. It is my hope that such will be a major function of some of the agencies that are set up—in fact a far superior function to that of imposing some of the mandatory quotas that are objectionable to some producers. I hope that we can now send this bill to the committee and deal with the amendments that I suggested which were considered very favourably in committee.

In conclusion I wonder, inasmuch as there was support from the other members who have spoken, whether I could ask to have the evidence taken in the last session with respect to Bill C-197 before the Standing Committee on Agriculture, taken under advisement or reinstated for the purpose of considering Bill C-176.

Mr. Baldwin: We would be quite agreeable to that, Mr. Speaker. I can see no good reason why all the time and money thrown away in connection with proceedings in the committee should be repeated. However, I think the order should be made without prejudice to the rights of members of the committee to pursue any examination of witnesses or briefs that were presented. This might not be necessary, but in an attempt to facilitate the passage of that bill in order that it could be brought back in the dying days of the last session, we did hurry through some of our examinations. If the order is without prejudice, we are perfectly willing that this should be done.

Mr. Speaker: It is my understanding that these are the terms of the order proposed by the hon. Minister of Agriculture. The order would be to the effect that the evidence already presented to the committee would be reinstated, without prejudice to the right of the committee to call further witnesses either with respect to new matters or matters already covered by the evidence which will then be before the committee as a result of this order. Is it agreed?

[Mr. Olson.]

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

* * *

CANADA GRAIN BILL

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION, PROVISIONS RESPECTING GRADING, LICENCES, ELEVATORS, ETC.

On the Order:

Second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Agriculture of Bill C-175, an Act respecting grain—The Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, may I first give notice that I am going to raise a point of order with respect to this bill being proceeded with at this time because of certain technical objections. However, before doing so, and on a general point of order, I think I should be entitled to say on behalf of members of our party—and I say this without in any way disparaging the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) who is discharging his obligations as Government House Leader most effectively—that it was indicated last night we would be proceeding with another bill. For reasons which are quite obvious, that bill was not circulated so that hon. members could not proceed with it at this time.

We have indicated our willingness to proceed with this bill, but because of the change in plan some of our members who are interested in this subject are not here today. I am not blaming the President of the Privy Council; he is just unfortunate in his choice of colleagues. However, if we are to discharge our responsibilities in processing the business of the house and the government, then the government will have to learn to bring in at an earlier stage in any session all the bills it should have ready, so that when second reading is called we will have had an opportunity to evaluate the legislation and to decide upon our position. After all, the period of gestation has been quite lengthy and the government have had ample time to draft the bill. There really is no valid excuse for this state of affairs today.

Having said that, we are ready to proceed, but I thought I should make that statement. I repeat, I am not putting any blame upon the minister. Indeed, I shall probably have other opportunities during the session to blame him more effectively for matters for which he is responsible. I hope that he will persuade his colleagues to bring in bills well before the date when this House proposes to deal with them so that we can make arrangements to proceed.

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture) moved that Bill C-175 respecting grain, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Baldwin: Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a point of order which is related to, and directed at, this particular bill. With great regret, I am compelled to point out to Your Honour that I doubt very much if this bill should be proceeded with at the present time because it fails to comply with Standing Order 62, which is related to section 54 of the British North America Act.

Your Honour has had some occasion in recent weeks to consider this point. My distinguished and learned colleague, the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), on two occasions recently called to Your Honour's attention this predilection of the government to include in the recommendation from the Governor in Council, which is required by Standing Order 62, a number of details with regard to what should be the financial aspects of a bill. With the great perspicacity which usually marks your judgments, Your Honour pointed out to all and sundry, but particularly directed your remarks at the government, that it would be much simpler and safer to have simple recommendation with regard to all aspects of the bill.

Having laid the groundwork, I would refer Your Honour to the recommendation which appears on the flyleaf of the bill and which reads:

> His Excellency the Governor General has recommended to the House of Commons the present measure respecting grain; to provide for the constitution of the Canadian Grain Commission, for salaries and expenses and accountable advances to the commission; for the objects and powers of the commission; for the establishment of grades of western and eastern grain; for grain standards committees, for the grading and inspection of grain; for the constitution of grain appeal tribunals; for licences and licensees and for charges by licensees; for elevators and grain dealers and the handling of grain licensees and other persons and the carriage of grain; and to make also further provisions in connection with the administration of the act.

When the government has seen fit to itemize a number of instances with regard to which financial aspects prevail, then I think they must cover all of them.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, if you would turn your attention to clause 108 of the bill you will find that it purports to repeal section 11 of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. Clause 108 of the bill provides for a levy of 1 per cent to be deducted from the purchase price of grain purchased from elevators. It then provides for that money to be paid into what is known as the Prairie Farm Emergency Fund. From that fund certain other payments shall be made. In addition, that same clause provides that certain licensees who fail to comply with certain subsections of the bill may have to pay a penalty of one-thirtieth of one per cent. That money goes into the same fund, and provision is made for appropriations out of that fund by the commission that is to be established by the bill.

• (3:40 p.m.)

I point out, Mr. Speaker, that this is an appropriation of public moneys for certain purposes, and the Governor General's recommendation simply does not cover it at all. This matter was dealt with, although not in the same sense, when this bill was before the standing committee in the previous session. The hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) proposed an amendment to clause 15 of the bill. The amendment read as follows:

> ...Where by reason of an order made under this section a person suffers financial loss, the Commission shall compensate that person in the amount of his loss; the Federal Court shall have original jurisdiction to determine the liability to compensate and the amount of compensation, if any.

At that time, the vice-chairman who was presiding over the committee, acting upon an opinion given by the law clerk and parliamentary counsel, ruled the proposed amendment out of order. I am not suggesting that those opinions are binding on Your Honour. I am simply citing them to show that my point has validity, because it relates to a set of circumstances that are precisely similar. The vice-chairman ruled the amendment out of order because the amendment proposed that compensation, or an award, should be paid to a grain producer. That is precisely the same as the proposal contained in new clause 108. Where the producer has suffered loss, there is to be a financial appropriation and, therefore, I submit, it is out of order.

May I read what the law clerk and parliamentary counsel had to say about that matter, as recorded at page 66 of the proceedings:

> ...I do not think a private member could do it. I will go further than that. I would say that a Minister of the Crown could not do it in this Committee. If he wanted to do it, he would have to do it at the report stage in the House by moving an amendment there, and to that amendment the recommendation of the Crown would have to be annexed.

I say this is a valid opinion. I approve it. I cite it to Your Honour, not because it is binding on you but because it is on all fours with the situation to which I am referring. The government, having brought down a recommendation from the Governor General setting out in detail various aspects of the bill which are subject to financial considerations, has included in its legislation a provision that a 1 per cent levy shall be paid into a fund, and from that fund the commission which is to be established will be authorized to make certain awards. What can that be except an appropriation of public funds?

Then, of course, there is the additional aspect of the fine of one-thirtieth of one per cent, which goes into the same special fund out of which awards can be made. Consequently, if you examine the bill in its entirety, you will find that there is no provision in His Excellency's recommendations to the effect that this special financial provision is authorized. I am sure that was not in there. I am also sure that if I were to move an amendment to this effect, as the hon. member for Crowfoot did before the committee, Your Honour would have no hesitation in ruling that I could not do so, or that a minister of the Crown could not do it either unless he had come to this House with an amendment to the recommendation approved by the Governor General.

I do not need to say anything more. Your Honour is well aware of the nature of this type of objection. You have pointed out the dangers which are inherent in the government's proceeding in this way. I point out that, under these circumstances, the bill is defective and, until

the government can produce the required amendment to the recommendation, the bill can hardly be proceeded with in its present form.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) has raised a very interesting procedural point with respect to clause 108 of this bill, claiming that its provisions are not covered by the recommendation. I am afraid I could not fully understand his argument. Certainly, there is a continuation of the activities that were carried on by the Board of Grain Commissioners, and there is a continuation of the responsibilities which were given to them under another act, in this case the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. Clause 108 of the bill repeals section 11 of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. That clause was included so that there would be a mechanism, the Board of Grain Commissioners, that would collect a levy that this Parliament decided ought to be collected, and those moneys are to be disbursed under other sections of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. I, therefore, suggest to Your Honour that the provisions for the disbursement of the fund collected for the purposes of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act are already included in that act.

Mr. Baldwin: In the Prairie Farm Assistance Act?

Mr. Olson: In the Prairie Farm Assistance Act.

Mr. Baldwin: Which the government is repealing.

Mr. Olson: The hon. member is saying that when we re-write and modernize the whole of the Canada Grain Act, an act that has not been revised in a substantial way since 1930, and when we adopt some amendments regarding the responsibilities which have been laid on the Board of Grain Commissioners under the Canada Grain Act, we are acting improperly. I suggest it is well known in this country that the activities of the Board of Grain Commissioners, which will now be called the Canadian Grain Commission, in matters such as collecting the 1 per cent levy and disbursing the money through other provisions of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act constitute a long established practice. It is a practice that was established in 1939, if my memory serves me correctly. Clause 108 of the bill attempts, very simply, to put onto the shoulders of the Canadian Grain Commission under the Canada Grain Act all the responsibilities which formerly rested on the shoulders of the Board of Grain Commissioners.

I know that it is difficult on many occasions for the recommendation of His Excellency, the Governor General, to spell out in detail all the authority that may be vested in the application of this act. This is not something new, that every single detail of expenditure is not indicated in the recommendation. But, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, with great deference, that it has been a long established practice for the Board of Grain Commissioners, which will now become the Canadian Grain Commission, to collect a 1 per cent levy for the purposes of funding the PFAA fund. The hon. member knows that. He also knows that, by a long established practice, it is one of the administrative functions of the Board of Grain Commissioners to collect that levy and turn it over to the Prairie Farm Assistance Act administration or indeed to collect it on behalf of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada. It is from that fund the PFAA payments are made from time to time.

• (3:50 p.m.)

I find it rather difficult to understand why the hon. member is trying to hang a procedural point on something that has been practised in Canada for at least 30 years, notwithstanding the fact that authority for the Board of Grain Commissioners to collect that levy is now going to be contained in the Canada Grain Act rather than the Prairie Farm Assistance Act.

The other point relates to the amendment with respect to paying compensation to grain companies which was moved in committee by the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner). This, in fact, was a new departure. It was not envisaged when this bill was drafted.

Mr. Baldwin: It was not in the recommendation.

Mr. Olson: It was not in the recommendation. In my view, the legal adviser to the committee quite properly ruled that it was beyond the recommendation and therefore out of order. I suggest that the hon. member is objecting to a long established practice. To base his argument on the fact that a member was prevented from introducing a new departure in expenditure under the authority of this bill because no provision for it was contained in the recommendation is not making a valid comparison.

Mr. Baldwin: Will the minister permit a question? Even if the minister is correct in his assumption that the financial authority granted to the Board of Grain Commissioners under the Prairie Farm Assistance Act carries over automatically to the new Canada Grain Commission—and I do not accept that with respect to the 1 per cent levy—does he not agree that according to clause 108, in addition to the 1 per cent levy, there is a further financial provision to take care of one-thirtieth of one per cent of a certain licence fee which is set aside as a penalty, the benefits of which are payable from the fund in respect of certain awards. Is it not true that particular provision was never in the Prairie Farm Assistance Act? It is a new financial provision which was never contemplated, discussed or apparent in the other legislation.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer that question without a bit of research and perhaps some advice. I am sure the hon. member realizes that while there may not have been a penalty provided for failure to collect a 1 per cent levy, there was a legal obligation on all of the grain companies to collect the levy and turn it over to the Board of Grain Commissioners for and on behalf of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, when one gets into a procedural debate, he usually has a point he wants to make. He usually knows where he wants to come down at the end of his remarks. Since I was called on short notice to take part in this

debate, I hope Your Honour will forgive me for doing a little thinking out loud. Maybe I will come down some place before I am through.

Mr. Baldwin: That is more than the minister did. He is still up there.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I am extremely sympathetic to the concern of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) that the government not get away with anything. We have both been here long enough to know that we have to be on guard against that kind of practice.

However, I wonder whether we have really sorted out what is supposed to be involved in the recommendation of the Governor General with respect to a money bill. In the few minutes since the hon. member for Peace River raised this point, I have been attempting to collect a few musty volumes to check some matters. I have also been wracking my memory.

Years ago there had to be a resolution preceding a money bill. When that resolution was first called in the House of Commons, a cabinet minister rose and stated "The Governor General having been made aware of the terms of this resolution recommends it to the consideration of the House". That is all there was to the recommendation at that time. The minister did not say, "On behalf of the Governor General the following are the details", when making a recommendation. He just said, "His Nibs has seen the bill and he says it's okay". I hope it is not sacrilegious to use that language in this place. We then had the debate on the resolution and proceeded from there.

There is a reference to the terms of a resolution at page 216 of Beauchesne's Fourth Edition. This reference reads:

—care must be taken that the terms used are sufficiently wide to cover the whole of the Bill which will be subsequently introduced.

I could read the whole of that citation, Mr. Speaker, but it is not necessary to do so. It is clear that the reference is to what we then called the resolution.

I can recall occasions when we complained because the resolution did not go far enough. I also, recall when the Hon. Paul Martin introduced a resolution to increase the amount of the old age pension. I believe that was in 1948. He did not put the amount of the increase in the resolution. Because there was a resolution with the approval of the Governor General which did not name an amount, we were permitted to move amendments involving a larger amount than Mr. Martin proposed. I am reminiscing more than I should, but the point is there is certain jurisprudence and there are certain rules which governed a resolution preceding a money bill. The rules were very clear that the resolution had to be wide enough to cover everything.

In December of 1968, a report was presented to alter the rules. I am now looking at page 432 of *Journals* for 1968-69. We recommend that the resolution stage be abolished. Nothing was said in that recommendation regarding the recommendation of the Governor General. In that report, spelled out in long paragraphs, we just said, "Let's do away with the resolution and the debate thereon." Then, since the Governor General's recommendation had been attached to the resolution, we were, of course, leaving a gap. So, as reported on page 458 of the *Journals* for 1968-69, we recommended that what was then Standing Order 61 be amended. It is now Standing Order 62. I shall not read it out, but I have compared the two versions. The previous one was a rule which required a resolution to precede a money bill. Since we were doing away with the resolution, we thought we ought to do something about the Governor General's recommendation. So, we wrote a new Standing Order No. 62, which says there must be a recommendation from the Governor General.

• (4:00 p.m.)

The point I am arguing out loud must be obvious by now. Is there not some danger we are confusing two things? We have done away with the resolution and the debate thereon; that is clear. But we have kept the requirement for a recommendation—we are bound to do so because it is required under the British North America Act. Under the old regime, the solution had to cover all the details of the bill. But there was nothing which said that the recommendation had to contain the same kind of detail. Perhaps we are getting into this trouble because we are now asking the Governor General to give us a recommendation the terms of which are a substitute for what used to be the resolution.

It seems to me the ruling which Your Honour has been called upon to make is an important one and possibly it should not be made on short notice, even though Your Honour has had the point before you for consideration on a number of occasions. Maybe we should discuss the matter in the Committee on Procedure and Organization. I might say in passing that the committee made a start on its work this morning. As I was saying, I wonder whether we are not confusing two things. The old resolution had to be very complete, but the recommendation of the Governor General, in those days, was contained in a simple sentence. It said he was aware of the bill and that it was in order for us to consider it.

I do not detract for one moment from the argument that it is necessary to watch the government, to see it does not get away with things. But I am also very conscious of the fact that we decide things here, and that the role played by the Governor General is a ceremonial one as distinct from that played by the government in this actual forum of legislation. I think we should be going too far if we wanted too much handled outside of this House.

The purpose of the so-called Royal recommendation is to make sure that it is only Ministers of the Crown, the cabinet, who can bring in a money bill. These, at any rate, are my views, Mr. Speaker. The question is one for you to decide. What I really wanted to do, I have done, namely, to draw attention to the possibility of there being confusion between the old resolution, which had to be very wide and precise in its scope, and the old recom-

mendation, which was a simple statement. Perhaps we ought to do away with the recommendation altogether. Then, of course, the Governor General could not make mistakes and leave out things which should be in the recommendation. But if we want a recommendation which takes the place of a resolution, I think we should say no. We do not say so at the present time in Standing Order 62. Its terms have not been read today, but presumably someone will do so before this debate is over.

It is clear that a bill involving the expenditure of money cannot be proceeded with unless it has been recommended to the House in a message from the Governor General. Nothing more is required. This carries out the provision of Section 54 of the British North America Act. The Act does not say that the recommendation has to go into the details. Thinking about this matter, I wondered whether we might have said something on the subject in our lengthy report tabled back in December, 1968, but I have gone through it, and we do not seem to have dealt with it there. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for listening to me. The decision is up to you.

Mr. Speaker: I see that the Minister of Agriculture wishes to contribute further to the debate on the point of order. He can do so only with the consent of the House. Is this agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Olson: I simply wished to reply to the question which was raised by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin). I have been advised that section 11(4) does, in fact, deal with levies. The hon. member asked whether or not this one-thirtieth of one per cent per day was provided for in the old act. The provision reads as follows:

> All licencees shall pay to the Board of Grain Commissioners for Canada for the credit of the Receiver General, monthly, as provided by regulation, all moneys collected hereunder, and any licencee who fails to comply with the regulations is subject to a penalty of 1/30th of 1 per cent of the amount due for each day that such payment is in default.

May I clear this up by adding that as far as I am aware the provision with which the hon. member is concerned contains nothing new. There is perhaps some updating of the wording and a renumbering of the subsections, but section 108 is almost identical with section 11 and the ten subsections contained in the Prairie Farm Assistance Act.

Mr. Baldwin: That applies to most government legislation.

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me there are two points which the Chair should consider at this time. The first is the relatively narrow point raised by the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) to which the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) has replied, namely, whether a new charge is created by section 108 of the Canada Grain Act.

The hon. minister argues that in fact there is no new charge on the treasury because we are simply re-enacting a provision of a former statute, the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. The minister assures the Chair, that a similar provision was included in the previous statute. I am not too sure of the argument of the hon. member for Peace River that there is a new charge being created at this time which might require an alteration of the recommendation of His Excellency. That should be my ruling for the time being. I have to take into account, also, and I do take into account, that it would not be a matter of great moment to have the recommendation changed if the Chair considered a change should be made. I recall that when a similar matter was brought to my attention some days ago I agreed with the hon. member who had raised the point that the recommendation ought to be changed, and as a result of a sudden and speedy action on the part of the minister responsible for the bill then before the House, a new recommendation was obtained and accepted by hon. members.

The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has raised a much wider question which is one of greater interest. He may remember, if he was in the House, that when a similar point of order was raised by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), I did say—unfortunately, I do not have the text of my statement here—I had often thought that the only thing which might be required as far as the recommendation was concerned was a general statement from His Excellency to the effect that His Excellency had looked at a bill, and recommended it to the attention of the House. Substantially, it seems to me this was the form of the recommendation which was received by the House as part of our practice before the change in our rules.

I have an example before me dating from some years back; the minister introducing a bill simply said that His Excellency the Governor General having been made aware of the subject matter of the resolution, recommended it for the consideration of the House. This may be all that is really required from a constitutional standpoint. The Crown must retain the financial initiative and this is done through a recommendation from His Excellency. It may be that His Excellency having looked at the bill and having noticed that there were financial implications, might recommend the proposed measure to the House.

• (4:10 p.m.)

As the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) has very clearly said—and I am very strongly inclined to go along with his reasoning—we appear to be confusing the resolution stage of the bill, which has now been discontinued, and the recommendation. It may be that before we changed the rules these were two separate matters, the recommendation made in the terms I have just indicated, and then a resolution which delineated the four corners of the bill which would come before the House but which was not then known to hon. members and, indeed, not known to His Excellency as his recommendation was directed to the resolution. It may be that His Excellency should see the bill and then recommend it to the House. It may well be that this is all that should be required to allow hon. members to proceed with con-

sideration of a measure advanced for study by the Government. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre has suggested this might be a point which could be considered by the Committee on Procedure and Organization. I agree with that. If I were asked to make a ruling now, I would tend to make a ruling that all that is required under our rules and Standing Order 62 is to have a recommendation come forward: it might not be necessary to have it in detail but, the regulations and our Standing Orders, in particular Standing Order 62(1) and 62(2) might be entirely satisfied by a recommendation in general terms as submitted to the House.

This would be *obiter dictum* at the present time because I have not ruled that, and in my view it may be that the explanation given by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) is sufficient and that the recommendation as it stands, if it were required to be in detailed form, is sufficient.

If the matter were raised again it may be at that point a decision would have to be made by the Chair as to whether a detailed recommendation covering all aspects of the bill should be necessary, but this would be a matter which could be considered at that time. Hon. members are now on notice, in any event, that this is a matter of importance and of interest, I am sure, to the whole House. If the point of order is raised again, I would expect to hear further from the hon. members who have taken part in this debate today and, I am sure, from other hon. members who have been placed on notice, as a result of which they will give this matter serious thought. For the moment, I would suggest that we proceed with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, a great deal of public discussion throughout the grain growing areas of this country and, indeed, in this House has taken place in respect of the provisions now envisaged in Bill C-175. There have been several days of debate in this House, which I considered to be useful debate, as well as a great deal of discussion in the Standing Committee on Agriculture when the predecessor to this bill, that is Bill C-196, was under consideration by that committee.

If my memory serves me correctly, there were 26 amendments made to Bill C-196 by the committee on agriculture. I suggest this was a very useful exercise because there is no doubt that when a government proposes to introduce a bill of the size of the one that is before us, which is really a re-writing of the whole of the Canada Grain Act, and this is done after a period of nearly 40 years, it is perfectly understandable and indeed desirable that there be a great deal of debate, that there be far-ranging discussions in the industry from the producers all the way through, and that all of these discussions should be taken into account. I suggest this has been done.

There were many people from producer organizations who appeared before the committee. There were a large number of trade associations as well as individual companies which made their views known to us in respect of a number of proposals in Bill C-196. In addition to that, a new dimension has been added to the consideration of the Canada Grain Act since the last time it was revised, that is the organization known as the Canada Grains Council. As you know, this council is made up of producer organizations involved in co-operative wheat pools, other grain companies, the railways, the terminals and everyone else involved in the business. The council undertook the responsibility of examining the details of Bill C-196 and then presented its recommendations to various people involved in a series of different procedures.

First, there were a great number of discussions carried on between the Board of Grain Commissioners and the people involved in the trade. Then, there were discussions certainly with Members of Parliament and other people respecting revisions to the Canada Grain Act. Of course, to highlight and perhaps summarize all of these previous discussions, the Canada Grains Council did in fact appear before the Standing Committee on Agriculture giving their considered opinion in a very detailed way as to what was desirable and perhaps what ought to be changed slightly in the proposal that was before the committee at that time, namely Bill C-196.

I can never claim that a bill is perfect. I suggest there may be some minor amendments, perhaps even some major ones, that will need to be taken under consideration when Bill C-175 gets to the committee. In fact, there never was any doubt in my mind that when we undertook to completely re-write the Canada Grain Act, which contains in its new form some 116 clauses as well as the schedules and the annexes that are added thereto, it would be a miracle if that were written in perfect terms the first time.

What has happened has been that the bill before us now is the result of the best efforts of the Board of Grain Commissioners, in consultation with their advisers, both legal and experts in the trade. These drafting instructions were presented to this House and the standing committee. I believe the number of amendments made by the committee was 26. There were more proposed but there were in fact 26 amendments made. There may be more needed. In fact, I am prepared to consider favourably some amendments which may be considered technical by some, or matters of substance by others. For example, I have been advised that there was a provision in the old Canada Grains Act which dealt with matters respecting insurance, and that the companies indicated that "acts of God" or the "Queen's enemies", which are not provided for in this bill, ought to be put in because there could be a substantial difference in the insurance premiums to be paid if these two exemptions were not made. It seems to me this, in fact, could be done when we reach the committee stage or even at the report stage. I would be happy if we should be able to have this bill moved along to the point at which it was at the last session.

• (4:20 p.m.)

I understand there is also a small problem related to special bin grain that has been drawn to our attention. I am advised that, in the opinion of a number of grain

companies, Bill C-175 does not properly identify this. In the new bill the implication is that the terminal owns the grain and that the terminal, under all circumstances, must be able to deliver this against a warehouse receipt. There is confusion concerning whether or not a warehouse receipt is indeed exactly the same thing as the kind of ticket one receives for special bin grain, special bin grain being grain that is kept separate from other grain. If one receives a warehouse receipt designating a certain grade and quality of grain, the terminal is not obliged to deliver the same grain but can deliver grain equal to the grade indicated on the warehouse receipt that any individual or company may hold.

We are prepared to consider some changes in these items, but I advise the House there may be more. I do not deny that there could be other changes that would be necessary from time to time. I would hope, however, the House would be disposed to move on with the passage of this bill, the rewriting of the Canada Grain Act, even though we may not find every one of the flaws in it in the first instance. There are some principles involved in the grain handling business that ought to be changed. Indeed, in my view there has been too much delay now, but that is only my own personal opinion. I refer to such things as the statutory grades, including a protein factor, in setting out the schedule for certain grades and other mechanisms in respect of the grain handling system. These should be modernized for the benefit of everybody involved. So, I would hope, with the assurance I am prepared to give the House and the committee, that after the application of this new bill for any specified length of time, be it one year, two years or however long, we will be prepared to consider amendments based on the experience we gain in attempting to apply this act—

An hon. Member: I hope you will not still be the government.

Mr. Olson: Some members opposite hope we will not be the government. They do not need to advise me of that because I am aware of that every day of the week, but the people of Canada do not agree with them and so long as it is that way it is fine with me. Whether I or somebody else occupies this position, I am sure he will be prepared to reconsider any defects that arise as a result of applying this new act to the grain trade and will come to this House seeking amendments to improve it on the basis of that experience. But what I cannot accept is the holding up of anything of a major nature because we might not have thought of all the details. I can guarantee to hon. members in this House that no matter how well we examine this bill and try to anticipate every difficulty, since the grain trade today is changing there will be other changes we will have to deal with even four or five years from now. Hopefully even then, much to the chagrin of hon. members opposite, we will still be administering this country at the very high level at which it is being administered today.

I wish to conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by saying to hon. members opposite I hope they will give favourable consideration to a suggestion I wish to make that this bill be reinstated in the same position—that is at the report stage—in which it was when the last session was prorogued. I might say that while there has been discussion there has been no commitment by members opposite that we do this. I plead with them now, for the sake of the producers, to agree to this proposal so that we can get on with bringing in what everybody agrees is a useful structure. If they fail to agree to that, then I hope they will send this bill to the committee bearing in mind it is a bill which has been given a great deal of consideration by the whole of the industry and indeed by the members of this House who are members of the Standing Committee. As I said there have already been 26 amendments since the original version was introduced in this House.

There may be a possibility that some discussion could reduce the number of amendments before this House. So far as I am concerned, however, I am not worried about that. What I am very concerned about is that the members of this House and of the committee, after having heard the amendments and arguments in support of them at least once or twice, will allow a vote to be held so that no further time will be lost. I think every member of this House and every member of the committee ought to be able to move the amendments they wish to move. However, I believe it is also a basic right of the members of the committee, after the argument has been heard once or twice, to have a decision made as to whether or not the amendments are in fact acceptable. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if we approach the procedural requirements involved in getting this bill from a bill into the law of this land in that spirit, we would be doing the farmers and the rest of the grain industry in Canada a great service.

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Agriculture, in his best tone of voice, has tried to leave the impression that the bill that is being presented here is an amended version of the bill presented last session and that those of us in the opposition who have had some doubt about its original intention should drastically change our minds. We should simply go along with him and, because of the lapse of time, should find ourselves in a position where we can revise our thinking simply in order to accommodate him. I am not prepared at this time to give him such an assurance because I had some reservations about the original bill and I still have some reservations about the bill before us now. May I point out first that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) plays second fiddle to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Lang), who is also responsible for the Wheat Board. Unfortunately, the Minister of Agriculture has not been able to convince either his colleague or the rest of the cabinet that this bill is in the best interests of Canadian agriculture. Six months ago the Minister of Agriculture rose in the House and said: "We cannot sell any wheat because we cannot give an assurance to our customers that we can produce wheat of a certain protein quality". A few months ago we found ourselves in an entirely different situation. Is there a credibility gap? Where has this statement come from? It came right from the minister.

• (4:30 p.m.)

The Minister of Agriculture does not know what he is talking about. He was trying to sell us a bill of goods, and we, as members of the opposition, are expected to swallow that. I have asked the farmers to whom I have talked on street corners, in little grocery stores and everywhere else, and I find they know better because the situation is different today compared with three or four months ago when the minister first introduced this bill. If we had allowed ourselves to be sucked in by this minister, then the original bill would have been passed. Is protein grading selling our wheat or is it something else? I see the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) sitting opposite. I want to give him all the recognition that he deserves. He gets a lot of press recognition from the pool. All of a sudden he seems to have advance notice of what is going to happen. Six months ago he said that another statement would be made. We all read the newspapers and the pool reports, but all of a sudden the pools are to be used by this government.

I am not asking for a fight, but if that is what is going to happen I am quite ready to accept a fight. The pools are going to be used by this government, and all of a sudden that has become necessary. I say to the country and I say to the pools that it is certainly not necessary for us. The minister who introduced this bill is being ridden by the other minister who is obviously a step closer to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), because he can tell the Prime Minister that he needs to introduce the bill. He made a statement the other day, and it is very interesting that everyone has fallen for it all of a sudden. As a result of his statement what happened? We lost something. This is typical of the Liberal government. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) throws out a big proposal. Then, everyone bucks against it, and the leader of the Liberal party in Manitoba objects to the whole thing. Everyone in the country is objecting.

Of course, the government will withdraw certain proposals but we will not have gained anything. The farmers in my area are in a difficult position. I will not say anything more about it because I spoke on the subject when the bill was first introduced several months ago. We are going to sell only low grade wheat because we are told that we are in a low grade wheat area. The minister tells us that this measure is advantageous to us. How can it be advantageous when the storage has been reduced. What have we? All we have is low grade wheat. Instead of introducing the bill to the House, the minister should have held discussions with the minister from Saskatchewan. I know that my farmers are going to count their pennies. Until the minister from Saskatchewan made the announcement, we were under the impression that even though the initial payment was to be dropped we would receive a final payment. What will our final payment be now? We will not get it and we do not expect it from this government because when they disguised this whole thing as an equalization payment they left the impression that they were doing something for us.

The minister smokes behind the curtains and grins, because that is all he has left to do. He does not know how much longer he will stay in the cabinet unless he puts these bills through the House. He will not stay in the cabinet long because the Prime Minister does not have much use for western farmers.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Olson: That statement is wrong.

Mr. Korchinski: He told us that himself when he was out west. What did he tell us when he went to Regina? Why are they piling up all that wheat in Saskatoon? Why did the hon. member for Assiniboia have to take him into his own back yard to hide him from the rest of the people?

Some hon. Members: Ha, ha.

Mr. Korchinski: That is right, ha, ha. I want to relate my remarks to the statement of the minister from Saskatchewan, because he wants to get rid of the elevators. We have had evidence to the effect that there is no better system of handling grain than through the existing elevators, yet this minister wants to get rid of them. The Minister of Agriculture smiles and laughs. I want that to be on the record.

Mr. Olson: I am laughing at the foolish statement.

Mr. Korchinski: The minister can laugh all he wants, but it was the minister from Saskatchewan who made the foolish statement when he said we could handle our grain with 40 elevators in the west. That is how foolish he was. I am challenging the Minister of Agriculture, and the minister in charge of the Wheat Board, to contradict me right now. The Minister of Agriculture will not do this. I say to the House and to the country that that is what the government wants to do through their system of elimination.

As soon as they remove the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act, every farmer in the country will cry to high heaven because it will cost him money. The farmers will say that the elevator companies will receive all the money, and that is exactly what these fellows want. Let us not be fooled by that suggestion. At one time farmers were getting $2.12 per bushel for their wheat. What are they getting now? I asked the question the other day. I said to the minister, "The price is 50 cents lower than we were getting a few years ago." Sure, there will be a period when you will pay in, but then all of a sudden it is finished; it is gone forever.

• (4:40 p.m.)

On top of that, every farmer is to be responsible for every storage payment that is going to be made to every elevator. This provision is in this bill, because that is exactly what the government suggested. Evidence was presented by all the elevator companies that they could handle that grain cheaper than any other method that has been conceived of until now.

Then, this minister comes in here. He is a kind of second-rate minister anyway. He comes in only at the behest of the minister from Saskatchewan, in order to maintain his status as a minister, and he says, "I have got to get this bill through." Why are we raising these objections? It is because it is going to cost us money. Some $70 million that was paid into the grain storage business is not going to be paid any more, and this bill indicates we are going to get rid of the elevators.

I used to deliver a little bit of grain in my day. When I first started trucking, a half cent a bushel per mile was what I charged. I don't know if that is the normal rate now. I am not in that business any more and perhaps I am behind the times in that regard. This was the normal rate we charged years ago, and I imagine some of the truckers today charge something like that, or probably a progressively bigger rate. But a farmer may have to deliver 25 or 30 miles because you must remember that this bill gives authority to get rid of the elevators all the way down the line. That is just one step. The next step is the elimination of the railways, which means the elimination of communities.

This minister asks us to go along with this omnibus bill. There are pages and pages of it. I am not ready at this particular stage to tell the minister that we in the opposition are going to destroy all these communities that he would like to destroy. He has a master plan, or perhaps it is the other minister who obviously has much more power than he has. Mr. Speaker, sometimes there are frictions within cabinet that are not too obvious to many people. But this minister is on the way out. This minister slid in quietly, and the Liberals accepted him. We wished him luck. We thought he was really going to do things for us. But I tell you, Mr. Speaker, this minister is quickly slipping out because he has not got a path into the Prime Minister's office. He has no way by which he can convince the Prime Minister that this bill is what he wants because he does not want it himself. How can he convince the Prime Minister when he is told by the other minister that this is what is necessary? It is the other minister who is making the speeches on the subject.

I have watched the performance—I have had to because this is my business—as I think most of the other members of the House have. Whatever regard we had for him as an individual, we are seeing the erosion of his power by the other minister who is gradually working himself up because the other minister does as the Prime Minister tells him.

Of course, what does the Prime Minister tell him? He told him, quite simply, "Why should I sell your wheat"? Put it in terms like that and anything can happen from there on in. He is not going to sell your wheat because he is not going to give you any more money for the production of that wheat. If in the process we were led to believe that this bill was in our interests, then we would be the first to be accused.

The other day I voted for the invocation of the War Measures Act. I believed this was necessary government action, but after a few days the Prime Minister pointed an accusing finger at the opposition and said, "You voted with us, so what do you want"? I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I have to be very critical. In fact this is my job as an opposition member, particularly when I see other flaws in this bill. I will vote with the government if I think that is necessary, but the other day the Prime Minister tried to humiliate me for voting with the government. Whenever I think the government is not adopting the right approach, I am going to speak out against it at every opportunity.

What about our rapeseed position? This is a grain that is gradually being accepted in the world market. We are not being told how the government is going to deal with it under this bill, whether storage will be provided or anything like that. The minister has indicated that he is ready to accept certain amendments, but he told us last spring that we were doing a disservice to the country because we objected to the predecessor of this bill. He told us they could not sell any wheat if this legislation was not passed. Protein grading was emphasized. We now find that this is not the story at all.

At that time, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) rose in the House and asked, "Would you be prepared to accept a proposal whereby we agree to introduce protein grading into the existing bill, and from there on in we will argue the difference"? The minister was the first to object to that, because there was more to the legislation than appeared on the surface. His big argument was protein grading, and now all of a sudden we have to swallow this whole bill.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, the farmers are not as stupid as the minister thinks they are. They know that the minister could have introduced a short bill without any debate in this House, and if that was what they needed that was what they could have had. I give him my word right now that I have the assurance of every one of my colleagues that they would agree to that, and I am sure the other members of the opposition would see the wisdom of that course. But we are not going to sell all these towns down the drain, which is exactly what is intended.

I know how these elevator agents work. I have talked with them. I am sure the minister has occasionally stopped in at elevators and watched some of their operations. Small towns collect perhaps half their taxes from elevators, and if these elevators were eliminated that would mean the end of such towns. In an area such as that which I represent, which depends wholely and solely on such establishments, this bill will write finis to whole communities. Surely, the minister does not want nor expect that. If he wants protein grading, then let him say so and we can argue the other point. But he wants more, and I am not willing to give him more. When the minister from Saskatchewan says he can sell 700 million bushels of grain, good luck to him and to the rest of the farmers. I hope they sell a billion bushels. This would be the greatest thing that ever happened, for the economy though it would mean defeat to some of us. But we must be very careful that this country does not fall headlong because of a one shot deal. Though we sell a billion bushels of grain, we must not lose whole communities in

the process and it looks as if this is what the minister is trying to do here.

• (4:50 p.m.)

In submissions made earlier this year, the elevator companies indicated that they could handle that grain about as cheaply as is possible and as quickly as possible. Though I have reservations myself, the block system has demonstrated to some people that it will work in getting out certain grades of grain. This system is still in its growing stages, but I am willing to give it a try.

I think the minister will agree that the elevator companies must fully co-operate with him. If you are not going to pay the elevator companies, then who are you going to pay? Maybe the treasury of Canada will save $71 million or $72 million if the government is not going to pay these charges in another year. If the system which was recently announced is introduced, it will mean this amount will have to be taken out of the total income of farmers. The hon. member for Assiniboia had better start asking for farm storage payments for grain stored on his own farm because he will have to keep it there. If he does not want to keep it in elevators he is going to have to store it on the farm.

Although there were good and fruitful discussions in committee, Mr. Speaker, because of the ramifications of this measure, I think we must ask the minister to remember that whole communities will be affected. Much as I am unhappy with things that have happened in the past, I am not ready to sell these towns "down the river", if you wish.

An hon. Member: If you wish.

Mr. Korchinski: No, your town too, along with mine. It has been going down very rapidly through no fault of ours. I say it is all wrong to set up a central terminal system of elevators under this bill and somebody is going to be hurt in the process. This is a disruption which we cannot allow at this particular time.

I am not happy with what has been happening. If the recent announcement made by the minister from Saskatchewan was his own work, then he should have been handling this bill because it goes along with his line of thought. I am sure our present Minister of Agriculture does not agree with him, but apparently he does not have very much to say about it. He is doing the chores because the Prime Minister says he will either do them or get out of the cabinet. He has to push this bill through or get out, though he disagrees with what is happening. I am sure he does because I can remember a time when he sat three seats away from me here on the opposition side. He was a Social Credit member and when we discussed these things we were in agreement on a lot of them. What has happened to him since then?

Mr. McCleave: Money.

Mr. Korchinski: Just for a handful of silver he left us. It is a sad day, Mr. Speaker, when a minister finds himself in the position where he does not want to introduce a bill, knowing the consequences of it, but in order to stay in the ministry he has to go along with what has been directed from above.

I call it five o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): It being five o'clock the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's order paper, namely, public bills, private bills and notices of motion.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

MATERNITY LEAVE ACT

EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN IN FEDERAL JURISDICTION BEFORE AND AFTER CHILDBIRTH

On the order:

Second reading and reference to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration of Bill C-6, an act respecting the employment of women in federal jurisdiction before and after childbirth. (As reprinted by order of the House Friday, October 30, 1970)—Mrs. MacInnis.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The House is surely aware of the fact that Bill C-6, was reprinted as the result of on an order of this House passed with unanimous consent on October 30. It is the feeling of the Chair that the motion should be put again which shall be done immediately.

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway) moved that Bill C-6, respecting the employment of women in federal jurisdiction before and after childbirth be read a second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration.

She said: Mr. Speaker, this is the third session in which I have endeavoured to bring this matter to the attention of the House. In previous sessions it has been too far down the list, but this time by the luck of the draw it was more fortunate. Now, thanks to the co-operation of members on both sides of the House it has been possible for the bill to be altered so that I could bring it here for debate this afternoon. I should like to thank all members for their courtesy.

This is a very important issue. The principle of maternity leave has been supported by women's organizations across Canada in growing numbers, and by women who recognize its far-reaching significance. The bill is not as broad as I could wish but under the rules of the House it must be limited to women in employment under federal jurisdiction, that is federal undertakings of various kinds as well as employment covered by the Public Service Employment Act. This matter of providing protection for women through maternity leave is a test of our sincerity. If we are sincere when we proclaim our belief in equality for women in employment, we must do more than concern ourselves merely with equality in wages, hours, working conditions and promotion, important and neces-

sary as these may be. Rather, we must take legislative steps to provide equality of employment where pregnancy is concerned. This is not merely a women's problem. She certainly did not create it by herself. This is not merely an individual's problem. It is a family problem and a community problem, and must be met as such.

• (5:00 p.m.)

The Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) is to be congratulated for having recognized this social responsibility by including provisions to deal with the problem of pregnancy in the new white paper on unemployment insurance. I wish to offer him warm congratulations for it as far as it goes, but I would point out that its proposals fall far short of providing complete maternity leave protection. I will return to that a little later. I surely hope the white paper will come through the labour committee unscathed; we have seen what has happened to other white papers in committees, notably to the white paper of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson). We can only hope. This one is running into heavy weather from a number of powerful employer organizations which all believe that motherhood is a very good idea, but not at the expense of the unemployment insurance fund.

In providing protection for women in employment where pregnancy is concerned, we are up against years of basic social organization and assumptions which have built a barrier of discrimination against women in the labour force. According to these traditions, woman's main permanent responsibility is marriage, a family, and taking care of the home. When a woman seeks employment, she is expected at the same time to fulfil her primary responsibilities of home making. Ideally, a woman starting a family has the protection and income of a man to support her during pregnancy, childbirth and early child care. Men are supposed to support their wives and children. Women are supposed to provide care.

Of course, today's facts do not support these suppositions; but myths die slowly—and painfully for women, I may add. Many women today have turned to gainful employment outside the home because their husband's paycheque is insufficient to provide a modern standard of living. Many others are the sole support of their families. It is instructive to note that of all female employees under the Public Service Employment Act, 57.4 per cent have children and 46.3 per cent of these are the sole support of their children. Yet, in spite of these facts, women are treated as though they were temporary accidents in the labour force, and as though, if conditions were sufficiently uncomfortable, they might go away. They are employed in the temporary and lower paid, less skilled positions and are viewed as supplementary employees both by their employers and, I might add, by themselves. Nowhere is this more evident than in the matter of maternity leave in both public and private industry and occupation.

Fortunately, more and more people are coming to realize that women have the right to continue to keep their employment, in the same way as men have that right. The purpose of maternity leave, the purpose of this bill, is to make this right more secure.

[Mrs. MacInnis.]

Some people argue that providing maternity leave legislation discriminates against some employees in favour of others. Such people, perhaps, do not realize that the Public Service Employment Act now provides special benefits for some of its employees, benefits which are not extended to all. These include: special leave, with full pay for an employee who has a death in the family, a serious illness in the family or a family or household emergency; leave with full pay for military reserve force training, attendance at court, veterans' medical treatment or examination, marriage and paternity leave for the father. Surely, no one could claim that such provisions discriminate against those who do not encounter any one of these emergencies. Why, then, should maternity leave be regarded as any more discriminatory than paternity leave?

The provisions of my bill, Mr. Speaker, are quite simple. They provide for seven weeks leave of absence for a woman before the probable date of her confinement. Should the certificate of her doctor recommend more time than that, it can be given. The same length of time can be granted after her confinement but there is nothing to stop the woman from returning to her employment earlier than that should she desire to do so.

These periods before and after the birth of her child are more flexible than those proposed in the white paper, which gives a straight nine weeks before confinement and six weeks after, a total of 15 weeks. My bill would provide greater attention to the needs of the individual woman concerned. My bill states categorically that an employer shall not dismiss an employee for any reason arising out of her maternity leave absence until, and unless, she has been absent for a period of 16 weeks. There is nothing, of course, in the white paper on unemployment insurance to prevent her dismissal for reasons arising from her pregnancy.

The great value of the unemployment insurance proposals is the fact that during her 15 weeks of absence due to pregnancy the woman will receive two-thirds of her previous earnings. I should very much like to have been able to bring in a similar proposal in this bill, but the rules did not permit me to do so. However, I shall content myself with congratulating the minister and supporting his proposal fully.

My bill has two other very important provisions. The first is that the employee's job shall be held open for her should she wish to return to it after the birth of her child at the end of her maternity leave period. The second is that she shall suffer no loss of her seniority rights because of her absence during the maternity leave period.

These are the terms of my bill, which is in line with the International Labour Organization Convention that was passed in 1919 and revised in 1952. That is a convention which, I should point out, we have been unable to sign in Canada because of our peculiar constitutional set-up and because all our provinces are not yet ready to accept it. It is my hope that the federal government, as the largest single employer of labour in this country, will adopt this bill, or at the very least, send its subject matter to the

Standing Committee on National Health and Welfare for study. I hope that this bill will not be sent to the Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs. I think the Standing Committee on National Health and Welfare could more appropriately deal with it. I really feel that the time is right for this bill to be sent to that committee.

The federal government should, in my opinion, act as a model for other employers in this regard. Up to this point, only two provinces, British Columbia and New Brunswick, have maternity leave legislation of any kind on their statute books. In private industry only a small fraction of employees are covered by any sort of maternity leave legislation. Of course, when I say that, it will be obvious that Canada lags far behind many countries in this regard. A survey carried out by the federal Department of Labour in 1967 mentioned such countries as France, Britain, Sweden, Australia and New Zealand.

The proposals of this bill represent a considerable advance from the situation now existing in federal government legislation. I should like to reiterate that the bill does not propose merely to cover employees under the Public Service Employment Act. This is a broader proposal than that. It proposes to cover women whose employment comes under federal jurisdiction which means, of course, that the employment need not only be under the Public Service Employment Act; it may also be connected with all forms of federal works, undertakings or enterprises such as transportation, communications, banking, etc. Therefore, it is a much broader bill than the present legislation, and covers more. As I say, the proposals of this bill represent a considerable advance from the situation now existing in federal government legislation. Employees covered by the Public Service Employment Act are allowed to take time off for pregnancy, but they receive no pay during their period of absence. This may be an improvement over being fired outright when they become pregnant, but this unjust condition still exists in many areas of Canadian employment. For example, there was the recent case in Ottawa where the Public Library fired a woman for pregnancy. Being forced to take time off without pay is really being punished for being a woman; it is being punished for becoming pregnant. I cannot see it in any other light. At the very time when the economic needs of a woman are increasing, she is forced to leave her job.

• (5:10 p.m.)

The present situation in the federal service is that an employee must resign at least two months before the birth of her child unless a medical certificate is provided or the agreement of the department concerned is obtained to permit the woman to continue working. The employee must return to work within six months of the birth of her child. This leave is granted without pay. During this time the woman is required to pay both her own share and that of the government toward her superannuation and medical insurance plans. It is hard to believe that this situation exists in our Public Service Employment Act. It is manifestly unjust at the time a woman is laid off that she should have to continue to pay both her share and that of the government toward both superannuation and medical insurance plans.

My bill is necessarily limited to cover women whose employment comes under federal jurisdiction. Of all persons under federal jurisdiction 26.5 per cent are women. It is estimated that 36 per cent of these women are between the ages of 20 and 34, which can be roughly classified as the child-bearing years. As far as I can understand this is how they are classified by the Women's Bureau.

In the general work force the participation of women of child-bearing age is increasing. This was shown by a report issued in the last day or two. It is, therefore, entirely likely that such is also the case in those positions under federal jurisdiction.

Thousands of women today have to face the double job of looking after a family and holding a position outside of the home. It might be better if such were not the case. I have no doubt that if they could find alternative sources of income such as a husband, some kind of family allowance or a guaranteed income, many of these women would not be in the labour market. Those who are forced to be there are having a difficult time making their way against customs and social organization which no longer fit in with today's needs and realities.

We, as Members of Parliament, should be doing all that we can to place these women in a position of greater equality to enable them to carry their double burden. After all, it is not their burden alone, but the burden of society. I urge the government to look carefully at these proposals with a view to adopting them or similar proposals to provide adequate maternity leave protection for women employed under federal jurisdiction. If the government is not prepared to do this, then, the least it should do is to have a committee thoroughly study and make recommendations on maternity leave. The time is now ripe, particularly in view of the fact that pregnancy is covered under the Unemployment Insurance Act. The very least we can do is to refer the subject of this bill to the Standing Committee on National Health and Welfare for study and report.

Mr. Jack Cullen (Sarnia-Lambton): Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent upon me to congratulate the hon. member on presenting this bill. I think the male members of this House can also take a pat on the back because we saw fit to leave this bill in its place of priority, notwithstanding the offending section, and allowed the hon. member to delete this section so that the matter could be debated this afternoon.

The attitude concerning women in the work force has undergone considerable change, particularly in the past 10 or 20 years. May I be so bold as to suggest that this change in attitude has been healthy? It is interesting to note that we have moved from ridiculing the suffragette to the present position where a royal commission has been appointed to study the status of women. It is, therefore not surprising that a Member of Parliament should be introducing or suggesting the kind of legislation we are debating today.

We were not taken completely by surprise when the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) in his white paper entitled, "Unemployment insurance in the 70's" saw fit to suggest that payments be made to those whose income has been interrupted due to sickness or pregnancy. Although it is not surprising that such a provision is contained in the white paper of the Department of Labour, those of us who sit as members of the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration have found that there is a considerable amount of opposition to have included in the unemployment insurance plan such a benefit for pregnant women. The mover of this bill indicated that she is concerned about what is going on and made reference to other white papers. I suggest with respect that she should also consider the white paper on veterans' legislation that was studied by the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs to see how much stronger that particular white paper was when the committee was finished their study of it. I do not think very many members of that committee were sidetracked from this very good recommended legislation. Paragraph 4 on page 10 of the White Paper "Unemployment insurance in the 70's" reads:

> In order to fill the gaps in the present system, payments will be made to those whose income has been interrupted due to sickness or pregnancy. In both cases benefits will cover a fifteen week period and will be available to anyone whose earnings cease due to pregnancy or sickness and who has been in the labour force twenty weeks or more during the previous 52 weeks.

As all members are aware, under the present act pregnant women are presently disqualified for benefits six weeks prior and after confinement. The plan to cover income lost due to pregnancy recognizes the particular status of women in the labour force. It is a step toward eliminating some of the hardships they experience, as outlined by the mover of this bill.

I believe it was two days ago when all members received a copy of the news bulletin from the Canada Department of Labour. The bulletin indicates that the Women's Bureau of the Canada Department of Labour has released a new publication entitled, "Facts and Figures: Women in the Labour Force 1969". It then states:

> Data contained in the publication shows that 35.2 per cent of Canadian women were in the labour force in 1969 compared with 26.7 per cent in 1959. During 1969, of the total labour force, 32.2 per cent consisted of women, compared with 25.7 per cent in 1959.

It is also stressed in the white paper on unemployment insurance that in the case of both pregnancy and sickness the proposed scheme will not replace existing public or private programs in this field, but will complement them within specific limits. I mentioned to the Minister of Labour this morning that if we cannot have an over-all guaranteed income for the most significant portion of the Canadian population, the work force, that maybe here at least we can look toward a guaranteed annual income. We must walk before we run. I think this is a move in the right direction.

The government has of course recognized that there are many women who are covered under private and public programs and in fact are probably well covered, but I venture to say that the vast majority of women in the work force who become pregnant are not covered under any present federal legislation. This is certainly true of the over-all work force. I suggest it is particularly true of women in the work force.

As the hon. member indicated, steps along this line have been taken by various provinces. Unfortunately, time does not permit me to go into the statutes of each province, but I have noted that under the Minimum Employment Standards Act of New Brunswick there is a clause which reads:

> An employer shall not employ or keep in employ a female employee during a period of six weeks from the time of being delivered of a child or a longer period on production of a medical certificate.

Section 12 reads:

> An employer shall permit a pregnant female employee to be absent from her work for a period of up to six weeks before her time of delivery on production of a medical certificate stating her delivery will probably take place within six weeks.

• (5:20 p.m.)

And in clause 13, it is provided that—

> Where a female is absent from her work in accordance with sections 11 and 12, her employer shall not give notice of dismissal for reasons arising from her absence until the employee has been absent for a maximum period of 16 weeks.

The enlightened province of British Columbia has passed a bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Employment of Women before and after Childbirth". This bill became law on April 1, 1966. The wording of the British Columbia statute is very close to the wording used in Bill C-6, and no doubt the hon. member has used these forms as her precedent. In my own province, the Province of Ontario, there exists an act entitled "An Act to Prevent Discrimination in Employment because of Sex or Marital Status". Although the bill received Royal Assent on June 26, 1970 it is not yet in force, although it will be in force on the day proclaimed by the Lieutenant Governor. This statute, in section 9, advises that:

> An employer shall not terminate the employment of an employee because of her pregnancy but the employer, before or after the commencement of the period referred to in subsection 2, may require the employee to commence a leave of absence at such time as the duties of her position cannot reasonably be performed by a pregnant woman or the performance of the employee's work is materially affected by the pregnancy.

I would hate to be the civil servant who had to make that particular determination.

The statute of the Province of Ontario has one further section to give some protection to the employer in that it advises that the section does not apply in respect of an employer unless he employs 25 or more employees. To this extent, it seems to me there is a measure of discrimination involved.

Hon. members may wonder why I am interested in this particular area. First, I would say my interest was aroused by the government's white paper entitled "Unemployment Insurance in the 70's." I noted that it is the intention of this government that since under the

present act pregnant women are generally disqualified for benefits six weeks before and after confinement, the unemployment insurance scheme for the 'seventies should fill that gap and authorize payment to those whose income had been interrupted due to sickness and/or pregnancy. Realizing that the government had this intention, I examined the statute, together with the bill presented earlier by the hon. member, Bill C-160, I believe, in the second session of the 28th Parliament. I also read a booklet prepared by the Canadian Department of Labour, entitled "Maternity Leave Policies". The book states, on page one:

> Maternity leave linked with security of employment is a relatively new addition in most provinces to the expanding list of employment benefits in Canada.

As yet, as I have indicated, it is the subject of legislation in only two provinces—British Columbia, where the original Maternity Protection Act dates from 1921, and New Brunswick which added legislation on this subject to provincial labour standards requirements in 1964. Its growing acceptance is no doubt related to the steady increase in the participation of married women in the work force which we have experienced particularly in the last decade. Although much of this increase is due to the return of married women to employment when their children reach school age, between 1957 and 1967 the participation rate of women of childbearing age rose from 47 per cent to 57 per cent in the 20-24 age group and from 26 per cent to 34 per cent in the 25-34 age group. The report makes it clear that an attempt was being made to give a descriptive summary of the results without attempting to draw conclusions, and concedes that a number of areas which might warrant more probing in depth had been revealed. In my view, the bill now before us is indicative that the conclusion is warranted by the statistics presented in this booklet.

I was interested to note that although, according to the report, "The most important provision required as a condition of eligibility for maternity leave is length of service with the employer", the hon. member's bill is silent on this aspect. The government's proposition is that in a pregnancy situation benefits will cover a 15 week period and will be available to anyone whose earnings cease through pregnancy or sickness, and who has been in the labour force for 20 weeks or more during the previous 52 weeks. If this bill were to be voted on today, I submit the hon. member might wish to give it more credibility by placing some similar requirement in her own bill. It is perhaps understandable that the hon. member should not include such a clause in her bill, because the report by the Department of Labour states, and I quote:

> The length of service required for eligibility varies not only between industry groups but within the industry group and between office and non-office employees, so that no clear pattern emerges. A majority of office employees in ten industry groups are required to have three to six months prior service, and in seven industry groups from seven to twelve months service. For non-office employees the period required tends to be shorter. In all but three industry groups a majority of non-office employees must have six months service or less and in half of these the requirement is three months. There does not appear to be any relationship between the length of service required and the size of the reporting unit or the presence or absence of a collective agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have covered the points I wish to examine. I wish to congratulate the hon. member for having brought this bill forward. I would have welcomed a few more statistics as to the number of women likely to be covered by legislation of this kind, but no doubt other speakers will deal with this aspect.

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): First of all, I should like to support the principle of this bill. Second, I should like to assure the hon. sponsor that I do not do so from any Victorian attitude. I suspect the hon. member who preceded me did, because it seemed me there lurked within the framework of his speech the awful notion that somewhere, somehow, a dewy-eyed young lady would present herself for work and, having duly registered for employment, would declare her pregnancy to the company doctor. This seemed to be a possibility which in itself was enough to cause grave doubts as to the virtue of the bill.

I see no problem about this at all. The woman is very much a part of the working force today, and the woman carries with her the possibility of pregnancy. So, may I say to the hon. lady who is sponsoring this bill that when she looks down her nose at the possibility that it might wind up before the Justice and Legal Affairs Committee she might be far better off in my tender embraces than she would in the embraces of some hon. members opposite who help constitute the Committee on Manpower and Immigration. I think the justice committee, especially the Tory members thereof, could do her a great deal more justice.

• (5:30 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, we should never fall into the school of thought that the last speaker mentioned where, as in New Brunswick, you can do one of two things to obtain your desserts under the legislation. As I understood his reading of the act, you can produce a child or you can produce a medical certificate. I would suggest to our colleague that she should bring her measure before the Justice and Legal Affairs Committee, where we would clearly have that matter straightened out.

Mrs. MacInnis: Hear, hear!

Mr. McCleave: I am glad to hear that she agrees with me. I do not know why we should have this God-awful emphasis placed upon statistics in respect of this problem. Whether it happens to 1 per cent of the female working population, or 99 per cent, surely is not the reason for this Parliament to take action: the fact that it happens at all—and this is one of the very natural things that will happen to a woman employee—should be sufficient reason for it to engage our attention. It is not the extent of the problem as it affects womenkind as a group that is important. The effect this has upon any woman who is working and finds herself in this position should

define the direction in which our hearts and heads should lead us.

Perhaps it is strange that I, as a mere male, am discussing this matter but once in a while I trespass in somewhat trembling fashion into these problems. The other day I tried to strike a blow for a nursing mother who, according to the Toronto *Globe and Mail,* had been deprived of certain rights by the Unemployment Insurance Commission. It turned out that the *Globe and Mail* report was incorrect and that the problem had been rectified. That fact was not reported in the *Globe and Mail.* I think it was not reported because I once had the temerity to stand up in the House of Commons, surveying that vast brood known as the editorial board of the Toronto *Globe and Mail,* and state I thought they had solved their housing problem very neatly because every two of them required only one seat in the editorial room. Ever since that deep criticism I have been put on the black-list of that noble publication.

Be that as it may, Sir, I support my colleague from the NDP in her endeavour to bring before us a very sensible point of view. It is one that can be referred to a committee of the House of Commons. In principle we are not being asked to accept everything, holus-bolus, that is set forth in her bill. That is no longer the purpose of second reading. We do not have to accept everything in principle; we simply say it is a matter that we should at least refer to a committee for study and consideration. Let the committee look at it, make changes and report back. When we see that product we will decide whether we accept it in principle. That is what we now do on second reading. It is not what we did before.

If there are imperfections in the way the bill is drafted—and I for one would niggle about some of its language—I would not say that was an imperfection. I simply say as a lawyer, and I am sure any other lawyer in the House would agree, that no two people would ever draft a bill in the same way. The bill is there, with reasonable certainty and clarity, and the important thing is that it catches a principle which could be put into the law of this country. The principle is that a woman should not be penalized for what women very naturally do. Women, very naturally, do have children from time to time. Quite apart from the element of statistics—and I would never approve or disapprove a bill like this because there was an overwhelming statistical or no statistical need for it—I say that we should look at its principle. I would not accept a statistical argument in any way, shape or form as a reason for approving legislation.

During the last 30 or 40 years more and more women have joined the labour force. I am sure that employers would tell us that you could not find any greater degree of loyalty, efficiency and job stability among employees than you find among females. Therefore, they should not be penalized in any way. We should not take from them their given right to have children and to carry on the race. I hope that not only this matter will be referred to the committee but that in addition to the two provinces which already have legislation in this field, the new women's division which is playing a great part in the Department of Labour will initiate action through the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) so there is more action at the provincial level and a sort of standard provision dealing with this important right at the federal level.

My final thought on the subject is that the Bird Royal Commission has not yet been heard from. Presumably it will report during this session. I think the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) expressed the hope last June that these ladies would put their views before us soon. I hope this will occur very shortly. I do not think we have to hold up this measure until we receive that report. It could go to the committee, and in due course when the Bird Royal Commission makes recommendations they could be sent to a committee where this very important topic could be discussed. In any event, this subject should be dealt with by a committee on its merits and a report sent back to the House. In short, I support the idea and suggest that we should not wait for months but should get on with it right now.

Mr. Ray Perrault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the director of the women's bureau of the Canada Department of Labour delivered a speech to the Women's Canadian Club in Toronto the other day. It was a very good speech. The lady's name, of course, is Sylvia Gelber. She asked the question, "What do women want?" She answered her own rhetorical question in the words of the report of a task force on women's rights and responsibilities submitted to the President of the United States a few months ago. Her answer was, "A matter of simple justice". It seems to me that is what we are talking about when we talk about the need for a maternity leave policy in Canada. It is a matter of simple justice, and perhaps overdue justice.

For ten years in Canada women have had the statutory assurance that within the federal jurisdiction there will be no discrimination on grounds of sex in connection with the right of the individual to equality before the law, a principle embodied in the Canadian Bill of Rights. For the past ten years efforts have been made to give meaning and substance to these technical statutory guarantees under the Canadian Bill of Rights. It is painfully clear—this fact has been pointed out by speakers in this debate and on many other occasions by spokesmen of all parties in all parts of Canada—that women do not enjoy full equality before the law and that there is not equality for them in many other areas of activity in this country.

In the area of justice, it is hoped that when the new law reform commission is established and operating, the women of Canada will have the opportunity to bring to its attention certain of the present sections of the law relating to women which might well be re-designed, if not eliminated. This is progress. But progress certainly cannot stop there, as has been pointed out by hon. members who have spoken on this bill which has been brought before the House this afternoon.

• (5:40 p.m.)

There are certain sections of the law in Canada which still reflect the attitudes of another era, an era in which it was assumed that all married women were wholly dependent upon and supported by their husbands, and problems relating to the responsibility for surviving dependents were viewed as problems solely affecting the male provider. Times have changed, and changed dramatically. I know that during election time when we go door-to-door in the process of canvassing our respective constituencies, so often we find there is no housewife at the door. She is out working, trying to earn money to put food on the family table.

I am sure hon. members realize full well the dramatic differences between the Canada of today and the Canada of 25 years ago. There are in this country today several hundred thousand women who are the sole supporters of their families. Some of these women are widows, others have been deserted, others have been divorced and thousands are married women who must work because their husbands are unable to secure enough income to provide a decent standard of living for the family. This is the situation we are talking about.

Today more than one out of every three women is in the Canadian labour force. There are now in Canada 2.5 million women employed. This represents one million more than there were 10 years ago. More than half of these women are married. In other words, of the 2.5 million women employed, more than half are married. There are 1¼ million married women in the Canadian labour force. In 1951, 11 per cent of all married women went out to work. This figure has now risen to over 30 per cent, and all of the analyses available to the government indicate that this trend will continue and that there will be an even higher percentage in the future.

All of us should bear in mind the following figures. In August of 1970 the total Canadian labour force was 8,720,000. The total number of women 14 years of age or over was 7,601,000. The number of women in the labour force was 2,733,000, 36 per cent of the total population of women or 31.3 per cent of the total labour force. This is an incredible figure. Not only is it significant from the sociological standpoint, but we see increasingly the importance of women in Canada's general drive toward greater productivity. The GNP in very large measure is the result of the work of women in the labour force.

Let us compare these figures with the figures for 1931. The total labour force then was 3,921,833. The total number of women in Canada 14 years of age or over was 3,481,089. The total number of women in the labour force was 665,302, 19.1 per cent of the total population of women or 17 per cent of the total labour force. So we have seen an increase between 1931 and 1970 from 17 per cent of the total labour force to 31.3 per cent of the total labour force. Against this background it seems clear that legislative standards governing maternity leave are both necessary and desirable. The government in no way quarrels with this concept. Against this background it seems equally clear that other legislative reforms are needed to assist the women in Canada's work force.

The White Paper with the "golden cover", entitled "Unemployment Insurance in the 70s", is a remarkable document and deserves to be given far greater publicity by all members of the House. It is perhaps one of the most advanced documents relating to social legislation to come before Canada's Parliament. This document states with validity:

> The rewards of economic growth should be directed not only toward the individuals who have had the opportunity for a good education, a well-paid job, a two-car garage and a home in the country... They are also for the widow or divorcee working long hours.

I think it should be added that society's concern must be extended to those who have been cruelly deserted and to those married women living on the economic margin. We talk a great deal about the just society. Indeed, this goal should be the object of all our activities in the House. In a truly just society the rewards of economic growth cannot, and must not, be denied to those married women who because of economic circumstances must go out to work in order to put food on the table and help raise their families in human dignity.

This country and the party which the people of this country chose to be the government in 1968 have built a remarkable record of social legislation, and there are those in other parties who are similarly concerned about the need for improved social legislation. No one claims a monopoly of interest in that field. Much of this reform has taken place over the past 35 years. That legislation has been geared to meet a whole spectrum of human needs. Despite this good legislation, the need for reform continues.

One area of need has been outlined today by the sponsor of this bill and by others who have participated in the debate. It must be obvious that a need for maternity leave exists, particularly in view of the increasing numbers and importance of women in Canada's work force. For anyone to suggest that the government and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) hold a contrary view, represents a distortion of fact. Surely no one in this House would ever attempt to distort facts. The Minister of Labour has distinguished himself as a strong supporter of women's rights, including maternity rights. The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis) may have been in the House on November 25, 1968, when the minister said:

> The idea of maternity leave is certainly not an original one. It makes sense and it should at least be part of the provisions of the Unemployment Insurance Act, if nothing else, when unemployment insurance comes up for drastic overhaul early in the new year.

This document "Unemployment Insurance in the 70's" reflects the real concern by the government of the need for action in this area. Admittedly, it talks in terms of compensation during the period of pregnancy, but it must be obvious that the two concepts of maternity leave and compensation during a period of maternity must go hand in hand. I want to assure this House that the government's and the minister's determination is still to correct

at the earliest feasible opportunity the injustice of women facing possible loss of employment because of pregnancy. As one speaker stated, maternity is a perfectly natural and, indeed, in so far as the future of this country is concerned, desirable phenomenon.

• (5:50 p.m.)

Let no one make the erroneous assumption that the problem of maternity leave has been tucked away in some governmental cubbyhole. Hopefully, the report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women will be tabled in the House next month. I think we will all welcome the tabling of that report by Mrs. Bird and the other commissioners. It may well be that this document will contain explicit recommendations not only for maternity leave but for other benefits associated with maternity leave. It may contain recommendations for new measures which would provide maternity leave as a matter of right for women employed in industries under federal jurisdiction. It can be argued that any action which the government may contemplate in the area of maternity leave should await that report. I think there is some logic in that position. As well, there may well be other recommendations contained in the Bird Commission Report which should be included in some wide-ranging, omnibus measure.

Let me reiterate one salient fact: there is strong and enthusiastic support on this side of the House for new measures which will be more favourable to the female labour force in this country. When this measure is brought forward by the government in whatever form it takes, it is encouraging to know the degree of support which exists in this House, not only on the part of government members but also on the part of the official opposition and members of the NDP.

In this regard I would remind hon. members that the proposed changes to the Unemployment Insurance Act will provide substantial new benefits for the women of this country. Under the act as it stands now, a sick person receives no benefit unless he or she becomes sick after entering the benefit structure. If pregnant, a woman is now generally disqualified for six weeks before and six weeks after the birth of her child. Personally, I find that kind of regulation indefensible. In the context of today's social situation, this denial of benefits to employees who become sick or pregnant is indefensible. Both sickness and pregnancy are natural phenomena.

I am sure that even opposition members will embrace with enthusiasm the proposal of the Minister of Labour that these anomalies be removed. The working women of Canada must be provided with benefits based upon a realistic appraisal of what their particular interruption of earnings means in the context of the work force of today. It has been pointed out by others who have discussed this point that when we adopt the concept of maternity leave we will not be wild-eyed revolutionaries in the process, that many other jurisdictions moved long ago to help women faced with this particular problem.

[Mr. Perrault.]

Under the proposed changes set forth in the unemployment insurance white paper, which goes hand in hand with the idea of maternity leave, if a woman has had 20 or more employment weeks in the previous 52 she will be entitled to UIC benefits nine weeks before and six weeks after her confinement, after a two-week waiting period. When we are thinking in terms of planning new legislation to bring into force a program of maternity leave, we should keep in mind these limits. There should be a standard relationship between UIC benefits and maternity leave benefits.

In the white paper entitled "Unemployment in the 70s" it is proposed that provision be made for the payment of benefits in the event of unemployment due to maternity. Financial benefits totalling two-thirds of earnings will be available, after a two-week waiting period, to women with 20 or more employment weeks in the previous 52 weeks and whose loss of income is due to pregnancy. Generally, the benefits will be available for a period of six weeks after confinement and nine weeks before. Similarly, there are many persuasive reasons why employers should be required in defined circumstances to reinstate them following leave and to protect their continuity of service for purposes of pensions and other employee benefits.

I agree with my colleague who spoke earlier that the limits should be defined and that rules and regulations should be provided. My colleague made a very valid point when he said that reference should also be made to the type of work which is available after maternity leave. If an employer proposes to provide employment after the leave has expired, but it is not the same type of employment, that is a very important factor. No one will dispute the fact that the period of eligibility for maternity leave should be long enough to embrace normal periods of probation, the period that a new employee must complete before achieving permanent status. These periods vary from employer to employer, but one to three months is common for non-office workers, and up to six months for office workers.

Surely, the period of eligibility should be long enough to counteract any tendency on the part of employers to introduce undesirable hiring practices such as requirement for a pregnancy test—this has been suggested as one of the stratagems which could conceivably be employed—which would suggest a minimum of at least nine months. Together with my colleagues on this side of the House I have no difficulty whatsoever in supporting the principle contained in this bill. It is a good principle. I am happy to see the official opposition joining the government in the desire to see reform in this area.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hour for the consideration of private members' business having expired, I do now leave the chair to resume same at eight o'clock p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

CANADA GRAIN BILL

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION, PROVISIONS RESPECTING GRADING, LICENCES, ELEVATORS, ETC.

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Olson that Bill C-175, respecting grain, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, we in this party favour the reintroduction of Bill C-196 as it was known, or Bill C-175 as it is now known, at the level at which it was last dealt with by the House. Certainly, we do not think it is necessary to return it to committee. We feel the bill does some good and essential things. For example, we feel it provides for the protein grading of wheat so that importing nations and the markets of the world will be in a position to purchase Canadian grain on a guaranteed protein basis. This is a good thing. The bill also provides for mixing at terminals or, if you will, tailor-making samples of grain for export. This will have some advantages: one is that we will be able to mix grain to the order of the buyer.

We on this side of the House, and I think most farmers, have long argued that something more specific should be done in the directing of boxcars on the Prairies. This has been a complaint for as long as I have been farming, and certainly for some time before that. I think these three aspects of the bill should have been introduced at least ten years ago. I recall that when I was a wheat pool delegate in the 1950s, farmers, wheat pool delegates and farm organization people were talking about them then. I only wonder why it has taken so long to get them before Parliament and passed in this form.

The important issue to be remembered when dealing with this bill is the selling of grain. Getting markets for our grain has always been a problem for as long as I have been farming, and we must be alive to changes in the markets. Too often we have been complacent. We have accepted the fact that our wheat and other grains were the best in the world and expected buyers to come to us. This is no longer true. Now we are in a buyer's market and we must do something if we are to sell our grain in competition with other countries.

I would like to mention just a few items which illustrate what I mean. A new milling process is being used to turn wheat into flour. It is known as the Chorley process and it requires a specific protein level of wheat. Bread can be made with a lower level of protein, but there must be a certain consistency to that level so the miller will not encounter difficulties. As I say, this bill would allow us to sell grain on a guaranteed protein basis.

Another matter I wish to mention is that other countries have been experiencing problems in agriculture, particularly with respect to agricultural trade. Some of them have been introducing tariff changes which may work against us. I wish to quote from a news clipping headed "Canada's wheat problems with U.K. begin." It reads in part:

> The British budget brought down last week signalled export problems for Canadian wheat much sooner than anyone here had expected.
>
> The budget indicated that the British government plans to start protecting its farmers with tariff walls even before it joins the European Economic Community.

In effect this is going to start now.

> Under the present British system, food is imported free, the government pays subsidies to the farmers, and consumers are given the benefit of lower prices.
>
> Under the new scheme, subsidies will be gradually abandoned, and Britain will switch to a system of import levies.
>
> That will make imported food more expensive and allow the British farmer to raise his prices.
>
> The important question now is who will suffer most. Will the British consumer bear the whole cost of the tariff? Or will the Canadian exporter have to accept lower prices in order to maintain his sales to Britain?

It is the reference to the Canadian exporter that I am worried about, because we export grain. If we are not awake to the problem posed by Britain joining the European Common Market, we may completely lose our sales of wheat to Britain, which we cannot afford to do. We have a surplus of grain. Our country's economy depends upon selling this grain. Much of western Canada's welfare depends upon the export of wheat, and we do not want to lose any sales if we can possibly avoid it.

I would like to mention a different matter in connection with this bill. Last summer we held hearings for several weeks in connection with Bill C-196, the Canada Grain Act, and I was very unhappy at the attitude of the grain companies in presenting their briefs to us. I was particularly unhappy with the Canada Grains Council. I felt its members did not give the leadership in this area that they might have done. I speak both in sorrow and in anger. I am sorry they did not give leadership and I am angry because the Canadian taxpayer pays for the Canada Grains Council; he pays $50,000 through the Department of Agriculture and another $50,000 through the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In my opinion, their reaction to the bill was a negative one. I feel we deserve better than that from the Canada Grains Council.

Had the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) expected this reaction, he might have had second thoughts about the people he appointed to the Canada Grains Council. We saw his creation, the Canada Grains Council, making a negative response to his bill. It makes me think of the man who has been bitten by a dog, and the worst part is that it was his own dog. The Canadian taxpayer deserves better than that. The Canada Grains Council has been very disappointing in so far as giving any leadership in this area is concerned. They have ignored the marketing needs of Canadian farmers and grain producers. Their

concern has been with their own problems and what is happening to the grain companies, with hardly a thought given to the export market.

• (8:10 p.m.)

I suggest that this bill is concerned with the export market. I hasten to say that some grain companies had a much better approach to this problem than had the Grains Council, but on the whole I was disappointed with the presentations. The Canada Grains Council should give leadership and bring forward new ideas regarding the problems experienced in regard to western Canadian grain. They should be looking for new and better varieties of grain, for cheaper methods of handling and transportation. They should be looking for future markets, finding out where they are and what kind of grains they need.

The possibilities for trade should be examined from the point of view of credit arrangements. I think there needs to be a shake-up within the council, because I do not think they have the leadership necessary to accomplish these things. The Canada Grains Council should be looking at the shifting emphasis in the market from the primary products of grain to secondary products such as meat. They should investigate the possibilities in the world meat market, and whether it might be worth while developing a market which would provide more employment than the growing of grain. This is just one of many areas that should be investigated.

The Canada Grains Council is a creature of the government, Mr. Speaker, and we should demand that they do better or be fired. The council should consider the value of grain, particularly wheat, for food. Just recently I read in the press that enriched bread was only good enough for rats to starve on. I suggest that whole wheat has much more value than this. If there is something wrong with the bread, it is because something is taken out of the wheat to start with, because wheat is rich in vitamins, minerals, protein and starch. As a country of grain producers we should be looking for improved foods and new uses for our wheat. Within the terms of this bill there may be room for such investigation.

We do not wish to belabour the point, Mr. Speaker. As we have said on a number of occasions, we are in favour of the bill and feel that it should be dealt with now. Therefore, we are quite prepared to support it.

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, I think it could be expected that the member representing the constituency which includes the wheat city of the west, the city of Brandon, would be concerned with the implications of Bill C-175 as it has come before the House. I followed the debate during the course of the afternoon and was glad to learn that the minister has modified his position considerably since this measure was first introduced during the last session as Bill C-196.

Within the limitations of time available today I have re-read the debate on that occasion. The minister's emphasis at that time was on the necessity for haste because fundamental amendments to the Canada Grain Act were of the utmost importance if we were to deal with the problem that had reached crisis proportions by last spring, namely, the difficulty caused by the drastic drop in wheat sales in particular and grain sales in general. As was pointed out by the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski) who spoke for the official opposition, the minister was on a slightly different wicket today. The thesis previously propounded by the minister was that the grain export situation depended upon the quick passage of the bill. That thesis no longer holds water.

As I remarked earlier, as the representative of a constituency still closely tied to grain for its continued prosperity, I feel it is of the utmost importance that the contents of this bill be examined carefully and in detail. This is the first time since 1930 that any major amendments have been made to the Canada Grain Act. The general state of the Prairie economy demonstrates that wheat is still king in the maintenance of prosperity. The situation which has developed over the past two years, the growing spirit of western alienation, has largely arisen from the fact that this government has been completely out of touch with the fundamental position of wheat in the well-being of the Prairie economy. Policies have been initiated that are incomprehensible to most Prairie farmers and producers.

I have attended many meetings where various attempts have been made to grapple with the growing crisis in the grain trade. Last spring I attended several meetings in connection with the Lift program, the Lower Inventory for Tomorrow program as it was described by the government, and the Lower Income for Tomorrow program as it was dubbed by the unhappy farmers.

At that time the criticism was that the federal government, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson), and the minister from Saskatchewan responsible for the Wheat Board had failed to appreciate that Lift would do nothing to solve the grain problem; in fact, in the long run it would aggravate it. This has been demonstrated recently by the report of increased grain sales with the reopening of the market in mainland China and the prospects of substantial sales of grain, primarily wheat, to the Soviet Union. Indeed, we find that the government so badly miscalculated in connection with the Lift program that perhaps by creating an artificial crop failure, or a government-directed crop failure as it is described by the farmers, we have placed our future sales position and prospects in jeopardy.

• (8:20 p.m.)

Therefore, I would urge very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that instead of acceding to the minister's request to reinstate the bill before the House at the level it had reached in the previous Parliament, we move very carefully and cautiously in order that we may make a fundamental revision of the Canada Grain Act and deal with the critical problems of our grain industry. It has been demonstrated by the changes that have taken place in the last few months that there is no need for haste. Exports are opening up, notwithstanding our dealing or not dealing with the matter of protein content. Therefore,

from that standpoint there is no excuse for hasty action on the bill.

There is before us at second reading stage a bill that is a rather complex and weighty document. I do not intend to go into detail with respect to particular items except to point out to the minister and the government that the enlarged powers to be given to the Canadian Grain Commission, which will be its new designation, should be carefully reviewed. The previous speaker criticized the reservations of the Canada Grains Council in this respect. But that is not the only representative body of the grain producers which has expressed reservations concerning the powers that are to be given under the revisions to the Canadian Grain Commission. Some of the leading publications representing the farmers of the province of Manitoba, for example, have expressed the same anxiety. The Manitoba *Co-operator,* a paper that followed closely the discussions that took place in committee and in Parliament with respect to Bill C-196, said as recently as last June 25:

> It is equally apparent that if Bill C-196 is delayed until the next session of Parliament that the Conservative opposition will be charged with being obstructionists. The government will say that Canada's ability to compete in the world wheat market has been damaged by the delay caused by the opposition. That, of course, is patently false, since as we have said, the matter of protein grading could be dealt with promptly, and with the full blessing of the opposition, if so many other strings had not been attached to the bundle.

One of the strings that has been attached to the bundle in this impressively large bill is the new powers that will be given to the Canadian Grain Commission which is replacing the old Board of Grain Commissioners. We shall need to consider under the terms of the legislation the whole question of the transportation of grain to export markets. Apparently, the entire problem of box car allocation is to be dealt with in the bill before us. In other words, it would appear that the legislation will provide the legislative basis for the block system which is already operating on the Prairies on an experimental basis. It appears that the bill will empower the Canadian Grain Commission to become the authority in the matter of the transport of grains.

In the latter part of the 1950s and the early part of the 1960s, when grain exports increased at a tremendous rate under the then Conservative government and the problem of providing or allocating boxcars at the right place and at the right time in order to bring out the required quantities and grades of wheat that were urgently required or the export market grew enormously, it became necessary to appoint a transport controller. This ad hoc provision of course was quite inadequate to deal with the upsurge of grain sales in the last few years. There was some delay in appointing a transportation controller, the result being that we suffered some unfortunate tie-ups both at Thunder Bay and at the western ports. It appears that the placing of this authority in the Canadian Grain Commission, under this legislation, will be a step in the right direction in this regard. Again, since these matters are fundamental there should be no haste in coming to definitive conclusions about them until there has been an opportunity to hear from all the representative groups engaged in the grains export industry.

One of the problems of our grain trade arises from its dependence upon the export market for its prosperity. The very fact that the export market is a fluctuating and difficult market to maintain is all the more reason for our having the best possible legislative framework for dealing with this matter. Fundamentally, Mr. Speaker, the bill is catching up on the years of neglect on the part of Canadian governments. The minister has made the point that there is a great and growing need for a new grading system of grain that will emphasize its protein content. Canada is one of the last major grain exporting countries to bring its legislation up-to-date in this regard. Australia and the United States have already provided the legislative procedures for this difficult problem.

In dealing with the problem of the protein content of wheat, we are merely dealing with a sympton of the over-all difficulties and not with a cure-all that will solve all the problems of the grain trade. For example, one of the major difficulties in the Canadian wheat and grain trade stems from our failure to upgrade the yields of wheat. This difficulty has arisen because of our failure to cope with improved technologies. There will be fundamental changes in the grain trade during the next few years because of the new varieties of grain that are being developed, particularly as a result of experiments that are going on in Mexico under the direction of Dr. Borlaug, who has been the director of the Ford Foundation research in that country for the past 20 years.

• (8:30 p.m.)

It is interesting to note that among the Nobel Peace Prize winners announced this year was the name of Dr. Borlaug for his breakthrough in dwarf wheats. This is the first time that an agronomist has been recognized by this award. It indicates the vital nature of work that has been going on in that country under the direction of that distinguished American who, incidentally, is strongly supported by Canadian researchers. One of the chief researchers for those programs is Dr. Frank Zillinsky, formerly with the Canadian Experimental Farm service. These are matters that have to be discussed when the legislation is before the committee. The more time and opportunity we have to grapple with all the complex phases of the industry, the more effective the new legislative framework will be.

Those of us who are concerned with the continuing problems of the grain trade agree that we should concentrate on the problems of selling grain as much as growing and distributing it. It has been demonstrated that the sales are there if the Wheat Board, on behalf of the government, carries out an aggressive sales program. There have been announcements regarding the sale of substantial amounts of wheat, for example, to mainland China amounting to approximately 98 million bushels. We are not sure about the price of the wheat that is involved. It is suspected that it is at the level of fire sale prices. If this is so, it will not solve the problem of the wheat grower. After two years of drastic decline in sales

he is faced with accumulated debts of cash advances and all the other sources of credit that have been made available. In order to recover his financial position, he will require an extended period of time with the maximum price for his grain.

There have been rumours to the effect that there has been a miscalculation in the demand for barley, so much so that it has been placed under export embargo. As it has been euphemistically explained, it is not an embargo on exports but, rather, a refusal on the part of the Wheat Board to receive any further export orders for barley. This is another way of saying precisely the same thing. I mention these matters at this stage of the discussion merely to point out that what we are grappling with in Bill C-175 will have a tremendous impact on the continuing progress and future health of the grain industry in Canada. This industry is fundamental to the prosperity of the Canadian Prairies.

The fear so often expressed at the various public meetings to which I have referred was this. There is a strong suspicion that behind this bill, as well as some of the other initiatives in agricultural legislation that have been put forward by the government in recent months, the government is attempting to deal indirectly rather than directly with the continuing problem of railway line abandonment on the Prairies. The question of railway line abandonment or continuation is intimately bound up in the whole stituation of the grain trade on the Prairies, involving the transportation facilities, the collection of the grain and the eventual transfer to export positions. We know that there has been only a temporary freeze on railway line abandonment for a certain period of time.

Some of the implications of the legislation are that there will be a rationalization of elevator facilities. What the government has in mind in some of its amendments is very closely related to the whole problem of railway line abandonment. This in turn relates to the process that has been going on not only in western Canada but in all rural parts of Canada. There has been a gradual diminution of the role of the rural community with the decline of the rural population. The population shift from the rural to the urban community goes on apace. In recent months much concern has been expressed because of the implications of this continuing shift of population from rural to urban communities.

The major problem area in Canadian society today is in our large complex urban communities—the booming, buzzing confusion of urban life. In this regard the government has not done anything to discourage the trend. Indeed, it has gone along with the trend, particularly with reference to the closing of post offices, our fundamental means of communication. Over the past two years in particular we have seen the ruthless, wholesale closure of rural post offices. In many instances this has meant the failure of community stores in small towns. When the country store goes, that is the end of that rural community as such. Since the Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Coté) who is responsible for the Post Office has assumed this responsibility, there has been a change of government policy in this regard. He has declared there will no further elimination of rural post offices until the whole matter can be reviewed. I suggest that the same thesis applies with respect to further rationalization of country elevators.

Anyone who has experience of the Prairies knows that the dominant characteristic of rural communities on the Prairies is the two or three grain elevators that stand starkly on the horizon. They are fundamental to the economic life of rural areas of the Prairies. They are also a very integral part of the whole problem of the decline of rural communities, with the consequent upsurge of urbanization and all the social and economic problems that arise therefrom. There is no need to belabour the point further. These considerations will have to be borne in mind when the legislative proposals are reviewed in committee.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Already some 20 amendments have been accepted by the government. These amendments could not have been made, of course, had the official opposition not stuck to its guns and delayed the passage of this legislation. A further 40 amendments or so not yet taken into consideration in connection with the new bill before the House have already come forward and, no doubt, as we hear from spokesmen from various sectors of the grain industry others will be set down for consideration. Eventually, we hope, after 40 years we shall come up with a new or completely rewritten Canada Grain Act which will be adequate to deal with the contemporary problems of the grain industry.

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in this debate may I say I am well aware that this is the second time around for a bill which is essentially similar to Bill C-196, on which a great deal of effort was spent in order to bring about changes to the Canada Grain Act. It now appears that a great many valuable improvements are to be expected.

It is 40 years since the Canada Grain Act was substantially amended. In my opinion, the bringing forward of that measure was a task which had to be undertaken and a great deal of effort was required to arrive at reasonable legislation. Ostensibly, the enactment of Bill C-175 is considered urgent as a means of bringing protein grading to Canadian wheat. It has been said we are losing sales because protein grading in specific percentages is required by some importing nations in order to satisfy new milling and baking practices. No doubt this position is accepted by all, but it is interesting to note that we have succeeded in increasing our sales of grain this year to a number of overseas countries—for the most part, perhaps, to the less developed countries where the subject of protein grading is not of such importance and where price is a more dominant factor.

I have in mind markets such as Red China, to which the sale of some 90 million bushels amounted to slightly more than exports in the previous highest year, but at a price considerably below the minimum set under the International Grains Arrangement. The farmers' position is further worsened by the rise in value of the Canadian

dollar, representing a price reduction of 6 or 7 cents. Then there are the sales made on extended credit, some of which perhaps fall in the category of give-aways and were possible only in the light of long-term credit.

Our main success in selling wheat in the absence of protein grading seems to have resulted from more aggressive selling by the Canadian Wheat Board in circumstances which called for more wheat to be imported into countries where a short crop had set the stage for this to happen. The government made much of the argument that the need for protein grading justified their insistence last session that the bill should be passed without much scrutiny. If protein grading had been so important at that time, amendments to the act would have received speedy passage in the House. Even so, we heard responsible people testify before the Standing Committee on Agriculture that protein segregation could be carried out under the existing system. They gave evidence that our customers could have been assured of protein grading although it would have been impossible, as I understand it, for this effort to have been reflected in the amounts paid to individual farmers.

It is to be hoped the introduction of protein grading will, in fact, as has been suggested, increase the acceptance of Canadian wheat in areas where such grading is desired. There is, unfortunately, one cloud on the horizon which threatens our sales of high quality protein wheat, especially to the United Kingdom. The other day, in an imaginative and bold budget, the Conservative government under Mr. Heath instituted a cut in both income and corporation taxes, while increasing social charges directly to citizens. The budget also included a plan to increase tariffs on food imported into the United Kingdom, while reducing subsidies paid to British agriculture. This is in preparation of the suggested entry of the United Kingdom into the European Common Market. This reverses the position traditionally taken by the British government since 1846, when with the repeal of the corn laws Great Britain embarked upon a policy of importing cheap food and providing subsidies for agriculture.

The United Kingdom has been one of our best and most consistent markets since the earliest days of the grain industry in this country. Although exports fell somewhat last year, exports to Britain amounted to 54 million bushels, mainly of the higher-priced grades, bringing a better price in dollars. So the introduction of protein grading should be welcomed as a means of securing markets in the United Kingdom and other countries of the European Common Market.

I turn now to the subject of barley, where a peculiar situation has arisen. A year ago, barley sales were almost non-existent. In September 1969, the Wheat Board lowered the price of barley from approximately $1 to 78 cents a bushel. This resulted in some sales and we began to sell barley on the world market. Subsequently, the Wheat Board initiated an aggressive selling program which produced sales in the present crop year amounting to at least 125 million bushels, though at prices considerably lower than those the market can command at this time. In other words, the board sold at cash prices and not in futures. This was perhaps unfortunate, especially since some of the sales were in respect of barley which has still to be sown.

Another special situation has arisen with regard to rapeseed, called by some the Cinderella of the grain trade. Transportation and movement of rapeseed to the ports has not been effectively managed and indeed there has been little free rapeseed in west coast ports—not enough, in fact, to take care of the demand which this grain is generating.

• (8:50 p.m.)

The bill touches a very sensitive area to which producers, the government and the grain trade will have to give serious consideration. Modernization of handling and transportation are the inevitable results of changes in technology. This is brought into sharp focus by the fact that the price of grain per bushel on world markets has hardly risen in 20 years; indeed, it has fallen in recent years. The grain farmer has been able to survive only by increasing his productivity, with an almost stationary or declining dollar value per bushel.

The costs of handling and transportation have not stood still. During the long years of oversupply, with large wheat storage costs being paid out of the public treasury and with large payments out of the farmers' pool, the grain handling companies have tended to obscure the actual cost of handling and the necessity of a more rational approach to the problems of handling and transporting grain. The original bill, C-196, seemed to give the government a blank cheque and complete power to move in on the grain handling industry, 60 per cent of which is owned by farmers, wheat pools and the United Grain Growers, in order to carry out their so-called rationalization at will. Perhaps the government made the original bill severe without intending to do so, but it certainly seems that this would have been its effect.

The committee heard many objections from farm organizations and from the grain trade at large to the effect that this power was much too sweeping. I think the amended bill probably will remove many of the objections. Another note of anxiety is that the grain trade and the private grain companies could well diminish their activities in the grain handling field and move into the apparently more lucrative agribusiness. This is the business of selling many different farm items to their customers. This perhaps stands to reason, because when handling charges are so rigidly set by the government it leaves little room for manoeuvre or expansion. With this in mind it seems likely that the grain handling business will have to be carried out by farm grain organizations.

It is no secret that in the minds of those who appeared on behalf of the Manitoba and Saskatchewan wheat pools before the parliamentary Committee on Taxation, in Regina, this was a real worry. They need the income and capital to carry out rationalization because they feel that as farm organizations they are much more able to do so than the government. This is a program we will have to consider for the future.

What is troubling many farmers in western Canada is the constant report that the system may be rationalized so there will be only a few terminals, perhaps 30 or 40 throughout western Canada. This will mean farmers hauling grain for 100 miles or more. This might be considered to be in the interests of efficiency. There is considerable fear that the government might, through its backroom boys, bring forward this rationalization system. This is not necessarily the answer. When a farmer has to haul his grain too far, it is a very expensive proposition. Even though the terminals may be very efficient in themselves, this extra cost to the farmer is substantial.

I was glad to see that an amendment to Bill C-196, to the effect that the producer would have the right to load grain over the platform, was accepted. This is a very important and basic right that the individual producer should have. In the matter of rationalization of the movement of grain, we must consider the railways. There is some talk about unit trains, and so on. This may be envisaged for the future, but we must remember that the facilities on the west coast, where much of our grain is handled, are inadequate to handle the volume that will probably be involved in the future. There does not seem to be any doubt about this. Government authorities will have to increase the amount of grain storage and the grain handling facilities on the west coast if the industry is to function at anything like the level of efficiency necessary.

The minister, in his explanation to the House on clauses 108 and 109, discussed the 1 per cent levy for the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. Needless to say, this is an interesting item. This 1 per cent levy has been in existence for many years and it seems to have drawn a mixed reception from many farmers. In my experience, many of them feel this levy may have outlived its usefulness and little practical use is made of it.

It is my impression that the PFAA has provided a very useful means of providing disaster relief to those farmers who usually do not carry crop insurance. I have found that many farmers have decided that crop insurance is too expensive, unsuited or unfitted to their particular circumstances. There are still many farmers who to some extent need to be treated as social cases when circumstances make it impossible for them to become operators of good, economic units in a so-called economic sense. It is important that at their age they continue to do what they have been doing all their working lives.

The Prairie Farm Assistance Act has provided a measure of relief to the low-income farmer who for various reasons does not wish to take out crop insurance. Unfortunately, the PFAA has not been upgraded since its inception in 1939 when it was designed for the era of the horse and buggy. It could stand some upgrading in order to become a more useful tool to help farmers who are in real distress. This measure has rarely cost the federal government more than has been collected through the 1 per cent levy. On only two occasions during 30 years were substantial payments made out of the federal treasury. I believe that as a means of government subsidy in times of severe crop failure, this is one of the most efficient ways of providing assistance in areas where it does the most good.

Regarding the announcement of the minister in charge of the Wheat Board, with his so-called proposals for a production and grain receipts policy for the western grain industry, the suggestion is that a 3 per cent levy be charged against the grain sales of producers which, on top of the 1 per cent for the PFAA, makes quite a formidable charge. When it is considered that payments to the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act amount to $50 million to $70 million per year, and that this will be transferred out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund as a charge to the farmers' pool, it can well be seen that a levy of 4 per cent to grain trade producers on delivery of grain to the elevator will be severe. In the coming months this matter will receive a great deal of considerations and discussion. I do not think the 1 per cent charge in respect of the PFAA should be discontinued unless there is an adjustment in other levies.

Having been a member of the Committee on Agriculture during a part of the discussion last year on Bill C-196, I am glad that 26 amendments were incorporated into the new bill. I think this will go a long way in meeting the objections of the producers and the grain trade both privately-owned and farmer-owned. There are further amendments that can be made to improve this bill. I hope the bill will be referred to the agricultural committee for the purpose of improving it.

• (9:00 p.m.)

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to unnecessarily prolong this debate, but I feel I should place my remarks on the record concerning the desirability of getting the revised Canada Grain Act into operation at an early date. While it is true that wheat sales will be somewhat higher in this crop year than they were last year, they may still be far short of the total exported in the peak years from 1963-64 to 1966-67, inclusive, when our wheat and wheat flour exports from Canada averaged 522 million bushels per year. I would point out in passing that those were all years under a federal Liberal government.

Mr. Dinsdale: And so are the present years.

Mr. Douglas (Assiniboia): The current level of exports is still far below the productive capacity of our Prairie farmers. In 1966-67 we produce 827 million bushels of wheat in Canada. Even with the improved outlook for wheat sales we are experiencing, farmers are being asked to hold wheat acreage down to 20 million acres in 1971, which could mean a production of about 500 million bushels.

The improved sales which have taken place have been mainly to countries that do not yet require a guaranteed protein level in the wheat they buy. However, an increasing number of major wheat importing countries demand a guaranteed protein level in the wheat they purchase. We are at a disadvantage in these markets. Most of the farmers in the Prairies are heartily in favour

of moving quickly to protein grading. Even though they may not be sure the wheat they produce individually is high in protein, they know that if we can maintain and expand our wheat exports to these sophisticated and growing markets, our total wheat exports will increase and there will be more opportunities for the sale of their grain whether or not it be lower in protein, or barley, oats or rapeseed.

To suggest, as the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski) did a short while ago, that there was no longer urgency in the matter of protein grading because the minister in charge of the Wheat Board has done such a good job in promoting grain sales, is unacceptable to the western farmers, to say the least. We cannot be complacent. We must cultivate all our markets to the maximum. There is no doubt that we must put ourselves in a position as soon as possible to supply wheat to meet the specifications of the growing number of countries which require high quality wheat. After all, this is our best and most reliable market.

Members of the Conservative party are doing their best to convey the false impression that somehow this bil is designed to radically reduce the number of grain elevators on the Prairies. The Board of Grain Commissioners has always had the power to license or not to license grain elevators. If the government had made up its mind about this matter, drastic steps could have been taken before now. The fact is that there is a study going on at the present time to determine what savings, if any, could be achieved through various types of grain handling and transportation systems.

When this study is completed, the information will be made public and the farmers and other people concerned will indicate whether they prefer to retain the present system or move more quickly toward another, and the government no doubt would be guided by their wishes. In the meantime, the grain handling system has not remained static. The grain companies have been doing a great-deal of reorganization on their own. Dozens of elevators are being closed out each year and, through a process of exchanges between companies, regrouping is taking place making better utilization of our elevators and elevator operators. I expect that this sort of thing will continue and there will be no sudden and dramatic speeding up of this process. The point I want to make is that the movement toward a rationalization of our grain handling system is completely independent of this revision of the Canada Grain Act; it proceeded under the old act and could continue under it.

Most people will agree that the Canada Grain Act is due for a general revision. There has not been one for 40 years. There is no great change in the basic concepts of Bill C-175 from those enshrined in the old Canada Grain Act. One important thing that is new in Bill C-175, in addition to protein grading, is the provision which gives the Governor in Council power to regulate the supply and allocation of boxcars, which it does not now have. It seems to me this provision could be every bit as important and urgent at this time as protein grading.

If it is in order, Mr. Speaker, I should like to read three subclauses of clause 97 which deal with this matter. They are as follows:

> The Governor in Council may by order, (a) where he considers it necessary in the public interest to do so, require a railway company to supply to and to place at any point at which the railway company supplies a service, railway cars for the carriage of grain;
>
> (b) notwithstanding anything in this act or the *Canadian Wheat Board Act*, authorize and direct any minister of the Crown or any agency of the government of Canada to exercise the powers in respect of the allocation of available railway cars contained in any provision of this act, other than paragraph (a) of this section, or of the *Canadian Wheat Board Act;*
>
> (c) direct that any allocation of railway cars be guided by the principle that the producer should have the right to select the elevator of his choice or to load directly—

All these are very important powers. Two of them are new and with the very heavy movement of grain anticipated in the next year or two I think these powers could be very useful. I suggest there are many reasons besides those I have enumerated for getting on with this bill and having it made part of the law as soon as possible. I offer my greatest co-operation to those who would assist in bringing this matter to a conclusion at the earliest possible date.

Mr. Les Benjamin (Regina-Lake Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to take very few minutes to comment not only on this bill but on what has been said by a few hon. members. First I wish to say that one aspect of the bill which the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) just mentioned, concerning the allocation of boxcars at the elevator of the farmer's choice, is something that members of this party and members of the official opposition were espousing on the Prairie provinces in the days prior to, and since, the Bracken commission. At long last a Liberal speaker has stood upon and advocated support for this provision. I have heard little mention of this matter from the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) or from any other government member; therefore, I was glad to hear the hon. member for Assiniboia speak on it. I hope the hon. member for Assiniboia, the Minister of Agriculture and other government members realize that if they in fact implement fully and completely this measure in the bill, the private grain elevators in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta will all be out of business.

If the government is prepared to go along with that proposal, it will have the full support of the New Democratic Party. It it is not prepared to go along with it, it should quit kidding the troops and the farmers, because there is no question that if boxcars are really allocated to the elevator of the farmer's choice, the United Grain Growers, the National Grain Company, the Pioneer Grain Company, Mr. Heffelfinger and all those who sit on the Canada Grains Council will be out of business. The government had better quit kidding the farmers and this Parliament.

Allocate boxcars to the elevator of the farmer's choices! I dare the hon. member for Assiniboia and the Minister of Agriculture to implement what this bill provides. Their colleague from Winnipeg, the Minister of Supply

and Services (Mr. Richardson), will be very unhappy when the subsidiary companies of James Richardson and Sons are out of business in the country elevators. They had better quit kidding, because every indication from the time of the Bracken commission until now is that if you deliver boxcars to the elevator of the farmer's choice, a bunch of your friends will go broke. I dare you to implement this provision. I hope you do. I am going to vote for this bill to see whether or not you do it. It will be interesting to find out.

• (9:10 p.m.)

It will be interesting to see what kind of excuses these hon. gentlemen give their friends in the private grain trade when they allocate boxcars to the elevator of the farmer's choice. It will be interesting to see what excuses the hon. member for Assiniboia will give in the sundry communities with which he and I are acquainted, when some of his friends in the elevator companies that are sitting there go belly up. I am waiting to see this, and I have to vote for this bill for that if for no other reason.

There is another reason why I have to vote for this bill. The Liberals are on the spot after 30 cotton-picking years of waiting. The Tories had six years. They had their chance and they blew it. Now they run around the Prairies saying they are friends of the farmers. They talked about elevators of the farmer's choice and they talked about parity prices: then they blew it. Now the Liberals have put it in writing in a bill.

I am dying to see what will happen with this clause on page 69 of the bill regarding the direction of the allocation of boxcars and the ordering of the railways. I am dying to find this out now that the Liberals have put it in writing. They are now putting in writing what they have been mouthing for all these years. When they do it, they and the Tories will lose the grain business and their grain business friends. It seems to me that if the government implements this bill as and when they say they will, the member of the cabinet from Winnipeg, who is part and parcel of the Winnipeg grain exchange and the private grain business, will have no choice but to resign.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Benjamin: Either that, or these people are still kidding the farmers like the Tories did. All of them are the same breed of cat.

Some hon. Members: Oh, no!

Mr. Benjamin: Yes, they are all in the same bag.

An hon. Member: The same old gang.

Mr. Benjamin: It's damn funny, Mr. Speaker. I might have been elected for a lot of crazy reasons, and perhaps the voters in my riding were "had" for a while; but there is one reason why they were not crazy—and I may have been elected by accident or by default—and that is that they were bloody tired of being taken in by these flannel-

mouthed people from places like Assiniboia, Crowfoot, Medicine Hat and Red Deer who only talk to the farmers. Will they bring in amendments to the Canada Grain Act and changes to the farm marketing boards for people who have never believed in farm marketing boards?

While the Liberals and the Tories have been in office we have watched 300,000 farms being lost to Canada. While these people talked about legislation when they were in office we lost another 100,000 farms.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) rising on a point of order?

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, since I have been included in the noble group which the hon. member just named, could he tell the House whether he is referring to the former or to the present member for Assiniboia?

Mr. Benjamin: I am referring to both. I am also referring to Red Deer, to Ethiopia or to any other place when it comes to the number of people that rural Canada has lost, to the family farms and to compounding the felonies that they have perpetrated on urban Canada because of the people we have driven from the land. These people who have betrayed rural Canada now sit as government members. The member who used to sit on SARM, and who has been active in the wheat pool movement, now betrays family farms. Now that it is in writing I want to see the production, and that is why I will vote for the bill.

We have lost over half of the family farms in Canada since 1945. The proposals made by these experts, whether it be the Minister of Agriculture or the minister in charge of the Wheat Board, are nothing more than further contributions to the elimination of rural Canada and the elimination of communities such as the one from which the hon. member for Assiniboia comes and about which he talks out of both sides of his mouth. He talks one way and votes another. We are fed up with it. I tell hon. members that I am going to spend a great deal of time and cross many miles asking the people in his riding where the hon. member for Assiniboia was when their communities were dying, their post offices were being closed, their railway stations were being closed, and now that their elevators will be closed.

Mr. Speaker, we have had enough of this damn double-talk on farm bills from these dinosaurs and these old parties who talked about family farms out of one side of their mouth and who said and did everything they could to promote the Winnipeg grain exchange and to defeat and destroy public compulsory marketing of farm products. They do everything they can to give aid and comfort to the railways which should be a public service, and they do everything they can to give aid and comfort to these outfits that have robbed the people of Canada in general and the farmers in particular.

The hon. member for Assiniboia and the hon. member for Medicine Hat, as well as the dinosaurs in the Tory opposition, will have to answer. I would like you fellows to show up this weekend in Lisgar. You can pick the

towns and I will go with you. You name the rules, and you name the place of meeting and invite all your friends to it.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I remind the hon. member that although his remarks are interesting, he should confine himself to the subject under discussion, namely, Bill C-175.

Mr. Benjamin: I appreciate your reminder, Mr. Speaker. I would point out that the Canada Grain Act has to do with boxcars, with selling grain, with grades of grain and with the amount of money that farmers get. Since the leading speaker for the official opposition spent most of the time dealing with proposals of the hon. member for Saskatoon-Humboldt (Mr. Lang) this afternoon, it seems to me that the debate is fairly wide open. In spite of that, I shall adhere to your admonition.

I say to hon. members of the official opposition, "If you really mean what you say, you will support this bill on second reading. If you really mean that farmers should have the right to deliver their grain to the elevators of their choice, you will make sure that that provision remains in the bill when it becomes law. You will also make sure that the Minister of Agriculture enforces this law, because when he does it will mean that the National Grain Company, the Pioneer Grain Company and the Federal Grain Company will be out of business"—and I suspect he will not hold still for that. The hon. member for Medicine Hat will not hold still for that, because if he does the Canada Grain Council will be out of the window. All his friends who sit on the Canada Grain Council, these experts who would not know a quarter section from their backsides, will quit. These are the people he needed to reinforce him in the elimination of rural Canada, so he has to have the Canada Grain Council. As a result, we cannot do anything but help implement this law to make sure that the farmers get boxcars to the elevators of their choice.

The hon. member for Medicine Hat, the hon. member for Assiniboia, the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson), the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner) and the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski) cannot have it both ways: they cannot be half pregnant, Mr. Speaker, because there is no such thing. I hope that all hon. members in the opposition will vote for this bill on second reading. Then we will do everything we can to ensure that the hon. member for Medicine Hat, the hon. member for Saskatoon-Humboldt and the hon. member for Assiniboia answer our questions—and it will be fun finding out what their answers are. The hon. member for Assiniboia, while he might be doing a great job of reading everything he has said in this House since he came here, will have to answer our questions. I hope every member now will vote for second reading, and let us call these dinosaurs' bluff.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I came into the House in a quiet and peaceful mood prepared to let bygones be bygones and have this legislation passed, but I was inspired by the very fiery speech just made by the hon. member who sits to my left—to my far left, you might say.

An hon. Member: Right.

Mr. Baldwin: An hon. member says I am right, that he is to my left. He is to my left, but I am not too far to his right. Mr. Speaker, before we leave the bill to the tender mercies of the minister who is going to deal with it in its final stages, I want to say that we are in favour of many of the proposals made in the bill.

I see the minister taking notes. No matter what notes he takes, he will not be able to contradict the truthfulness of my statement because this is on the record. We in the official opposition suggested last session to the government that what it should do, because of the serious situation that then prevailed with regard to the sale of certain grains, was to take the old legislation and provide, by a very simple amendment, for protein grading. That matter could have been dealt with and disposed of, so far as this party was concerned, in one half hour. One speaker was all we needed, and we would have consented to an arrangement of that kind. The government would have had what it asked for, and what I think the country has wanted for a long time, that is, a change in the regulations with respect to this type of grading. But the government did not want that. Members of the government wanted everything; they were not prepared to compromise. As a result, we have had to wait, unfortunately, for this period of time for the change to be brought about. The minister may say what he wants to when I have sat down, but the record will bear out that I am correct.

When my hon. friend to my left speaks as he has, I point out that one of the things we object to in this bill is the extent to which it places in the hands of the government a great extension of powers. We are afraid of the government, Mr. Speaker. We are afraid of its abuses of the past and those it will be guilty of in the future in respect of powers which this Parliament grants to it. It is all very well for my good friends in the NDP to accept this situation. They are a party which predicates their position on the increasing of bureaucracy. The only way a Socialist party can survive is by having the bureaucracy extended, with powers granted to operate by Order in Council and short-circuit the powers of this House. We do not believe in this. We believe the people of Canada elected us to come here to deliberate and to make the decisions, and not to pass this power over to any government, particulary not to this government.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Baldwin: Anybody who has seen the government operating in the last three weeks will see that this is not the kind of government that should be vested with the powers that it is asking for now.

Mr. Mahoney: Explain.

Mr. Baldwin: I do not need to explain; it is very plain, as it will be plain to the people of Canada. This is a power-hungry government which craves authority to deal with issues in its own way, secretively, without coming to the House of Commons. I am terribly ashamed of my friends on my left who apparently bought this approach to the politics of today. We say this is the place where decisions are to be made. If there is authority to be given, it is to be given by this House and not by the members of the bureaucracy opposite. That is why we have held this bill up, so that it could be debated effectively, so that the people of Canada will know what it is that the government is asking.

We are not going to object to the bill going through tonight. We will have a chance to examine it in committee. We will have a chance to offer amendments. We offered a number of amendments before; we may have some more to offer. The 40 amendments we have had before the House may well be increased. Or it may well be that as a result of discussion between ourselves and the government we will be able to combine them and come back to the House at the stage at which the bill was before, that is, with a number of amendments which will receive the attention of the House and which might restrict the kind of debate which there ought to be.

However, we are not prepared to make such an offer without some objection, without our taking the position that this is a government which we must treat with a great deal of caution when it seeks the kind of powers it is seeking now. We are afraid of it. The people of Canada will learn to be afraid of it, having in mind what it has done and what it intends to do. It is for that reason we have insisted that this debate be held up to the stage where we can make known our points of view. We serve warning right now that when the bill comes back to the House for amendment we will see that every effort is made so that the government will be stripped of the powers it does not really need, and that authority will not be left with the minister but with the House of Commons.

If my hon. friends to my left want to go along with the government, that is fine. I would just call their attention to a section of the Criminal Code which provides a penalty for seduction under the promise of marriage. The kind of seduction the government is going to practise on the NDP is something they should bear in mind before this bill comes back to the House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I should advise hon. members that if the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) speaks now, he will close the debate.

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I am greatly tempted to comment on the irrelevant remarks of the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) respecting the Canada Grain Act, but I think that is hardly necessary because the great flaw in his argument is that he could not persuade the people of Canada that there was any validity to it in spite of the attempts he made.

Mr. Baldwin: Wait until the by-elections.

Mr. Olson: I certainly hope he is not advocating that the government, which was elected by the people, should not govern the country, because if he is I suggest he needs a lecture on democratic processes.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Olson: The rest of his comments and remarks I found very interesting, if indeed not entertaining. We will certainly give them consideration in the committee and when the bill returns to the House. A number of points were raised by the hon. member for Mackenzie (Mr. Korchinski) and the hon. member for Battleford-Kindersley (Mr. Thomson) that I intended to deal with, but it seems to me that the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) dealt so well with their arguments that it is unnecessary for me to do so now. For example, a number of assertions were made that in my view had no validity to debate on this bill, such as with reference to the closing of elevators, starving communities of their economic well-being and that sort of thing. They are simply not valid when debating this bill and, as I pointed out, the hon. member for Assiniboia dealt very well with them.

The hon. member for Regina-Lake Centre (Mr. Benjamin) also made some very interesting remarks, but I believe the only thing I can agree with in his entire discourse was the suggestion that everybody in this House should support the bill. Other than that I find no agreement with any point that he raised. There was one serious point, in spite of the rather entertaining way in which he delivered it, respecting farmers delivering grain to the elevator of their choice. If this whole argument were based on the fact that farmers will choose not to deliver grain to all the companies he named, he is not in tune with the fact because farmers have had that option open to them for many years and they make the choice. Boxcars will be allocated to those elevators where farmers have indicated they wish to haul their grain, and that indication is endorsed by the fact that they have done it.

• (9:30 p.m.)

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my appreciation to hon. members of the House for the way they have handled this bill today. I thank them for the very genuine expressions of view that it is desirable that the passage of this bill be expedited, not only for protein grading but for a number of other provisions that modernize the whole system of handling grains in Canada. I hope that this same spirit will be in evidence when we get to the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the House for consent to reinstate the evidence taken in the Committee on Agriculture in the last session of this House when Bill C-196 was under consideration. There have been informal

discussions through the usual channels, and I believe there is general agreement among all parties to reinstate this evidence, with the same reservation that was expressed by the hon. member for Peace River respecting Bill C-176, that is, that in reinstating the evidence we do not in any way prejudice the right of the committee to call witnesses and to take whatever additional evidence they feel is necessary.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The minister has indicated that there is consent to reinstate the evidence heard by the committee during the last session, with the reservation the minister has mentioned. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Agriculture.

* * *

CONSUMER PACKAGING AND LABELLING ACT

PROVISIONS RESPECTING PROHIBITIONS, LABELS, STANDARDIZATION, INSPECTION, ETC.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs) moved that Bill C-180, respecting the packaging, labelling, sale, importation and advertising of prepackaged and certain other products, be read the second time and referred to the Standing Committee on Health, Welfare and Social Affairs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, it is with great personal pleasure and some personal pride that I rise to move the second reading of Bill C-180, the consumer packaging and labelling act. In my view this is one of the most important pieces of consumer protection legislation that this new department has introduced to Parliament. In a short time, Mr. Speaker, we have introduced some valuable and important legislation to this Parliament for the protection of the consumer, but so far I think this is undoubtedly the most important.

Earlier in the spring this Parliament passed an amendment to the Bills of Exchange Act, which was the first time an amendment had been made in this important field of consumer credit in some years. I refer to the amendment which became effective on November 1. The main feature of this was that finance companies which discount the promissory notes or bills common in consumer finance or time-payment transactions can no longer claim their right to collect from the purchasers under these time-payment contracts in absolute terms, but their claim against the consumer-purchaser is subject to all the rights and equities for a counterclaim which the purchaser might have against the original vendor. This important amendment in the field of consumer legislation, which received the wide acclaim of this House, came into effect only a few days ago.

Shortly before passage of that legislation this Parliament approved the Hazardous Products Act which I placed before the House. In my view this is the strongest piece of consumer product safety legislation in the world. As a Canadian I was very proud that with my officials this spring I was asked to go to Vienna to explain the operation of the Hazardous Products Act to the International Organization of Consumers Unions.

The National Commission on Products Safety in the United States, a presidential commission which only wound up its work a few months ago, called upon my officials to go to Chicago to testify in front of that commission as to the operation of the Hazardous Products Act. As a result of this, I understand and hope that the American authorities will adopt the methods we are now using in Canada under this act to label hazardous and dangerous household chemicals.

As hon. members know, the Hazardous Products Act placed an immediate ban on the importation, advertising or selling of a number of highly dangerous consumer products and made provision for prescribing the circumstances and conditions under which a number of other products, hazardous if incorrectly used, could be sold, advertised or imported into Canada. Regulations issued under this act have established a nationwide and consistent system of cautionary labelling for a wide range of household products in everyday use. It is a new system which I think other nations are now becoming interested in, and some of them are likely to adopt consumer products safety legislation.

Thousands of individual household products will be covered by these regulations. In the department we are carrying out active research under the Hazardous Products Act which, over the years, will bring more categories of products under the control of this legislation. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I hope to be able to announce by Thursday or Friday some more regulations that we have passed under this legislation to protect the consumer against unsafe products.

In a somewhat different field, early in 1970 this Parliament passed the Textile Labelling Act. Under its authority there will be mandatory labelling of the content of fibres used in clothing and in household textiles, and this will be combined with the fabric care program which I announced early in September. The two programs of textile labelling and care labelling for textiles will go a long way toward solving problems of consumer bewilderment caused by the multiplicity of textiles available in the modern market.

This evening I take pleasure in bringing in another piece of consumer protection legislation along the same lines but in a different field, Bill C-180, the consumer packaging and labelling bill which I suggest should be read with the bill presently before the Senate, Bill S-5, the weights and measures bill which provides for a complete revision of that act. Bill C-180 is designed to afford greater protection to consumers by way of information on the products they buy. It is also designed to make legislation more relative and meaningful in terms of current protection in the world in which the consumer

now acts and should remove sources of consumer confusion and discontent, thereby making consumer actions in the marketplace less difficult.

If we can go back in history, we see that people have been concerned for a long time about the weight of things and the measure of things. Consumers have wanted correct information about the products they have bought. I know, Mr. Speaker, that hon. members of this House are all biblical scholars. I would quote, for example, from the book of Deuteronomy, chapter 25, verse 15:

• (9:40 p.m.)

But thou shalt have a perfect and just weight, a perfect and just measure shalt thou have: that thy days may be lengthened in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.

Mr. McGrath: Amen.

Mr. Basford: I also quote from the book of Proverbs, chapter 20, verse 23:

Divers weights are an abomination unto the Lord: and a false balance is not good.

Mr. McGrath: Hallelujah.

Mr. Bell: Is that from the old testament?

Mr. Dinsdale: That is the King James version.

Mr. Basford: We see, in more recent days than biblical times, references to the subject. For example, I quote article 35 of Magna Carta:

Mr. Dinsdale: We are really for it now.

Mr. Basford: It says:

There shall be standard measures of wine, ale and corn ... throughout the kingdom.

Mr. McGrath: Hear, hear!

Mr. Dinsdale: We are getting lots of corn.

Mr. Bell: Explain.

Mr. Basford: It goes on to say:

There shall also be a standard width of dyed cloth, russett, and haberject, namely two ells within the selvedges. Weights are to be standardized similarly.

I have quoted these extracts, Mr. Speaker, to show that throughout all history people, whether they were biblical consumers or consumers in the reign of King John, have been anxious and concerned about weights, measures, proper labelling and proper information about products available to the consumer. This evening I am putting before the House a modern consumers' Magna Carta by which consumers will be entitled, once this bill is passed, to full, accurate and complete information about the consumer products they buy.

An hon. Member: But you can't smell a package.

Mr. Basford: As hon. members know, there has been in recent years a rapid change in packaging and merchandising methods used in modern business. There has also been an equally rapid increase in the number of prepackaged items appearing on the market. The trend has been to the supermarket type of operation, not only in the food field but in many of the retailing fields. While this bill refers to many things other than food, it is illuminating, I think, for us to know that in a modern supermarket there are approximately 7,000 different prepackaged items. Estimates says that in four years there will be between 15,000 and 20,000 different items in this category.

One only has to go into a modern department store to realize what a huge array of consumer products the consumer is faced with. One result of this development has been that the package has replaced, to a great extent, the live salesman. The consumer must now rely on the package to give him the basic product information he once received from the merchant. In days gone past we knew the corner grocer or butcher; we went down to him and discussed the products that we wanted to buy. That is not the case now. Modern packaging has revolutionized retailing methods and has contributed significantly to the cleanliness, appearance and convenience of many consumer goods.

An hon. Member: Without profit to the consumer.

Mr. Basford: Undoubtedly there have been improvements and consumers have derived some advantages from this development. Nevertheless, despite those obvious advantages there has been a considerable measure of consumer discontent about packaging practices. For one thing, packaging often conceals some essential qualities of the goods and makes consumers dependent upon labels for information about what they are buying. You cannot taste boxes. You cannot see, taste, feel and smell the product when it is sold in tins, cardboard boxes, wrapping-paper or plastic. Actually there may not be anyone in the store who can tell you the qualities of the product.

The situation is not the same for all classes of products. For some, particularly for pre-packaged food and drugs, the labelling requirements are fairly comprehensive under existing, modern food and drug laws in this country. Although these laws are good, there is a variation in requirements as between one class and another and I suggest that is a source of concern both to producers and consumers. For others, labelling requirements are minimal or even non-existent. The result is that the consumer is often misguided and confused, and perhaps even deceived, by a vast array of poorly labelled items which makes a rational purchasing decision virtually an impossibility. There is therefore, in my view, a serious need to fill the large legislative vacuum which now exists in many areas and to bring some uniformity and coherence into those areas where there is now a bewildering variety of labelling requirements.

This may be regarded as the prime objective of this bill. It is designed as a comprehensive labelling and packaging bill of general application and is to apply to

all consumer products. As the regulations passed under its authority are brought progressively into effect, it will go a long way toward facilitating choice among consumer products by providing better information and helping to reduce confusion in the marketplace. Consumers on the whole, and I am referring to modern consumers, are demanding the right to know what they are buying. They want full, factual and complete information about the products they are buying. They are given that right in matters of advertising. We have the right to truth in advertising, the right to truth in packaging, to truth in labelling, and so on. All these rights are aimed at giving consumers a chance to make a rational and intelligent purchase.

The inability, Mr. Speaker, to make a rational buying decision in regard to consumer commodities is not a reflection on the consumer. We are all fairly familiar with the problems we encounter upon going into a modern supermarket. If you want to choose between competing products and make the best buy, you almost need a degree in mathematics or calculus to figure out the best buy. I submit that this inability does not reflect on the consumer. It reflects, in my view, rather on the packaging and pricing patterns in the marketplace, which often have very little rationale. The consumer must act on the assumption that packaging and pricing are rational. If consumers did not act on this assumption, if all consumers insisted on weighing packages, examining contents and challenging the validity of prices in the many sizes of packages, the whole system of mass distribution would break down.

If it is to function efficiently, modern marketing requires that the buyer must be able to trust the package to give relevant, sufficient and accurate information. This, at present, he cannot do. Modern marketing, with the packages acting as salesmen, has created problems not only for the consumer but for the ethical business firm. It has fostered, as an unfortunate side effect, a form of unfair competition which can be seriously prejudicial to business rivals who do not engage in dubious practices.

Mr. Benjamin: When did the minister learn that?

Mr. Basford: Legitimate business can act in its own interest and in the interest of the consumer only if competitive conditions permit.

Mr. Benjamin: When did the minister find this out?

Mr. Basford: This requires laws and regulations to establish a framework of competition prohibiting deceptive and confusing practices and protecting the legitimate competitor from the unfair tactics of less scrupulous rivals.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bell: Terrific.

Mr. Basford: I am glad that the whip of the official opposition thinks so highly of the bill. Perhaps that means it will obtain easy passage through the House.

Mr. Bell: I was talking about the speech.

Mr. Crouse: Let us have some more quotations from the scriptures.

Mr. Basford: I am sure that the critics of Parliament will be delighted to know how welcome biblical quotations are in the House of Commons of Canada. Mr. Speaker, I return to the bill before the House. On the basic premise that the consumer has the right to full, accurate and relevant information, the bill before this House seeks to achieve the following objectives. The legislation will increase the efficiency of the average family as a spending unit. They will be able to spend their consumer dollars better and, as a result, live better. It will promote effective price competition by minimizing the capacity of packaging to confuse or deceive the buyer, and permit buyers to purchase more intelligently and more rationally. It will assure a quality of competitive opportunity for all producers and distributors. Small businesses are especially vulnerable to irrationality in the marketplace. Because of its limited resources, the small business has a vital need for competitive standards that permit the focusing of attention on price and quality.

• (9:50 p.m.)

When this bill is passed, the regulations will enhance the integrity of markets in order that they may accurately direct the productive activities of the economy by making it more likely that profits will be channelled to the more efficient producer rather than the inefficient. One of the effects will be to promote sound and effective competition by eliminating unfair or deceptive packaging in commerce and thereby upgrading the economic value of the fair packaging and labelling practices followed by the majority of our businessmen.

It seems that quite apart from this economic rationale for full, accurate and relevant information, the consumer is entitled to the truth about a product for truth's sake. Truth surely is a virtue in itself, and should therefore be sufficient reason for the requirements concerning packaging and labelling which are contained in this bill. We are sometimes told by marketing men that the consumer should and does "vote for the product with his dollars". The inference is that this act of consumer free choice is basically all that is required in the marketplace. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that the voting process—and that is what goes on in a marketplace—is more effective to the extent that full and accurate information is available to the voter, the consumer, and to the extent that he has not been misled. That destroys the operation of a marketplace. Some people who appear before the consumer affairs committee say we do not need labelling legislation because the consumer goes into the market every day and votes for his product. This bill assures us that the voting process is completely unfettered and that the voting is on the basis of complete information.

In adopting these objectives and in drafting this bill, as I indicated earlier, I paid close attention to the representations made by concerned individuals and by organized consumer groups such as the Consumers' Association of

Canada. I am grateful to them for their representations over the years in the field of packaging and labelling. I have also been influenced and guided by the Special Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Commons on Consumer Credit on which Senator Croll and I served as co-chairmen and by the more recent report of the Batten commission on the cost of living and inflation in the three Prairie provinces. I wish to quote from the interim report of the joint parliamentary committee which was published on December 20, 1966. The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. MacInnis), who was very active on that committee, will remember this observation which the committee included in the interim report:

> Product information must be provided. Consumers must be informed about physical properties of products they are buying such as weight, volume, quality and number of units and this information should be immediately available at the time of purchase and should be expressed clearly and unequivocally . . .
>
> It is essential for the government to take all measures within its power to foster the welfare of the consumer. In particular, the government has a responsibility for protecting the consumer against all forms of exploitation.

I believe that the essential recommendations of that committee, in so far as they apply to packaging and labelling, are met by the consumer packaging and labelling bill. If I may, I would refer to another source of information and inspiration for this bill. The criticisms of the Batten report in the field of packaging and labelling are summarized as follows:

> In the area of labelling this commission has found that present practices fall short of consumer requirements in a number of important ways. First, even where legislation applies, it is not consistent between products. In effect, it contributes little more than voluntary standards would. Second, the commission has found that many manufacturers hold the belief, and act on it, that consumers do not want accurate, or even any, technical information about many of the products they buy. Third, information is presented in different ways about different products to such an extent that what there is cannot be effectively compared. This is especially true of heavy appliances but prevails everywhere. Fourth, some product lines provide the consumer almost no information at the point of sale. Textiles are particularly to be noted in this regard but other lines have been called as strongly to the commission's attention.

The textile labelling bill which we passed last session will, of course, correct that situation.

> Fifth, some packagings carry labels which are actually depictive of things which are only somewhat like the product, but are not exactly the product inside.

That is, the pictures on the packages and labels are not descriptive of what is inside; they are deceptive.

> Sixth, many labels continue to carry terms which purport to be descriptive of contents, such as "jumbo", "giant", and so on, but which are not. All of these defects persist despite the widely acknowledged view by manufacturers that "the package is a salesman" of which the label is a critical part".

May I call it ten o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, there might be disposition on the part of the House to allow the minister to conclude his remarks if he can do so in the next ten minutes.

Some hon. Members: Ten o'clock.

At ten o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Wednesday, November 4, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

LEGISLATION DEALING WITH ROYAL AND/OR NATIONAL ANTHEMS

Question No. 21—**Mr. Forrestall:**

Is it the intention of the government to introduce legislation dealing with the Royal and/or National Anthems during this session of Parliament?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): See *Hansard*, November 2, 1970, page 780.

"HMCS RAINBOW"—COST OF REFIT

Question No. 30—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. What was the estimated cost for the refit of *HMCS Rainbow*?
2. What are the total expenditures to date for the refit?
3. On what date did the refit commence?
4. On what date was it completed, or is it due to be completed?
5. Were tenders called for the refit?
6. What companies bid for the work?
7. Who did the work, or was awarded the contract?
8. Was the contract awarded on a cost-plus basis?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): 1. In March 1969, $1,940,000.

2. $2,490,000.

3. September 8, 1969.

4. The refit, including trials and inspection, was completed July 17, 1970.

5. No.

6. Not applicable.

7. The Canadian Forces Ship Repair Unit, Pacific, in HMCS Dockyard, Esquimalt.

8. Not applicable.

NUMBER OF MERGERS OR TAKE-OVERS RECORDED

Question No. 42—**Mr. Saltsman:**

1. For each year 1963 to 1969, how many (a) foreign (b) domestic industrial mergers or take-overs have been recorded by the Combines Investigation Branch of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs?

2. Do the figures cover the Canadian service sector and, if not, to what extent are they understated regarding the extent of merger activity in Canada?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): 1. The number of mergers recorded by the Office of the Director of Investigation and Research under the Combines Investigation Act for each of the years 1963 to 1969 inclusive is set out below:

	Foreign[1]	Domestic[2]	Total
1960	93	110	203
1961	86	152	238
1962	79	106	185
1963	41	88	129
1964	80	124	204
1965	78	157	235
1966	80	123	203
1967	85	143	228
1968	163	239	402
1969	168	336	504

[1] Acquisitions involving a known foreign owned or controlled acquiring company (the nationality of the controlling interest in the acquired company prior to the merger could have been foreign or Canadian).

[2] Acquisitions involving an acquiring company not known to be foreign owned or controlled (the nationality of the controlling interest in the acquired company prior to the merger could have been foreign or Canadian).

This table both updates and revises the figures reported last year. The compilation is based upon information published in the major financial news media including daily and financial newspapers, trade journals, business magazines and other publications of Canada, the United States and the United Kingdom. When similar information was tabled in the House of Commons on December 15, 1969, certain companies involved in mergers drew attention to inaccuracies they found in the table. Accordingly, a review of the information recorded in the register, which depended upon the accuracy of press reports, was undertaken, but not to the extent of mounting a substantial research effort for which resources were not available. The examination of the recorded information revealed a number of problems. In some instances a division or group of assets capable of sustaining an independent firm in business had been acquired rather than the listed company itself. In others, the reported acquisitions of voting shares of a company, although substantial, did not necessarily amount to control. Some consolidations reported in the press as mergers were actually a reorganization of companies previously associated with one another by way of common ownership. Reported multiple acquisitions sometimes involved com-

panies that were already associated with one another by way of common ownership and sometimes the acquired companies were, prior to the acquisition independently owned. The extent of the foreign ownership in some Canadian acquiring companies was less than a majority of the voting stock. Certain acquired companies turned out to have been foreign controlled before the reported acquisition. Finally, in many instances there was no factual evidence available to indicate whether the particular acquired company was, prior to the reported merger, Canadian or foreign controlled.

This examination of the evidence indicates that although the register does reflect a fairly comprehensive coverage of published sources of information there is a great need of more adequate continuing sources of information about mergers. The register should, therefore, not be regarded at present as more than an initial review of public information, with no guarantee of its accuracy.

2. No. The Director of Investigation and Research has sought to record all reported mergers that have taken place only in those sectors of Canadian industry which are subject to the Combines Investigation Act. Accordingly, firms in the service sectors of the economy, except for transportation (of articles) are largely excluded, e.g. financial institutions, most utilities, advertising agencies, real estate companies, etc. The Director of Investigation and Research is therefore not in a position to estimate the extent of merger activity in the service sector of the Canadian economy.

PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION PERSONNEL

Question No. 52—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. Who are the present members of the Prices and Incomes Commission and what are their respective annual salaries?

2. In each case, what are the specific functions of each member of the Commission?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): I have been informed by the Chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission as follows: 1 and 2: (a) Mr. J. H. Young, Chairman, is paid a salary in the range of a D.M. 3, $37,000-$40,000. (b) Mr. P. Gérin-Lajoie, Vice-Chairman, is paid a salary in the range of a D.M. 3, $37,000-$40,000. (c) Mr. B. G. Barrow, who is responsible for the Price Review Program, is paid a salary in the range of a D.M. 1, $28,000-$33,000. (d) Mr. G. E. Freeman, who is responsible for the Research and Current Analysis Programs, is paid a salary in the range of a D.M. 1, $28,000-$33,000. (e) Mr. G. V. Haythorne, who is responsible for the Information Program and relations with Economic Interest Groups, is paid a salary in the range of a D.M. 1, $28,000-$33,000.

CANADIAN COMPANIES EXEMPT FROM LIABILITY FOR CUSTOM DUTIES ON IMPORTS FOR MILITARY CONTRACTORS IN UNITED STATES

Question No. 60—**Mr. Broadbent:**

1. What companies in Canada are presently exempt from liability for custom duties on imports used in making components for military contractors in the United States?

[Mr. Basford.]

2. In each case, when did the custom remission order become effective and for what period of time?

3. In each case, what is the estimated value of the remission of custom duties?

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister of National Revenue): 1, 2 and 3. Order in Council P.C. 1960-1600, November 25, 1960, provides for duty and tax remissions for goods that are or will become the property of the United States government and will be used solely and exclusively in joint Canada-United States projects. The Order remains in effect until formally revoked. Companies extended the benefits of the Order are:

Name of Company	Estimated annual value of remittance $
Abbey Electronics Co. Ltd., Rexdale, Ont.	13,400
Atlas Polar Co. Ltd., Toronto, Ont.	5,000
Canadian General Electric Co. Ltd., Toronto, Ont.	18,000
Canadian Marconi Co., Montreal, Que.	34,000
Canadian Westinghouse Co. Ltd., Hamilton, Ont.	315
Garrett Manufacturing Ltd., Toronto, Ont.	2,300
Genaire Ltd., St. Catharines, Ont.	5,000
ITT Canada Ltd., Montreal, Que.	14,000
Litton Systems, Toronto, Ont.	30,000
Motorola Electronic Sales, Rexdale, Ont.	129
Prelco Electronics, Montreal, Que.	1,100
Radio Engineering Products, Montreal, Que.	1,200
Raytheon Canada Ltd., Waterloo, Ont.	4,500
Spar Aerospace Products Ltd., Malton, Ont.	6,600
Standard Coil Products (Canada) Ltd., Toronto, Ont.	1,400
Valeriote Electronics (Guelph) Ltd., Guelph, Ont.	13,000
Varian Associates of Canada Ltd., Georgetown, Ont.	2,000
Order in Council P.C. 1970-1404, August 5, 1970, the Canadair Limited Defence Development Remission Order, grants remission of Customs duties on parts and material imported during the period January 1, 1968, and ending December 31, 1971, by Canadair Limited, Montreal, Que., under defence development and production-sharing programs.	20,000

TASK FORCE ON INFORMATION RECOMMENDATION

Question No. 92—**Mr. Mather:**

Has the government accepted the Task Force on Information recommendation regarding government advertising and, if not, is the government giving consideration to establishing a Crown corporation or agency for all government advertising?

Hon. Robert Stanbury (Minister without Portfolio): Cabinet has approved in principle the major Task Force Recommendation on agency selection procedures for government departments and agencies and is now considering the best means of implementing that recommendation.

MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY REGULATIONS

Question No. 94—**Mr. Mather:**

On what date does the Minister of Transport, under Canada's Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Regulations, intend to announce standards regarding (a) front and rear bumper construction (b) rear window defrosting standards (c) trunk penetration, side-impact and door crash resistance standards (d) standards limiting the horse-power of vehicles made in or imported into Canada?

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): In relation to (a), (b) and (c), research on these aspects of vehicle safety is currently being undertaken but, until such time as the results of these studies can be translated into safety standards, it is impossible to forecast the date on which they will be covered by the Motor Vehicle Safety Regulations.

With respect to vehicle horse-power, (d), the question of power/weight ratio for vehicles is under review.

In accordance with Section 9 of the Motor Vehicle Safety Act, all regulations will be published initially in Part I of the *Canada Gazette* as proposals so that manufacturers and other interested persons shall have a reasonable opportunity to make representations. In all cases, publication of the proposed regulations is the initial announcement of the Government's intention to issue and enforce standards.

INFORMATION CANADA

Question No. 95—**Mr. Mather:**

Have any private consultants undertaken any study for Information Canada and, if so, in each case (a) what is the nature of the study (b) was there a competitive tender for the contract (c) what is the name of the firm undertaking the study (d) what is the dollar expenditure of the contract (e) when is it anticipated that the study will be completed (f) is the study expected to be made public?

Hon. Robert Stanbury (Minister without Portfolio): 1. (a) citizens' advisory bureaus; (b) no; (c) Mrs. G. Stewart and Miss K. Starrs; (d) $100 per person daily not to exceed $5,000 each; (e) early next year; (f) yes.

2. (a) A study of federal department and agency logos; (b) yes; (c) Communication Arts Centre Inc., of Montreal; (d) $24,000; (e) the study is complete; (f) yes.

3. (a) A survey of public opinion on design in relation to the federal identity program; (b) yes; (c) Contemporary Research Centre, 18 Grenville St., Toronto 189, Ontario. (d) $1,250; (e) the study is complete; (f) yes.

SNOWMOBILES—SAFETY REGULATIONS

Question No. 112—**Mr. Skoberg:**

1. Were public tenders called by the Minister of Transport throughout Canada to conduct a detailed examination on snowmobiles from a safety point of view and, if not, for what reason?

2. If public tenders were called, how many bids were received and from whom?

3. What were the terms of reference given to the successful firm?

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. As the work involved expert professional services normally provided at established rates, public tenders were not called. The contract was awarded to Hovey and Associates Limited, Ottawa, as this was the only independent firm known to the Department possessing the required expertise and facilities to undertake the required study in an acceptable time period.

2. Not applicable.

3. Terms of reference specified a two-phase program. Phase I required the purchase and detailed examination of vehicles to identify potentially hazardous features which must be rectified at the point of manufacture and and to evaluate the engineering and economic impact on the industry of proposed safety regulations. Phase II of the program will entail rigid testing of vehicles under actual operating conditions to identify problems for which additional standards may be necessary.

HIGHWAY SAFETY

Question No. 113—**Mr. Skoberg:**

1. Were public tenders called by the Minister of Transport for an inventory of research in highway safety and the organization and conduct of a seminar to discuss safety research in Canada on future programmes that should be organized and, if not, for what reason?

2. If public tenders were called, in what way, and in what locations in Canada were they tendered?

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Public tenders were not called by the Department for executing the inventory of highway safety research as public tenders are not considered an acceptable means of engaging professionals to provide expert services. In this case, five engineering consulting firms, known to possess the capability to undertake this project, were invited to submit proposals. The successful firm was selected by a committee within the Department on the basis of the firm's appreciation of the problem, the proposed methods of investigation, time scheduling, costs, and experience of personnel in similar work.

2. Although public tenders were not called, proposals were received from firms located in Toronto, Montreal, Winnipeg and Fredericton.

Questions

RESEARCH ON TRAFFIC SAFETY WARNING AND CONTROL DEVICES

Question No. 114—**Mr. Skoberg:**

1. Did the Minister of Transport call for public tenders throughout Canada for a contract into research on traffic safety warning and control devices and, if not, for what reason?

2. If public tenders were called, how many bids were received and from whom?

3. Were public tenders called throughout Canada for the evaluation of the effectiveness of safety campaigns awarded to Peat, Marwick and Company, of Toronto and, if not, for what reason?

4. If public bids were called, how many bids were received and who made the decision on the successful tender?

5. What firms, individuals or associations make up the Traffic Inquiry Research Foundation of Canada, Ottawa, that is preparing a study to review the type of knowledge in Canada concerning the role of alcohol in road vehicle safety?

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Public tenders were not called by the Department for providing research on traffic safety warning and control devices as public tenders are not considered an acceptable means of engaging professionals to provide expert services. In this case, five engineering consulting firms, known to possess the capability to undertake this project, were invited to submit proposals.

2. Although public tenders were not called, proposals were received from firms located in Montreal, Toronto, Willowdale and Edmonton.

3. Six consulting firms, known to possess the capability to undertake an evaluation of the effectiveness of safety campaigns, were invited to submit proposals. Proposals were received from five of those firms.

4. The successful firm was selected by a committee within the Department on the basis of the firm's appreciation of the problem, the proposed methods of investigation, time scheduling, costs, and experience of personnel in similar work.

5. Traffic Injury Research Foundation of Canada is a non-profit chartered foundation supported by donations including grants from the Department of National Health and Welfare and several Provincial Governments. Founding members include, among others, the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons, Defence Research Board and Medical Research Council. Individual members include professionals from many disciplines.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE—MAN-HOURS SAVED BY UTILIZATION OF COMPUTERS

Question No. 182—**Mr. Robinson:**

How many man-hours have been saved as a result of the utilization of computers by the Department of National Defence during each year since computers have been used?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): It has not been possible to maintain meaningful estimates of the man-hours that have been saved as a result of the utilization of computers by the Department of National Defence during each year since computers have been used.

[Mr. Duquet.]

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE—LAY-OFFS DUE TO UTILIZATION OF COMPUTERS

Question No. 183—**Mr. Robinson:**

As a result of the use of computers by the Department of National Defence, how many employees have been (a) laid off (b) hired?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): No employee has been laid off as a direct result of the use of computers. Records are not maintained in a manner which would indicate the number of employees hired as a result of the use of computers.

HALIFAX AND YARMOUTH HIGHWAY SERVICE MAIL SERVICE

Question No. 211—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. What tenders have been received for the Halifax and Yarmouth H.S. mail service, by name and amount?

2. To whom was the tender awarded?

3. Who held the contract previously, for what length of time and for what amount?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister without Portfolio): 1. Howard L. Lowe, $22,875; Charles W. Giffin, $30,936; Peter Werenka, $31,954; Casino Taxi Limited, $34,183; Donald L. Lutz, $35,400; John R. Fletcher, $36,000; Arthur W. Armitage, $37,156; Donald Sprott Smith, $68,000; Robinson Bros. Express Ltd., $73,489.

2. Charles W. Giffin.

3. J. R. Fletcher, five years, $36,459 per annum.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL REVENUE—MONTREAL EXPOS' BASEBALL TEAM

Question No. 224—**Mr. Saltsman:**

1. Has the Department of National Revenue ruled that the Montreal Expos' baseball team can depreciate the value of initial player contracts over a ten year period?

2. Is the total estimated cost allowed by the Department of National Revenue for deduction purposes estimated to be $9 million and, if so, will the Montreal Expos' baseball team pay no tax each year on the first $900,000 of their profit?

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister of National Revenue): 1 and 2. This information is confidential and cannot be divulged.

HALIFAX AND PORT HAWKESBURY HIGHWAY MAIL SERVICE

Question No. 230—**Mr. McCleave:**

1. What tenders have been received for the Halifax and Port Hawkesbury H. S. mail service, by name and amount?

2. To whom was the tender awarded?

3. Who held the contract previously, for what length of time and for what amount?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister without Portfolio): 1. James Hubert Beck, $22,000; Peter Werenka, $23,444; Edward N. Smith, $23,972; Casino Taxi Ltd., $25,080; John R. Fletcher, $26,400; Arthur W. Armitage, $27,261; Denton Roney Ehler, $28,375; J. S. Culligan, $29,265; Donald L. Lutz, $33,000; J. E. San Cartier, $36,000; J. S.

Culligan, $39,235; Joseph MacDonald, $39,300; John J. Grace, $47,652; Harry Heckman Trucking Ltd., $49,500; Robinson Bros. Express Ltd., $54,249; James Clement Ryan, $58,769.

2. Peter Werenka.

3. Peter Werenka, five years, $24,645 per annum.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL REVENUE—LAY-OFFS DUE TO UTILIZATION OF COMPUTERS

Question No. 241—**Mr. Robinson:**

As a result of the use of computers by the Department of National Revenue how many employees have been (a) laid off (b) hired?

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister of National Revenue): (a) No employees have been laid off as a result of the use of computers. Normal retirements, resignations, and transfers have reduced staffs where clerical and other tasks have been eliminated or reduced through computer use. (b) As at October 26, 1970 the department employed 207 computer systems analysts, programmers, and computer operating personnel in its permanent staff involved in all areas of activity using computers. Very few of these were hired from the outside because of the introduction of computers. Most were transferred from other duties and trained in computer technology. In addition, several hundred temporary key-punch staff are hired each year to provide necessary input for systems involving the department's computers. The number employed at any one time varies widely with the season of the year. Many permanent staff, as well as temporary key-punch staff, are employed on computer work for departments other than National Revenue, Taxation.

DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL REVENUE—MAN-HOURS SAVED AS RESULT OF UTILIZATION OF COMPUTERS

Question No. 242—**Mr. Robinson:**

How many man-hours have been saved as a result of the utilization of computers by the Department of National Revenue during each year since computers have been used?

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister of National Revenue): Records of man-hour utilization are not kept in the detail which would be required to give a precise answer to this question. In general reply, it can be stated that the use of computers has eliminated or reduced the man-hour requirements for certain kinds of clerical and returns examination work but has increased them for other activities in the area of enforcement. The computer system's ability to detect errors in returns, disclose cases of unreported income, and find instances of non-filing, has generated substantial extra work of an enforcement nature which can only be resolved by people. On balance, it can be said that the use of computers has required more man-hours of staff utilization but the resultant extra costs have been far less than the extra revenues generated. Also inhibiting comparisons of man-hour requirements before and after computers is the fact that the department has had to undertake several new, major programs since it acquired its first computers in 1962. Examples of these are the collection of tax for nine provinces and the provision of their statistics and other data and the collection of contributions to the Canada Pension Plan. These programs, to be effective, required the use of computers and imposed additional demands for both manpower and equipment.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, would you be so kind as to call Notices of Motions Nos. 5, 10, 16, 21, 27, 28, 32, 33, 34, 35, 80, 132 and 137.

CORRESPONDENCE, ETC., BETWEEN DR. LLOYD BARBER AND INDIAN ORGANIZATIONS ON TREATY CLAIMS AND ABORIGINAL RIGHTS

Motion No. 5—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all correspondence, telegrams and other documents exchanged between Dr. Lloyd Barber and the Native Indian peoples organizations across Canada regarding the matter of Indian land and treaty claims and aboriginal rights.

Mr. Barney Danson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this rather interesting motion is identical to motion No. 370 by the hon. member in the last session. The position taken at that time, as reported in *Hansard* of March 11, 1970, at page 4665, has not changed. I would therefore ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Nothing else has changed either, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate?

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Not on my request, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacEachen: Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

REGULATIONS OF THE OWNERSHIP AND CONTROL OF THE URANIUM INDUSTRY IN CANADA

Motion No. 10—**Mr. Saltsman:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all correspondence, memoranda, etc., between the Government of Canada and industry in Canada since January 1, 1970, regarding regulations on the ownership and control of the uranium industry in Canada.

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources that correspondence received from uranium producing and exploration companies contains information specifically requested by the government and given with the assurance that

it would be treated as confidential. In view of this, I trust the hon. member will agree to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Saltsman: That is not acceptable, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacEachen: Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

INTERIM REPORT OF TASK FORCE ON OIL POLICY

Motion No. 16—**Mr. Saltsman:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the interim report of the Task Force on Oil Policy (Northern Development), as mentioned by the Acting Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources in *Hansard* on April 25, 1969, at page 7956.

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of Energy, Mines and Resources that the task force on northern oil development is an interdepartmental group of officials reporting on an interim basis directly to ministers on developments as they take place. It is not customary to release such communications but when a final report is made consideration will be given to making it public. I would therefore ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Saltsman: That is acceptable.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

• (2:10 p.m.)

SUBMISSIONS TO ECONOMIC COUNCIL ON COMPETITION

Motion No. 21—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of the nearly forty submissions presented to the Economic Council of Canada for its review of Canada's competition policy, as referred to in the Council's report of July 1969 at page 4.

Mr. Barney Danson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this very thoughtful motion is similar to motion No. 10 by the hon. member in the last session. I am informed by the Economic Council of Canada that the stand taken by them in response to that motion, as reported in *Hansard* of December 17, 1969, at page 2084, has not changed. I would therefore ask that this motion be withdrawn.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, my views have not changed. I still believe in open government and the tabling of reports, and I would like to have them.

Mr. MacEachen: Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

DISCONTINUANCE OF PUBLICATIONS DUE TO INCREASE IN POSTAL RATES

Motion No. 27—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of all letters received by the Postmaster General from churches, professional organizations, trade unions, co-operatives, credit unions and private organizations, indicating that as a result of the increase in postal rates they intend to discontinue or curtail their publications.

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I think this is the third time this motion has been presented, and the reply to it will be the same as on the last occasion, namely, that the motion is not acceptable as the information requested would necessitate a review of over 5,000 files. It is estimated that several hundred man hours would be expended in drawing files and searching for the desired correspondence without taking into consideration the time expended in copying such correspondence.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): I would therefore ask that the motion be withdrawn.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I take the liberty to bring to the attention of the minister, and of other ministers and parliamentary secretaries responding on behalf of the government, that there should be an indication given as briefly as possible on the part of the government whether a motion is accepted or whether it is the wish that it be transferred for debate. I gather that the minister has asked that the motion be dropped.

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree to that. Since the Post Office does not seem to be delivering the mail it might do this instead.

Mr. MacEachen: Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is transferred for debate.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND CAUSEWAY—REPORT BY C. B. HAVER

Motion No. 28—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the report by C. B. Haver of Montreal for Northumberland Consultants Limited regarding a review of the cost-benefit evaluation by Stanford Research Institute for a Prince Edward Island causeway as mentioned in answer to Question Number 1,832 reported in *Hansard* July 21, 1969 at page 11374.

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the Minister of Public Works that as stated in reply to question No. 1832 reported in *Hansard* on July 21, 1969, at page 11374, this report was prepared for internal use only and is therefore a privileged document. Under these circumstances I would ask the hon. member to consider withdrawing his motion.

Mr. Orlikow: I cannot agree to that. I thought Information Canada would help us get reports and not deny them to us.

Mr. MacEachen: Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is transferred for debate.

STUDY BY PIUS DENIS FOR DEPARTMENT OF MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION

Motion No. 32—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study of Pius Denis, Regina, undertaken for the Department of Manpower and Immigration regarding the "Analysis of the information derived from the Longitudinal Study of the Economic and Social Adaptation of Immigrants".

Mr. Chas. L. Caccia (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Pius Denis did early research work on the first questionnaire for the longitudinal study but he did not produce a written study or report. As there is no report, the hon. member may wish to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Orlikow: I will do that, but I will try to find out how much he got paid for doing nothing.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

STUDY BY FARIZA HASAN FOR DEPARTMENT OF MANPOWER AND IMMIGRATION

Motion No. 33—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study by Fariza Hasan, Ottawa, undertaken for the Department of Manpower and Immigration regarding the "Analysis re the development of cost-benefit models and other studies conducted by the Quantitative Methods Group".

Mr. Chas. L. Caccia (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, Miss Fariza Hasan provided consultative services to the department. She was engaged on a contractual basis to carry out statistical analysis and no written report was produced. Since no report exists, the hon. member may wish to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Orlikow: I will agree.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

STUDY BY LEO MES ON ANALYSIS AND PREPARATION OF COST ESTIMATES ON PROJECTS

Motion No. 34—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study by Leo Mes, Ottawa, undertaken for the Department of Manpower and Immigration regarding the "Analysis and preparation of cost estimates on projects".

Mr. Chas. L. Caccia (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Leo Mes of Ottawa was engaged as a consultant by the department to provide specification and programming services for computer work being carried out in the Planning and Evaluation Branch. No written report was ever produced. In view of this, the hon. member may wish to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Orlikow: I will agree.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

STUDY BY PAUL MOREAU REGARDING ANALYSIS AND PREPARATION OF COST ESTIMATES ON PROJECTS

Motion No. 35—**Mr. Orlikow:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the study by Paul Moreau, Ottawa, undertaken for the Department of Manpower and Immigration regarding the "Analysis and preparation of cost estimates on projects".

Mr. Chas. L. Caccia (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, this motion asks for a copy of a study by Mr. Paul Moreau of Ottawa who was engaged as a consultant by the department to provide specifications and programming services for computer work carried out in the Planning and Evaluation Branch. A written report was not produced. The hon. member may therefore wish to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Orlikow: I will agree at the moment.

Mr. Speaker: The motion is dropped.

Order discharged and motion withdrawn.

CONSULTANT REPORT REGARDING INFORMATION MEDIA RELATIVE TO WAR ON POVERTY 1967-68

Motion No. 80—**Mr. Skoberg:**

That an Order of the House do issue for a copy of the consultant report by Hewart, Newman and Associates and Julian, Hebert and Associates, Montreal, regarding information media relative to the war on poverty undertaken in the year 1967-68, for the Privy Council Office, as mentioned in answer to Question Number 1323 of the first session of this Parliament.

Mr. Barney Danson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this quite challenging motion was dealt with in the last session as No. 212 in the name of the hon. member. The reasons stated at that time, as reported in *Hansard* of January 14, 1970, at page 2378, still pertain. I would therefore ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Skoberg: We cannot fight the war on poverty in the Privy Council office, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacEachen: Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

CONTRACT REGARDING SALE OF A NUCLEAR RESEARCH REACTOR

Motion No. 132—**Mr. Gilbert:**

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency praying that he will cause to be laid before this House a copy of the contract between the Atomic Energy of Canada, Ltd. and the Atomic Energy Council of Taiwan regarding the sale of a nuclear research reactor.

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, Atomic Energy

of Canada Limited advises that the contract between Atomic Energy of Canada Limited and the Atomic Energy Council of Taiwan is a commercial contract and it has not been customary to make public documents of this class because of the confidential nature of their contents. I would therefore ask the hon. member to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Question.

Mr. Gilbert: Question.

Mr. MacEachen: Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

STUDIES REGARDING CONSIDERATION TO CONVERTING PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT INTO CROWN CORPORATION

Motion No. 137—**Mr. Gilbert:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all studies, reviews, etc., that have been undertaken by the Government of Canada regarding the consideration being given to converting the Public Works Department into a Crown Corporation.

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I am advised by the Minister of Public Works that as stated when an identical motion was called during the previous session, all studies on this subject are of a confidential nature and intended for internal use only. Therefore the hon. member might agree to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Gilbert: Transfer for debate.

Mr. Speaker: Transferred for debate.

Mr. Jerome: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining notices of motions be allowed to stand.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the remaining notices of motion stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

NATIONAL SECURITY

KIDNAPPING AND MURDER OF PIERRE LAPORTE—POLICE SURVEILLANCE OF PAUL ROSE

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on Monday I asked the Solicitor General a question relating to the surveillance of one Rose, a prime suspect in Quebec, and why he had not been picked up. Has the Solicitor General had an opportunity to review the answer he gave, which was to the effect that there was not sufficient evidence to arrest Rose at the time, inasmuch as a report has since come out of Montreal that the Montreal police believe there was sufficient evidence to arrest Rose and, in fact, at that time a number of people were, I believe, being picked up without very much evidence in any event?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, after hearing about the CBC broadcast last night I first of all tried to procure a transcript of it and its references to this question. I was advised by them that it would take at least two days before they could give me the transcript.

An hon. Member: Call the CRTC; they will get it for you.

Mr. McIlraith: In any event, this morning I carefully reviewed the question asked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition on Monday and my reply to it. I have no changes whatever to suggest to that answer.

An hon. Member: You never have.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, to avoid any misunderstanding, does the minister mean to suggest that he consulted again with the people on the spot to ensure that the information on which he based his opinion was correct?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, the minister consulted the authority whom he normally consults on this type of question in the House, the federal authority, the only authority we have, and his answer given today is made after detailed consultation with them on this point.

WAR MEASURES ACT—ARRESTS, RELEASES, CONTINUING DETENTIONS AND CHARGES

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I have a question for the Minister of Justice, Mr. Speaker. Is he now able to give me the information which I have sought four times, I believe, namely, how many of those who have been detained under the War Measures Act have been detained for longer than seven days at the request of the Attorney General of the province concerned?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I hope there is no implication in the question asked by the Leader of the Opposition that I did not try to get the information for him and for the House as quickly as possible. The number of persons arrested and detained as of 11.40 this morning under the regulations pursuant to the War Measures Act is 424, the number of persons released, 359, and the number of persons still in custody, 65. Of the 65 persons in custody 46 are in custody in Montreal and 19 are in custody in other parts of the province.

A total of 228 orders were issued by the Attorney General of Quebec pursuant to subsection 2 of section 9 of the emergency regulations authorizing detention beyond seven days. The breakdown is as follows: Montreal, 148; Quebec City, 54; Rimouski, 8; Sherbrooke, 2; Hull, 11; Victoriaville, 3; St. Jerome, 1 and Thetford Mines, 1, for a total of 228.

Of the 65 persons presently in custody, 43 have been held beyond seven days. The breakdown is as follows: 30 in Montreal and 13 in other parts of the province.

With respect to the question, how many persons were arrested, released and then arrested again, the answer is one, and that person is still in custody. The number of persons still being sought is 43. I expect, from my conversations with the office of the Attorney General of Quebec, that further charges will be laid today, tomorrow and on Friday.

WAR MEASURES ACT—CHARGES AGAINST THOSE DETAINED OF BEING MEMBERS OF FLQ

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): In view of the statements made in the House by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion to the effect that there are about 3,000 FLQ members in vital posts in the province of Quebec, can the Minister of Justice say how many of the 65 who are still detained have been charged under the War Measures Act regulations with being members of the FLQ?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, none to date.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I ask how many will be charged?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

REPORTED REDUCTION OF RCMP PERSONNEL ENGAGED IN SEARCH FOR KIDNAPPERS AND MURDERERS

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Solicitor General a question regarding reports from the Montreal police that 150 men of the RCMP Intelligence and Security Division have been withdrawn. Can he tell the House why this number of men has been withdrawn from the search for persons who are alleged to be responsible for kidnapping and murder?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I cannot possibly accept the premise on which the hon. member bases his question.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister then whether he will confirm the statement by Montreal police sources to the effect that the number of RCMP members attached to the Intelligence and Security Division who are at present engaged in the search for the persons being sought has been reduced from 200 to 50?

Mr. McIlraith: Mr. Speaker, I will not confirm any such rumour or statement, nor will I deny it. If the hon. member is prepared to ask a substantive question, I will immediately try to obtain the information as to what, if any, number has been withdrawn from that work.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a substantive question. Has there been any reduction in the number of RCMP personnel engaged in the search for the persons responsible for the crimes of kidnapping and murder in the Montreal area?

Mr. McIlraith: I believe not, Mr. Speaker, but I will verify that before the end of the question period.

[*Translation*]

WAR MEASURES ACT—PRESENCE OF CYC MEMBERS AMONG THOSE ARRESTED

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Justice.

Could he tell the House if any former or present members of the Company of Young Canadians were among the persons arrested under the War Measures Act?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): I do not have that information, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

CHARGES UNDER WAR MEASURES ACT AND CRIMINAL CODE

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): In order that the House may continue proper surveillance over the powers granted under the War Measures Act, will the minister indicate, whenever he can, how many charges under the Criminal Code will be laid, with respect to the people detained, how many will be charged in respect of alleged infractions against the regulations under the War Measures Act and, possibly, how many confessions were made while these people were being detained in jail?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to furnish the hon. member and the House with the details of the charges as, if and when they are laid. The discretion as to whether they are to be laid rests with the Attorney General of Quebec.

WAR MEASURES ACT—REASONS FOR DELAY IN INTERROGATION OF THOSE DETAINED

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Justice a question. Since a great many of those arrested were kept in jail for quite a number of days and in many cases were not interviewed until the second last day of their stay in jail, on the sixth, twelfth or fourteenth days, and so on, and were then interviewed for a very short time, ten to fifteen minutes, may I ask the minister whether he has discussed with the Attorney General of Quebec the reasons for the delays in interrogation while persons were kept in prison incommunicado? If he has not done so, is he prepared to discuss it with him?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to accept the various preambles, allegations and insinuations in that question.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I will say, however, that of course there were delays because of the great number of people arrested at the same time and the necessity of carrying out this process by skilled interrogators. In certain cases that did result in delays. As for the rest of the preamble, Mr. Speaker, I do not think I need to deal with it.

Mr. Lewis: Is the minister prepared to inquire and report to the House, as to how many of those arrested were kept for many days in jail incommunicado before even being interrogated, how long the interrogations lasted and what kind of questions were asked?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

WAR MEASURES ACT—INDEPENDENT COMMISSION OF REVIEW

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I have a question for the Minister of Justice. In view of the number of detainees—185, I believe—held longer than seven days and then released without a charge being laid, will the minister take some steps—to allay any concern in the minds of the public—such as urging the government of Quebec to appoint a commission of review, not necessarily to make a public report but at least to assure those in authority and this House that there were no abuses of due process within the limits of the intention of the measure?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General of Quebec has already appointed a committee drawn from members of the Civil Rights Association of Quebec, the staff of the Archbishop of Montreal and other members. I would imagine that might be within their terms of reference. I see no point in going further in that regard at the moment because I think that committee is well qualified and I am sure it will pay due attention to the factors raised by the hon. member.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): In view of the answer of the Minister of Justice, what authority do the members of the committee in question have to enter the places where these people are detained and incarcerated?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Under the authority of the Attorney General of Quebec, Mr. Speaker.

WAR MEASURES ACT—NON-PROSECUTION FOR ACTS COMMITTED PRIOR TO PROCLAMATION

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Can the Minister of Justice inform the House whether or not the federal government has requested the Attorney General of Quebec not to prosecute under those sections of the War Measures Act regulations which make actions which were not criminal before the implementation of the Act criminal offences?

[Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton).]

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): I have confidence that the Attorney General of Quebec will exercise properly the discretion given to him by law and by the authority vested in him properly.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

REQUEST FOR PUBLIC INQUIRY INTO NEWS SERVICE

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Prime Minister on my favourite subject, namely the CBC.

On May 1, 1970, the Prime Minister gave me the following reply:

For my part, I am busy dusting my Chinese vases.

Today the journalists' union of the CBC is requesting a public inquiry into the news service in order to shed some light on the Corporation's information policy.

Does the Prime Minister intend to carry out this pious wish so that we may know exactly what goes on within the CBC?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I was not aware of this request, Mr. Speaker, but I will be pleased to discuss the matter with the Secretary of State to see whether it is in the public interest to initiate such an inquiry, as requested by the people concerned.

* * *

[*English*]

BROADCASTING

SPECIAL CBC INSTRUCTIONS RESPECTING NEWS PROGRAMS—CRTC REQUEST TO PRIVATE RADIO STATIONS TO PROVIDE CERTAIN TAPES

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): My question is also directed to the Secretary of State. On November 2 I asked the hon. gentleman if he would inform himself, through the CBC, whether special regulations or instructions were issued by the CBC respecting news coverage both on Radio-Canada and on the English-speaking network. Is the minister now in a position to reply?

While I am on my feet, may I ask whether the Secretary of State was able to take notice of a question I directed to the Prime Minister yesterday about the CRTC and the telegrams which were sent to various private stations?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the Secretary of State might answer one question at a time. I think it would cause confusion if he attempted to deal with two different questions at the same time. The Secretary of State might refer to the first question asked by the hon. member for Annapolis Valley.

Mr. Nowlan: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, from time to time ministers take the opportunity to answer two questions while they are on their feet. I followed a similar practice because yesterday I directed a very cur-

rent question to the Prime Minister involving the communications media of Canada, and I was hoping that the Prime Minister had referred that question to the Secretary of State so he could reply to both at once.

Mr. Speaker: I still abide by the ruling I made a moment ago. I do not wish to be unfair to the hon. member, but I am suggesting it complicates the question period when two or three different questions are asked at the same time.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is that at the beginning of the Cross-Laporte matter, the directors of the news service of the French network were issuing oral instructions to senior editors, producers and reporters asking them to show continuous and increased vigilance over news on that matter, to check and double check any information on the subject before releasing it, in order to avoid creating a feeling of panic, and to always show restraint.

After the emergency measures were adopted, the authorities gave the people in charge of radio and television news programs a copy of the regulations passed by the federal government and they were in constant touch with the legal advisers of the Corporation about the interpretation of the regulations.

The English network has instructed its agents to observe moderation and caution when releasing information related to the crisis, particularly when dealing with conjectures. It has also issued directions as to the legal aspects of reporting under the War Measures Act. Such instructions are usual in cases of serious crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether I would be transgressing the rule you have just laid down—

Mr. Speaker: Order. It might be in order to determine whether the hon. member wants to ask a supplementary question related to the Minister's reply.

[*English*]

Mr. Nowlan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do. Would the Secretary of State be kind enough to obtain these directives and have them tabled, if possible? Would he also tell us whether he has been informed by the CBC, either the English-speaking or the French-speaking networks, that pursuant to this directive certain news reports were, in fact, changed before they were broadcast?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pelletier: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member has missed an important word in my reply. I did say "oral instructions", which means obviously that I cannot produce any document.

As far as the second question is concerned, it was not contained in the first one. I shall therefore inquire from the Corporation and prepare a reply for the hon. member.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I should like to answer the question asked yesterday when I was not here in connection with the tapes requested by the CRTC. The hon. member is well aware that, according to Section 4(5) of the CRTC Regulations issued under the Broadcasting Act, radio and TV program tapes or transcripts are to be kept by the stations for 30 days. It happens quite often that the CRTC, as a result of a complaint or on its own initiative, asks a station for tapes or transcripts of certain programs.

In the case referred to by the hon. member for Annapolis-Valley, I am told that the CRTC sent this request to broadcasting stations because the 30-day period is about to expire and the tapes concerned may be destroyed.

The CRTC thought it had the responsibility of recuperating and preserving those tapes for reference, study and research purposes. Indeed it is a well known fact that newspapers covering the lifetime of many generations are available in libraries and archives but such is not automatically the case with electronic news media.

[*English*]

Mr. Nowlan: I thank the Secretary of State for his answer regarding the CRTC. Is the House to understand that this request by telegram, which went out to some 20 stations across Canada without explanation, was sent on the initiative of the CRTC? Or was it done on the initiative of the government, or of the RCMP?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pelletier: The CRTC took this initiative, Mr. Speaker, and I should like to point out to the hon. member that if any police service had wanted any tapes, they could have asked for them without going to the CRTC.

[*English*]

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): I have a supplementary question for the Secretary of State relating to the remarks made by the Solicitor General a few moments ago about the difficulty in getting a tape of last night's news broadcast. Inasmuch as CRTC regulations require such tapes to be held, why should the Solicitor General experience difficulty in getting this tape from Montreal today?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pelletier: I believe the answer to this question is quite simple, Mr. Speaker. When requesting information of this type, you don't ask for a piece of tape, but for a transcript. The transcript has to be made from the tape and that requires a certain amount of time; therefore, a delay is inevitable.

[*English*]

Mr. MacInnis: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. My point of order arises from the fact that the minister is not well informed about CRTC regulations or about what he, as the minister, can do. The fact remains that these tapes can be made directly available from the station which makes the broadcast. For that matter, I have a tape made by the President of the Privy Council—

Mr. Speaker: Order. This is a debate between the hon. member and the minister.

Inquiries of the Ministry

INFORMATION CANADA

SUGGESTED DUPLICATION OF SERVICES—REDUCTION IN DEPARTMENTAL PUBLIC RELATIONS BUDGETS

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I wish to direct to the Minister without Portfolio who answers for Information Canada. Can the hon. gentleman say whether representations have been received from the Public Libraries Trustees Association of Canada objecting to the duplication of its public information services which would be caused by the establishment of additional public Information Canada offices?

Hon. Robert Stanbury (Minister without Portfolio): No such representations have been brought to my notice, although I have received expressions of strong support from librarians for the concept of Information Canada and for the plan to establish, as recommended by the task force on government information, regional inquiry centres which librarians see as a valuable complementary element in a public information system. We are anxious to co-operate with libraries and I think libraries are anxious to co-operate with us.

While I am on my feet I might refer to a question which was asked yesterday by the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster indicating that Information Canada would be taking over programs of departmental information branches. As I think the hon. member knows, this is not the case, and there was no such announcement.

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, while the minister is in an expansive mood—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. We have just seen illustrated, for the benefit of hon. members, the difficulty which arises when two questions are asked or answered at the same time. The hon. member for Surrey has a supplementary to the first question and the hon. member for Saint John-Lancaster has a supplementary to the second. The hon. member for Surrey.

Mr. Mather: Would the minister check with Information Canada to make sure that no such representation as I mentioned has been made?

Mr. Stanbury: Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Bell: Will the minister give the House an assurance that there will be definite reductions in the information services and budgets of individual departments now that he has taken over, in the way he has explained, a $150 million budget?

Mr. Stanbury: As the hon. member knows, I am sure, there is no budget of $150 million. If he reads the report of the task force on government information he will see that the figure he mentions includes such things as application forms—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[Mr. Speaker.]

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL SECURITY

WAR MEASURES ACT—PAYMENT BY QUEBEC FOR SERVICES OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Prime Minister.

Since the Quebec Minister of Justice is greatly concerned because Quebec could be compelled to pay the cost of the armed forces stay in that province, could the Prime Minister answer that question to-day?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether the beginning of the question is true, but if it is I will simply say that the Quebec Minister of Justice has no reason to be greatly concerned.

* * *

[*English*]

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

ARREST OF CERTAIN NEWS BROADCASTERS UNDER WAR MEASURES ACT

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, on Monday I asked the Secretary of State a question concerning three or four members of Radio-Canada who are news broadcasters. I asked the minister whether or not they, having been picked up, had been released, and he said that he would find out the answer to the question.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I said to the hon. member—certainly not yesterday, since I was not in the House—that I did not have any such information and that I would try to get it. I have not yet obtained it; as soon as I have it, I shall transmit it to the hon. member.

[*English*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion gave to the minister the information that he himself made public, namely, that several members of Radio-Canada who were broadcasters apparently had a code which they used to communicate with the FLQ? Did his colleague give him that information and did he make any investigation in regard thereto? Can the minister give the House some information on that matter, because at the time the information was given by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, he was still free to speak?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pelletier: Mr. Speaker, this piece of information, whether it is accurate or not,—I have not checked it—is one that I have read also in the newspapers, like the right hon. member. But the right hon. member for Prince Albert has had a tendency in the last few weeks to repeat constantly the same mistake. He seems to believe that the Secretary of State is the minister in charge of a specialized police force. I want to inform him that such is not my role. I have no jurisdiction over any police

body as the right hon. member for Prince Albert seems inclined to think.

[*English*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, that is scarcely an answer to the question. I never took the minister to be other than a nonentity.

* * *

[*Translation*]

POST OFFICE

ISSUE OF STAMP IN HONOUR OF PIERRE LAPORTE

Mr. Ian Watson (Laprairie): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Postmaster General.

Does he intend to issue a stamp in memory of Pierre Laporte?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, even though the 1971 commemorative stamps program has already been published the department is considering the possibility of issuing in 1971 a stamp in honour of Pierre Laporte, which would mark Mr. Laporte's 50th anniversary.

* * *

[*English*]

IMMIGRATION

ADMISSION TO CANADA OF BLACK PANTHER MEMBER, RAYMOND HEWITT

Hon. W. G. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Prime Minister. In light of the conflict arising from the statement of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion equating the FLQ and the Black Panthers as fellow revolutionary terrorists, and in light of the permissive attitude expressed by the Minister of Immigration yesterday with reference to the visit of Black Panther Ray Hewitt to a university campus in the province of Manitoba, would the Prime Minister clarify the government's position on this matter to allay the concern of many responsible citizens in the keystone province?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Manpower and Immigration stated the government's position perfectly adequately yesterday.

Mr. Dinsdale: Do I take it from the Prime Minister's statement that it is the policy of the government to detain under the War Measures Act visitors to Canada who belong to movements committed to the overthrow of law and order by terror and violence, or does the policy apply only to Canadians?

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question which is similar to the question the Prime Minister did not answer. When the government considered this matter of the Black Panthers, did it take into consideration the new statements made by the fugitive Black Panther leader, Eldridge Cleaver, contained in the New York *Times* for November 1, wherein he openly advocated political assassination, the killing of Richard Nixon and encouraging people all over the United States to kill police? If so, why did the government make such a decision?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, my reading on terrorists is not as adequate as that of the hon. member—

Mr. MacInnis: That is your problem.

Mr. Trudeau: —but I am glad his party is at last getting around to realizing that the government did right in invoking the War Measures Act.

With regard to the previous question, which I did not answer because I did not understand the last words of the question, even though I am being asked for a legal opinion I think I can be permitted to state my opinion on the matter. We would treat aliens in the same way as we treat Canadians if they fall under the definitions in the War Measures Act regulations or the new law. If the hon. member reads the regulations he will find they were directed at a special circumstance, but were not limited in regard to the nationality of people who might be accused under the regulations.

Mr. Dinsdale: A further supplementary question to the Solicitor General. Could the minister inform the House whether any aliens fitting into the category of revolutionary terrorists have been detained up to the present moment?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I would have to get more information to answer fully on that point, but there is one such case with which I am familiar.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Solicitor General give serious consideration to having everybody wearing a pink shirt arrested?

* * *

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

NON-PAYMENT OF MINIMUM WAGE—RETIRED EMPLOYEES PENSIONS—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. Taking into consideration the well received stand last week by the Minister of Labour in connection with payment by the CNR of less than the federal minimum wage, would the Minister of Labour inform the House what action has now been taken in this regard?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I have not changed my opinion that Crown corporations should pay minimum wages, as should all industries that come within federal jurisdiction. I expressed this opinion two weeks ago and gave my department the authority to proceed in the matter in the usual manner. I refer to the application of the rules and regulations under which the Department of Labour normally proceeds in such cases. I presume that advice is now being

sought from the appropriate department in regard to proceeding further.

Mr. Skoberg: A supplementary question to the minister in connection with CNR labour-management policy. In view of the present wage and rules movement now going on with the CNR, and in view of the unanimous report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications in regard to the CNR pension plan, would the Minister of Labour tell the House whether or not he is interested in intervening in this particular case and drawing the attention of the CNR to the importance of settling this dispute?

Mr. Mackasey: Mr. Speaker, I do not make a practice of interfering with the principle of collective bargaining. The hon. member has referred to the report of the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications pertaining to pensions. I think this is required reading not only by the CNR but also the unions since there are some very far-reaching recommendations in the report applicable to both parties to this dispute.

* * *

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL SECURITY

WAR MEASURES ACT—PAYMENT BY QUEBEC FOR SERVICES OF ARMED FORCES

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, my question follows from the answer given earlier by the Prime Minister to the hon. member for Shefford, in which he said that payment for the services of the Armed Forces in Quebec should not "greatly" concern the Justice Minister of that province.

Does the Prime Minister wish to indicate thereby that the central government has decided to pay the whole cost of such services?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Well, no, Mr. Speaker. The detailed answer I gave the other day to the hon. member for Shefford was based on the fact, which had, I think, given rise to his question, namely, that the Canadian press had spread the rumour lately that I had stated that Quebec would definitely have to assume the cost in full, whereas it is not at all the position I have taken. It is possible that Mr. Choquette in saying that he was afraid Quebec would have to pay based his assumption on this position which is not at all ours.

I have repeated to the House what I have said today, Mr. Speaker—you are impatient and I am too—that Premier Bourassa and myself had decided to deal with the question in due time as it is not the most urgent matter at the present time.

Mr. Asselin: Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question.

Did the Premier of Quebec request that the federal government pay the entire cost of troops stationed in the province of Quebec?

Mr. Trudeau: No, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Mackasey.]

[*English*]

NATIONAL REVENUE

INQUIRY AS TO CLOSING OF SYDNEY TAXATION OFFICE

Mr. Robert Muir (Cape Breton-The Sydneys): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I wish to address to the Minister of National Revenue. Is he in a position to reply to the question I posed yesterday?

Hon. Herb Gray (Minister of National Revenue): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to tell the hon. member that the department is not giving consideration to closing the Sydney district taxation office.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

IDENTIFICATION OF OWNER OF CAR IN WHICH BODY OF PIERRE LAPORTE WAS FOUND

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct to the Minister of Justice the question I asked him on October 26. It is one I have been asked about a great many times. Has the green car that was used in the kidnapping of Mr. Laporte been identified and the owner of the licence number established? Is this information in the hands of the provincial and federal governments, or was the licence number changed on the green car in which the body of Mr. Laporte was unfortunately found?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I do not want to give the evidence in the hands of the police concerning the criminal charges which will be laid and the warrants that are out.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT FORECASTS BY ECONOMIC COUNCIL CHAIRMAN—GOVERNMENT REACTION

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance and arises from the speech to the British Columbia Federation of Labour by the chairman of the Economic Council of Canada about employment and unemployment forecasts. Does the government agree with these projections?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have not seen them at this point. I will take a look at them.

Mr. McCleave: When the minister answers that question, will he also say what the government expects the unemployment situation to be if he differs from the chairman?

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

APPEAL OF DECISION IN STAFFORD SMYTHE INCOME TAX CASE

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): Mr. Speaker, this question is directed to the Minister of Justice. Is it the intention of the minister to appeal the order of His Honour Judge Kelly who stated that the Crown had no legal right to proceed against Stafford Smythe by indictment with regard to charges under the Income Tax Act?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I have instructed the department to take mandamus action against that judgment.

* * *

PUBLIC WORKS

EGANVILLE—PROGRESS TOWARD NEW FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Public Works which I hope is in order because I gave him notice of it. What progress is being made by his department on the project for a new federal building in the town of Eganville?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would think this is a question which normally should be on the order paper. I regret I have to suggest that to the hon. member. If there is urgency the matter could be debated at the time of adjournment.

* * *

SOCIAL SECURITY

REQUEST FOR PRESENTATION OF WHITE PAPER BY END OF YEAR

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, this question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the fact that the Minister of Labour has every intention to bring in legislation regarding the Unemployment Insurance Commission by July, 1971, in light of the fact that witnesses had difficulty presenting briefs and pointing out their position because they did not know where the government was going on social policy, and in light of the fact that the committee will probably have that same problem in presenting a report, can the minister give us any indication when he expects the government's white paper on social policy will be brought forward? If not, could he assure the House if this white policy—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Alexander: This white paper on policy. Mr. Speaker, it has never been my policy to say that white is not beautiful.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Alexander: I wonder whether the minister can possibly assure the House that he will bring his policy down before the end of the year because that would certainly assist the committee.

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I would say to the hon. member, as has been stated several times in the House, that the matter is under active consideration by the government and when a decision has been made it will be announced in the House.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Kootenay West.

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. I have been patient in that regard—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I will allow the hon. member a supplementary, but we have only a few minutes left.

Mr. Alexander: Could the minister be more definite in that regard and assure the House that there is a possibility he might have the policy before the House before the end of the year?

Mr. Munro: I would like to accommodate the hon. member, but I cannot add anything further to what I have already said.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

WAR MEASURES ACT—DESTRUCTION OF PHOTOGRAPHS AND FINGERPRINTS OF THOSE RELEASED WITHOUT CHARGE

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Solicitor General. Has any move been made to have the photographs and fingerprints destroyed of the 359 individuals who were arrested under the War Measures Act and released without charge?

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): No, Mr. Speaker, not that I know of.

* * *

[*Translation*]

SOCIAL SECURITY

ISSUANCE OF INSURANCE CARDS TO NON-CANADIANS

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Labour.

Is he in a position to reply today to the question I directed to him on October 29, and I quote in part:

—whether the Unemployment Insurance Commission has the authority to issue social insurance cards to individuals who are not recognized as Canadians, such as American Army deserters, or to other classes of individuals who have entered Canada illegally?

Mr. Speaker: I think such a question should be put on the order paper. I apologize to the hon. member if, so to speak, I lost the question since it was asked earlier. On thinking it over, however, I think it would be better to put it on the order paper.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*English*]

TRANSPORT

FREIGHT RATE LEVEL IN PRAIRIE PROVINCES—ACTION TO REMOVE DISCRIMINATION

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. In view of the very high freight rates prevailing in the Prairie provinces and particularly in northern Alberta where the freight rate structure is now at the peak for North America, what plans, if any, has the government in mind to rectify this discriminatory situation?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I do not think I could answer that question without more definitive information.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I had some doubt as to the question. Perhaps the hon. member might make it more specific. It seems to me he is inviting the minister to make a statement of a very general nature. If he could make the question more specific it might be easier for the Chair to allow it.

Mr. Southam: Then, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister if he would consult with his colleague the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs with a view to looking into what appears to be discriminatory rates in a captive freight rate area since this is a matter of deep concern to the people of western Canada?

Mr. Jamieson: Mr. Speaker, I would go further than that. I might advise the hon. member and the House that I have initiated talks with the officials and the premiers of the prairie provinces with a view to obtaining their general reaction to the current freight rate situation and to see what recommendations they might have for improvement.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

REPORTED REDUCTION OF RCMP PERSONNEL ENGAGED IN SEARCH FOR KIDNAPPERS AND MURDERERS

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I would like the permission of the House to supplement a reply I made earlier to a question asked by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands concerning the number of RCMP in the Montreal area working on the current case. There has been no reduction of manpower working on this matter by the RCMP.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order affecting the business of the House for tomorrow. It is the intention of the government, if the item of business now to be called is not completed today, to continue with it tomorrow. Therefore we will not call an opposition day tomorrow.

Mr. Baldwin: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister whether he has given any thought, if the consideration of the bill which we are to consider today and possibly tomorrow should not be completed, to whether or not the government is prepared to sit throughout tomorrow until the business is concluded?

Mr. MacEachen: Yes, we would be happy to consider that.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PUBLIC ORDER (TEMPORARY MEASURES) ACT, 1970

PROVISION OF EMERGENCY POWERS FOR PRESERVATION OF PUBLIC ORDER

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice) moved that Bill C-181, to provide temporary emergency powers for the preservation of public order in Canada, be read the second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole.

• (3:00 p.m.)

He said: Mr. Speaker, we are beginning the debate this afternoon upon a bill which fulfills the commitment given by this government and made before the final vote was taken upon the resolution of this House which endorsed the proclamation by the government of the War Measures Act. The commitment given by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), the government House Leader, was that within a month of that date, October 19, we would bring in the bill. We have brought in the bill within two weeks of that time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): This bill is designed to replace the regulations made pursuant to the War Measures Act on October 16. It is directed toward meeting the continuing threat of the Front de Libération du Québec in Quebec and to the relationship of Quebec within Canada. It is a temporary measure designed to meet what we hope will be a temporary phenomenon. The measure before the House is precise in its terms. If adopted by Parliament, it will revoke the proclamation which activated the power of the War Measures Act, a power that, I hasten to add, was not totally exercised under that act but was exercised only in a limited way.

The burden of what I have to say today will relate to the reasons for this bill and the threat that the bill is intended to meet. The purpose of the bill is to replace the regulations passed under the War Measures Act. During the two-day debate on October 16 and 17, the House of Commons debated whether or not the government had reason to invoke that act. This House has already, by an overwhelming vote, endorsed the proclamation of that act.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Subject to conditions.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I submit that the debate on this bill should not be a mere resurrection of the previous debate but that we should concentrate upon the nature and terms of the bill now before the House and the purpose that the bill is meant to achieve.

During the past two weeks the government has repeatedly been asked by members opposite to reveal the factual basis upon which the government acted. As the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) stated on Friday, October 23 in this House, and as he has reiterated on several occasions since then in the House, the country already knows the facts upon which we based our decision. We received written requests from the government of Quebec and from the civic administration of Montreal for immediate assistance in the face of what they called apprehended insurrection. A Quebec minister and a British diplomat had been kidnapped and governments had been held to ransom. Large amounts of dynamite had been stolen, were ready for use and had been used before. Arms and ammunition were in the possession of terrorists.

All this was against the background of an erosion of public will and confidence in the ability of the institutions of government and law enforcement agencies in Quebec to respond to this crisis. We do not have to explore plots or allegations of provisional governments to appreciate the acute sense of apprehension and fear in Quebec in those days preceding the proclamation of the War Measures Act.

Those who still continue to suggest that our decision had to be based upon some sort of tallying up, some sort of mathematical summary of the number of sticks of dyanmite that had been stolen, or the estimate of the number of terrorists involved with the FLQ and the number of specific instances of violence that had taken place, operate, I submit, from a misleading premise. Let there be no mistake: the government recognizes that the decision involved a value judgment, it involved an assessment by the government of all the available facts, but the decision of the government must be viewed against the total background of events in Quebec, events that form a continuum of change in the social fabric of that province.

I submit, Your Honour, that the state cannot be reasonably required to measure danger in the "nice balance of a jeweller's scale". These are words used by a Chief Justice of the United States, pronounced in the case of *Gitlow v. New York* in a statement that was later approved by Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. The Chief Justice went on to say:

> A single revolutionary spark may kindle a fire that, smouldering for a time, may burst into a sweeping and destructive conflagration. It cannot reasonably be required to defer the adoption of measures for its own peace and safety until the revolutionary utterances lead to actual disturbances of the public peace or imminent or immediate danger of its own destruction; but it may, in the exercise of its judgment, suppress the threatened danger in its incipiency.

[*Translation*]

The government recognized and, from the beginning, expressed the opinion that the War Measures Act was "too blunt an instrument", to repeat words I used previously.

We recognized the need for more definite but flexible statutory instrument and we must review exactly what was involved when the War Measures Act was invoked.

Some of the criticisms aimed at the government in some circles were absolutely irresponsible and irrelevant. When the government invoked the War Measures Act, it changed the law of the land only to the extent of the change brought about by the regulations made under the act. Nothing else was law. The War Measures Act is only an enabling statute giving the government the power to make orders and regulations dealing with various number of matters.

But only the regulations are law and those defined by the government increased the powers of authorities charged with the application of the law or reduced the common rights of citizens to a very limited extent.

As a result of the regulations, arrest and investigation powers of the police have been extended in very specific circumstances and for a very limited period. These extended powers are solely procedural: the power to arrest without warrant, to detain for a limited period without indictment, to search without warrant and to suspend bail upon request of the Attorney General.

I am not underestimating these powers, nor will I deny that they restrict some of the procedural guarantees embodied in our regular criminal law. However, these powers have been vested in the authorities responsible for application of law, under control of a provincial Attorney General, with a specific purpose. They were created for a specific objective and aimed at the FLQ, which has been declared an illegal association, in regard to which new crimes have been defined as coming within the provisions of the law. But the other laws which, in Canada, govern other areas of activities have not been suspended.

After the horror, shame and disgust that Canadians experienced last month when confronted with the acts of the FLQ came a period of deep reflection on the part of millions of our fellow countrymen. We have witnessed the deep attachment of Canadians for Canada and their affection, their faith in a very special social order which is part of the Canadian soul.

This feeling of solidarity first revealed itself in the massive support given to the government and in the endorsement of its policy by this House. Others expressed a feeling of sadness and bitterness that in our country our most cherished liberties had to be suspended, even temporarily. I appreciate all these tokens of support such as the Prime Minister has foreseen them in his statement to the House on October 16.

• (3:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

This deep concern of Canadians everywhere is proof that we have in Canada a sensitive yet resilient society, a society capable of defending itself, yet not unaware of the costs that are associated with this defence, a society which does not permit itself to confuse the illness with

the symptoms. I am proud, as a member of this House, that the expressions of steadfastness, of sadness and of questioning which have been heard in this chamber during the past two weeks have largely reflected the attitude of most Canadians. The vote recorded on October 19 makes it clear how responsive and basically reflective of public opinion is Parliament—as it should be.

But, Mr. Speaker, there have been a few other voices as well. Not confident voices. Not sad voices—hysterical voices, shrieking voices. We have heard them in this House, we heard them from Winnipeg, we heard them from Toronto. They said that the government acted out of emotion. They said this, and they shouted it emotionally. They said that the government acted for base political purposes. That is what they said, and they shouted that, again, emotionally. These voices, I submit to Your Honour, are yelling for their political lives.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I say to Your Honour that this shrillness is a hollow shrillness and that their thesis is preposterous. They say the government of Canada was wrong, the government of Quebec was wrong, the government of Montreal was wrong, that 190 members of this House were wrong and that every member of this House, of whatever party, elected from a Quebec constituency was wrong. They say we all overreacted.

Mr. Peters: Is this not possible?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I leave it to Your Honour and to this House to decide which party overreacted and which parties have been acting responsibly.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Fortunately, the hysteria, the forgetfulness—the forgetfulness of the facts that brought the train of events into motion—and the attribution of base political motives by these persons are not widespread nor have they the agreement of two many people. They did not even convince the Premier of Manitoba on Sunday and they certainly will not convince the millions of Canadians and people everywhere who have applauded Canada for standing up against terrorism and making terror a less credible device in this country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, to say, as these gentlemen have done, that the proclamation of the War Measures Act amounted to a suspension of all civil liberties in this country, as the leader of the NDP (Mr. Douglas) has said, is just not true. He talked of censorship, he talked of deportation, he talked of the wide powers of expropriation, he recited all the potential powers in the War Measures Act as if they had all been brought into force. Yet he ignored the fact that only the regulations have the force of law. He and the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) talked of the totalitarian powers invoked by the government. By describing the potential in the War Measures Act instead of directing criticism, which might have been constructive, to the regulations that alone have the force of law, they were misleading the Canadian people and I suggest to Your Honour they were being intellectually dishonest.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): We have all read the reports of what went on in Winnipeg. The leader of the NDP drew a parallel between the implementation of the War Measures Act in Canada and the rise of the Nazis in Germany.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I do not know what interpretation to place on that parallel. I shall place as charitable an interpretation as I can on it. Perhaps he was comparing the terrorist tactics of the FLQ with the terrorist tactics of the Nazis in the thirties. But one thing is sure—history has recorded what happened to the Weimar republic. That republic, that democracy, did not know how to protect itself. I suggest that the Canadian government does know how to protect the people of Canada and we do know how to protect democracy in Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The people of Canada understand and the people of Canada will remember.

Mr. Peters: Oh, shut up.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): This government, Mr. Speaker, accepts responsibility for what it has done. I submit to the House that to have refused a request from the government of Quebec, in the terms in which it was made and under the circumstances in which it was made, would have been gross irresponsibility. The action of the federal government was in response to written requests from the government of Quebec and the administration in Montreal. The army is deployed in Quebec because Quebec called for the army. Increased powers of apprehension and investigation are operating in Quebec because Quebec called on the federal government to equip it with these extra powers to deal with the FLQ. The three governments, federal, provincial and municipal, were acting in concert, acting within the respective mandates given to them under the Constitution by the people who elected them, and acting properly within the contours of a federal state.

This government has the confidence, and I believe in the last two weeks has enhanced the confidence it enjoys, of the Canadian people. The Premier of Quebec and his government recently received an overwhelming mandate from the people of Quebec. The mayor of Montreal won an overwhelming victory at the polls a week or so ago. To say, as the hon. member for York South has said, that this government acted for political motives is an insult not only to the members of this House but to the people of Montreal, the people of Quebec and the people of Canada.

Some hon. members may feel that the circumstances did not warrant that request from Quebec or that

response from Ottawa. That is within the legitimate range of argument. That is their right and I submit that if they believe it, it is their duty to express that feeling. That I respect. But I believe that it is worth noting that to date not one of the members of this House from the province of Quebec has challenged either the necessity for what was done by the government nor the way in which it was done.

[*Translation*]

The legislation that we have presented in the form of this bill is intended to meet the present threat of the FLQ.

The events we went through make us aware of the vulnerability of our democratic institutions. To the extent that violence breaks out in a democracy, it indicates the failure or weakness of that system. But, as members of the House, we cannot accept the suicide of democracy by remaining passive before violence. Rather we should act—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): We should not shrink even from using force in a legal and constitutional way in order to check the threat and to restore that atmosphere of stability and control that is the primary condition of any social progress. Only when we have achieved that stability shall we be able to tackle and solve efficiently the problems facing this nation.

• (3:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

I have already mentioned the genuine concern for civil liberties in these past few weeks. I share that concern. The enduring existence of those rights and freedoms enumerated in the Canadian Bill of Rights, the very essence of our democracy, is beyond dispute. For that reason their existence must be cherished and protected. However, it is not, and never has been, part of the democratic process that society should refrain from taking such steps as are necessary to protect itself and protect its citizens from being deprived of those very liberties and freedoms by organized criminals and anarchists. The most fundamental right of all, without which no others can be enjoyed, is the right to life itself. In this regard we must not lose sight of one paramount fact, and that is that the members of the FLQ have demonstrated beyond doubt their willingness to kill, no matter how innocent their victims might be.

Pierre Laporte was not the first person to die at the hands of the FLQ. Only a short time ago and within a few hundred yards of this House, an innocent woman, Madame Jeanne-d'Arc St-Germain, was killed in a bomb blast at National Defence headquarters in Ottawa, for which the FLQ claimed credit. There have been other similar tragedies; I shall not recite the unhappy catalogue.

For a government to refrain from taking the required action to deal with an organization like the FLQ would be the height of irresponsibility and folly; indeed, it would be the very negation of the concept of civil liberties as we have come to understand that concept. There are no civil liberties where there is no democratic government to secure them. Mr. Speaker, I cannot state this too strongly: No government entrusted with the security of its people and with the protection of the liberties of the people who conferred the mandate, the temporary power, upon them could have acted otherwise.

No government has a mandate to negotiate away its own existence or surrender the rights of its people. If it did, it would be acting treasonably to its own people while betraying itself. And to suggest, as some members of the opposition have, that because an insurrection did not occur, therefore it could not have been apprehended, is an exercise in false logic.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The FLQ is a revolutionary conspiracy. We do not have to read extensively to learn what men like Vallières and Gagnon really stand for. We need examine only brief passages from "Les Nègres Blancs d'Amerique" and copies of the publication of the comité central of the FLQ to understand what their tactics are. This FLQ literature lays out a pattern of revolution, escalating through different levels of action, violence and confrontation to the ultimate overthrow of the established order in Quebec and Canada. By their actions they deny the legitimate means of reform available to the political process. By their words and deeds they repudiate the rule of law. And as they do so, they seek its protection and seek to take advantage of it.

I have heard people say, "Don't overreact; you'll drive the FLQ underground."

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

An hon. Member: We heard that two weeks ago.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Drive them underground? They are already underground. This is already a clandestine movement of terror and anarchy.

An hon. Member: But you cannot find them.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Some revolutionaries like Vallières and Gagnon have rather strange attitudes as was noted by Hon. Justice Brossard of the Quebec Court of Appeal, in the case Vallières vs. Regina. Vallières had lodged an appeal to the Quebec Court of Appeal in connection with his conviction for manslaughter following the death of a woman killed in a Montreal bombing. The court granted him a new trial, because wrong instructions had been given the jury, but Justice Brossard said, and I quote:

> I take the liberty of pointing out the contradictory nature of the situation created by this appeal. The appellant owes those days of grace to legislation which, as can be seen from his writings, he looks down upon and which could remain a dead letter should the use of violence he is advocating in his writings be followed. It is so to speak without his co-operation and in disagreement with some pernicious ideas that he seems anxious to spread around that the principles of justice, the administra-

tion of which he puts in jeopardy, assure him the benefit of a nonsuit with respect to his conviction for manslaughter, his lawyers having appealed in his favour.

[*English*]

The regulations under the War Measures Act, Mr. Speaker, and the bill now before you and the House provide that their provisions shall be enforced by the provincial authorities. This is consistent with what is now, and what has been since confederation, the basic position in this country with respect to the enforcement of the criminal law. The enforcement of the Criminal Code, which embodies the largest part of our criminal law, is left to the provinces. The regulations which were brought into force on October 16 are in their nature criminal law, as are the provisions of this bill.

It has been suggested by some in this House and outside the House that the enforcement of the regulations and these special laws should not have been left to the provincial authorities. I disagree. In large measure, the police resources in the province of Quebec are provincial and municipal resources. In the main, the crown attorneys in the province are employed by the provincial government. Furthermore, the FLQ is largely and peculiarly a menace within Quebec. To hear some who object to provincial enforcement of these laws, one might be led to think that the government of Quebec is an irresponsible government rather than a government elected by the same electorate and by the same democratic processes as are 74 hon. members of this House.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I say that kind of talk and that kind of mentality is calculated to sow and nourish seeds of distrust and disunity in this country. What I have said applies to the province of Ontario and the province of British Columbia just as it applies to the province of Quebec. It is a fundamental principle of the enforcement of our criminal law.

In the course of the preparation of the bill now before the House, consideration was given to including in it legislation of a permanent nature that would permit the government of the day to deal with emergencies of the kind which we are now facing without having to resort to the all-embracing authority of the War Measures Act. As hon. members know, the War Measures Act confers upon the federal government the broadest powers to enact laws.

There is, I believe, some feeling that special laws should be enacted so as to permit the government of the day to deal with lawlessness or violence of an organized nature which extends beyond the ambit and the control of the ordinary criminal law. After a good deal of thought and consultation across Canada, within this House and within the caucus which supports the government, it was decided that the government should defer action on proposed permanent legislation in the hope that it would speed up consideration of the measure now before the House, so that the War Measures Act might be withdrawn as soon as possible.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton).]

Mr. Peters: Why?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Because we wanted to introduce this bill which was more precise in its provisions than one that circumstances forced us to introduce in a time of emergency and crisis.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): We also had the thought in mind that proposals for permanent legislation might receive better and more mature consideration on another occasion because, Mr. Speaker, a climate of crisis does not nourish the calm deliberation that the delicate balance between collective security and individual liberties and rights requires.

[*Translation*]

Hon. members have had a chance since October 16 to familiarize themselves with the Regulations which because of their significance they certainly examined at length. In view of the circumstances, I do not wish to take too much of your time in going back over them. I merely want to point out a few differences between the Regulations and this bill.

The bill was phrased in such a way as to limit further its application. It deals specifically with the Front de libération du Québec and its attempts to resort to force and crime as a means to operate a change in government in Canada, and especially with regards to the province of Quebec or its relationship to Canada.

The bill is aimed at reducing to some extent the presumptions of affiliation with the illegal association as compared with those provided for in the Regulations; furthermore, the periods of detention pending the filing of an indictment have been reduced significantly as compared with those specified in the Regulations.

On the other hand, we have clarified the way the Canadian Bill of Rights will apply to persons who have been arrested, held in jail or convicted under the new law, and it is provided that the rights stated in paragraphs (*a*) to (*g*) of Section 2 of the Canadian Bill of Rights will apply with two exceptions. Among the rights which will still apply to arrested or detained persons is the right to retain counsel without delay.

I have to mention also that this bill, like the Regulations, provides for expediting the trial of a person charged with an offence and detained in custody without bail. Indeed, this is a special legislation because it is not generally offered to persons charged with an offence under the ordinary provisions of criminal law.

I should like to make another remark about this law. Once it is implemented, the government intends to repeal it as soon as the threat to freedom and to the constitutional government of this country is brought to heel and settled.

Hon. members will see that the last clause of the bill gives much freedom and flexibility in that field. The government very much hopes that circumstances will soon allow such action.

• (3:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

Why the need for special legislation, Mr. Speaker? What are the inadequacies in our existing criminal law? The existing criminal law is not designed to cope with a group or groups of persons organized on a continuing basis with a fanatic dedication to achieving governmental change by resorting to the commission of crime which, of course, is the nature and purpose and organization of the FLQ. While the Criminal Code deals with treason and sedition, it does not do so in relation to an organized group of the kind mentioned. It deals only with the criminal conduct of individuals, which is not necessarily related to the existence of an identifiable group such as the FLQ.

It follows that no matter how criminal in nature an organization might be, membership in itself may not be unlawful. For obvious reasons, the government would not under ordinary circumstances seek to make membership in any organization a crime in itself. There must be severe limitations on that kind of approach because it is one that can easily lead to unwarranted abuse. We recognize that. On the other hand, it must be self-evident that a point can be reached where that course of action is both necessary and justified—and in the view of the government it has been reached with respect to the FLQ. I say that because unless an organization like the FLQ is made illegal, its ability to exist and function is largely unimpaired. The reason for this is that the FLQ can and does, in addition to the criminal behaviour of its membership, pay lip service to causes that are perfectly legitimate; causes such as unemployment, inadequate housing, grievances of taxi drivers, and so on. In the result, persons can with impunity identify with and support the FLQ financially or otherwise by simply pointing to legitimate causes of the kind just mentioned.

Unless, therefore, it can be shown beyond reasonable doubt that an FLQ supporter has stolen dynamite, committed robbery, murder or some other crime, he is beyond the reach of the ordinary law. That is why the organization itself is being made unlawful. When the conclusion is reached that society must defend itself against the very existence of an organization like the FLQ, then that group and support of it must be outlawed. This is what the emergency regulations did, and that is what this bill proposes to do. The aim of outlawing the organization is to render it ineffective to the greatest extent possible by placing its membership in jeopardy, eliminating sources of support, crippling its ability to make propaganda, making communication on its behalf criminal, and so on.

There are two other special measures in the emergency regulations and in the bill which do not exist in the ordinary criminal law. The first is the authority to arrest without warrant where there is reason to suspect that a person is a member of the unlawful association or has committed, or is about to commit, any of the offences prescribed in section 4 of the regulations or clause 4 of the bill. This requirement is less stringent than that contained in the Criminal Code, which requires the existence of reasonable and probable grounds to believe that an indictable offence has been committed.

Secondly, under the provisions of the bill, law enforcement authorities will be allowed a maximum of seven days—which is a reduction from the 21 days in the regulations—to develop any leads they may acquire against a person arrested on suspicion. Under the ordinary rules of the criminal law, a person who has been arrested and detained must be charged and brought before a justice within 24 hours.

Mention should also be made, Mr. Speaker, of the special provision regarding search and the provision relating to the refusal of bail. These special measures undoubtedly facilitate investigations into suspected violations of the emergency laws and, just as important, suspected violations of other offences under existing criminal law. They permit law enforcement authorities to detain suspected FLQ members and supporters who would otherwise be completely out of reach. They also give law enforcement authorities more time to develop a case against a suspect who by reason of his detention is not in a position to take steps to frustrate the investigation. There are risks involved. There are potential abuses. We have weighed them carefully and we have attempted, in so far as we can, to be of assistance to the Attorney General of Quebec and to ensure that these abuses are kept to a minimum. Those are the main arguments I wanted to submit for Your Honour's attention and the attention of the House.

October, 1970, was a watershed for this country. Canada changed. We have experienced what Toffler might call "future shock". It is not easy for a people unaccustomed to violence, seemingly secure in the belief that "It can't happen here", to sense that finally it has happened here. We are no longer immune from the contagion of violence that plagues parts of the world. Canada, someone said, has lost its innocence—and that may well be true. But it is a sad and even tragic commentary on our times that the experience of violence seems to be regarded as the final entry permit into the family of nations.

If Canadians were philosophically unprepared, if we were psychologically complacent, so was our law. After all, the law of a nation is the measure of its civilization. Our laws were moving, and will continue to move, toward giving individuals in this country more personal options, more equality and more appeals against those who govern. In a time of peace and tranquility, the impetus of law reform holds forth great promise; but I suppose it tends to leave us vulnerable in a time of violence or insurrection. Our criminal law was unprepared, both in substance and procedure, both operationally and philosophically, to deal with the kind of terrorist activity and violence which we have witnessed in recent weeks. It was not meant for a society wherein terror and violence suddenly became synchronized.

The criminal law, as we have it now, assumes that a crime is primarily an individual act or is committed by a single individual. Our criminal law is not equipped fundamentally to deal with organized group violence or

organized terrorism. Extra powers were needed to deal with this new phenomenon in Canada. The invocation of the War Measures Act and the present bill in more precise form represent the first and second response, by a society determined to protect itself and determined to preserve a climate in which individual liberty can flourish, to this new threat of violence.

I say to Your Honour that those of us in the government did what we had to do with great reluctance. We did what we did because it had to be done. Some of the measures we have had to adopt in the short run and for a short term are philosophically abhorrent to us. We intend as soon as we can to turn once more to the road of law reform and the continuing enhancement and protection of civil liberties. Perhaps this experience will prompt us to accelerate our priorities in social and economic justice, to humanize our institutions and to democratize the process by which our decisions are made. We have become aware of the fragility of a democratic order. The very strengths of democracy are also its weaknesses. The very liberties we strive to enshrine can become, by excess, the licence that can destroy. There is no freedom without order under law, and there can be no order under law without freedom.

• (3:40 p.m.)

The causes of violence run deep. The sources of the alienation that provokes such violence run deeper still. What we did to meet violence in the short run, which we do now with continued determination, must not deter us from what we need to do in the long run; rip out the social and economic abuses that breed the frustration and anger that brings out the worst violent streaks in men and women. Only if we pursue diligently the search for a new social and economic order will we achieve the fundamental purpose of this bill.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner). In his opening remarks he stated he hoped that all members who participate in the discussion of this bill will keep their minds focused on the bill and not spend too much time on the events of the past. He then launched into an inflammatory attack on some members of the House, not members of my party, who disagreed with the position he took.

This bill will replace the reliance the government has placed upon the War Measures Act. It is undoubtedly a vast improvement. From the beginning we demanded temporary legislation to provide the necessary powers to fight terrorism, but limited to that purpose. To say the least, the government was very reluctant to commit itself to such legislation. With all due respect to the Minister of Justice, I tried to get such an assurance from the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau).

An hon. Member: That was the first day.

[Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton).]

Mr. Stanfield: The Prime Minister made a very general statement that meant very little and which did not commit the government to anything. The second day, when I asked the Prime Minister whether he would make a firm commitment, he refused to do so.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: It was not until over the weekend that the government House Leader gave assurance that such a bill would be introduced within a month. The government has now in effect accepted our leadership in this matter.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: This party will support the bill on second reading although we will be introducing amendments to improve it. I remind the government that this does not absolve it from its responsibility to take the people of Canada into its confidence, and that government by rumour must stop. I accept the need for special measures of a temporary nature, as long as there are proper safeguards, to fight terroristic revolutionaries in Quebec. However, I wish to emphasize one point the minister dealt with but in my view did not bring into close focus, and that is that this bill will not stamp out threats of future terrorism. I believe the great majority of the people of Quebec realize this only too well. It is only through long-range attacks upon fundamental problems, including those of law and order, that we can hope to do this.

I believe that during the last two or three weeks we have seen Parliament react in an appropriate manner in showing its wares in a time of crisis. We believe there has been a demonstration of responsible opposition in attacking this crisis.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: As a consequence of opposition insistence we have now before us a bill, although admittedly imperfect, which has unusual powers. However, they are certainly very restricted compared to the vast powers which the government had when it invoked the War Measures Act. These new powers will be much more limited than the excessive powers given to the authorities under the regulations of the War Measures Act, where there was no provision for an effective review of the exercise of the very extensive powers given under those regulations.

The minister again raised the question of the provinces exercising responsibility. I do not want to go over that ground again, but I do want to say that a federal government which creates exemptions from the traditional procedures of the criminal law must surely accept some responsibility in connection with the exercise of those exempted powers.

There were some faults in the initial regulations adopted by the government. First, they were in force through-

out Canada. Second, they provided for long periods of detention without a charge being laid. This afternoon we learned that 228 people were detained for more than seven days, of whom 180 were eventually released without a charge being laid. This is too lengthy a period of detention without a charge being laid. There was no provision for review and no provision has been made except for a group of persons interested in civil rights who have been authorized to visit the prisoners. I have not yet seen a report by that committee, but I understand they were not too pleased with the conditions in one city where persons were being detained. It was found that the only person still detained, although he tried to see his lawyer and to communicate with his family was refused that permission. Apparently, the group that visited him was able to make the necessary arrangements. But that is a very far cry from an independent review board authorized, really, to review everything that is going on in connection with these detentions.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Fourth, there is the broad definition of illegal association in the initial regulations which has been very substantially narrowed in the new bill. Fifth, there is provision for retroactivity in the regulations: one can be convicted on the basis of evidence related to a time before the regulations came into effect. Unfortunately, this provision prevails in the bill, although its rigour has been lessened to some extent, and this constitutes an improvement.

So, with regard to the new bill there are a number of improvements. The definition of illegal association has been narrowed, a substantially shorter period of detention has been authorized in the absence of a charge being laid, there has been some improvement with regard to the provision about evidence and, as I understand it, there is a clearly assured right to counsel. These represent substantial improvements.

When we reach a later stage it will be more appropriate to talk about the specific defects of the bill, though I might mention one or two now. There is still no provision for a judicial or independent review. There is still provision for retroactivity to prevail, and there is still provision for a prisoner against whom a charge has been laid being detained for 90 days before there is any requirement to appear before a court and have a date set for trial, perhaps at some distant time in the future. It is not very obvious why such a provision, as it now stands, is essential to an effective fight against terrorists.

It is important to bear in mind that this bill is not based upon any assumption of apprehended insurrection. It is based, rather, upon recognition of the existence of an organization of ruthless terrorists whose purpose it is to try and change the government, or certain relations between governments, by force or criminal acts. We should all understand that this bill is not based upon an apprehended insurrection. I think it is now clear that the sooner a bill like this one was brought down, the better—a bill designed to provide the powers necessary to fight terrorists, but powers limited to the extent required to do the job which needs to be done.

The horror resulting from the kidnapping of James Cross, and from the kidnapping and murder of Pierre Laporte, was overwhelming. Not only was there horror but, obviously, real fear as to where the terrorists might strike next. There can be no doubt about this. There can be no question as to the necessity of tracking down these terrorists. There can be no question as to the authorities being given the tools necessary to do that job. This bill, in my view, provides those powers, although as I have suggested it lacks a few safeguards of a kind which would in no way impede the authorities in the effective prosecution of their duties.

I said a few minutes ago that government by rumour must end. This bill, as I have pointed out, is not based upon any apprehended insurrection, but the government invoked the War Measures Act on the basis of apprehended insurrection. While the Minister of Justice said he would concentrate on the future in the terms of this bill, he spent a good deal of time—and I do not object to that—going over the ground with respect to apprehended insurrection. However, I do not think he said anything new. I believe it is clear that when the government invoked the War Measures Act, the vast majority of Canadians put their trust in the government. I do not dispute that for a moment. They believed the government had facts which justified the action which it took. Indeed, they clearly applauded the government for taking this action, especially after the murder of Pierre Laporte. Clearly, the vast majority of the people of this country were fed up after years of terrorist activity culminating in the horror of that week or ten days. There is no question at all as to the need for vigorous action against the terrorists. Indeed, many of those who applauded the government for its action asked why more effective action had not been taken earlier.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: Certainly, as the Minister of Justice has reminded us this afternoon, the plans of the FLQ did not flower overnight; the Minister of Justice and his associates did not discover these revolutionary documents just on the eve of invoking the War Measures Act. There were warnings, Mr. Speaker. I believe there were abortive attempts to kidnap diplomats in Montreal on two occasions earlier this year, and a great many people in Canada have been seriously concerned that no effective action was taken earlier. They were concerned as to how effective our security service is; concerned whether the government was warned, or not warned, by our security officers.

Unquestionably there was kidnapping, unequestionably there was murder, unquestionably there was terrorism and the most profound feeling of personal insecurity in the province of Quebec but, as I say, none of this amounted to grounds for apprehended insurrection. But the act having been invoked, the ministers of the Crown immediately began to create confusion as to exactly what constituted the insurrection which the government apprehended. The Minister of Regional Economic Expan-

sion (Mr. Marchand) started it off on the Friday afternoon of the debate by talking about all sorts of dangers which existed in Montreal and Quebec.

The Minister of Justice, either then or shortly afterwards, said the government might never be able to disclose all the facts which moved it to act. Then the Prime Minister began the process of insisting that the public knew all the facts which had motivated the government's action, as the Minister of Justice repeated here this afternoon. Then, of course, came the intervention of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion in the Montreal election, an intervention which, however one might regard it and however charitable one might feel toward that particular minister, can only be described as a catastrophe of the first order.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: As a result of this confusion created by conflicting statements made by ministers, journalists and others, people in opposition began to have doubts in their minds as to what really had motivated the government. This uneasiness was not restricted to those outside the government or outside the ranks of those supporting the government. It is clear that people in high places spread the rumour of a plot to overthrow the duly elected government of the province of Quebec. Mr. Speaker, I say categorically it is very obvious now that no such plot ever existed. I want to say to the Prime Minister in his presence that I am very disappointed he should have allowed the impression to continue that such a plot might have existed when he knew perfectly well there was no such plot in existence.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (4:00 p.m.)

Mr. Stanfield: Whether this was designed as a distraction, or whether someone was out to get Claude Ryan, I do not know and I express no view. But when there is no solid information and when conflicting statements are issued by ministers, what we have is government by rumour. There is a very ugly aspect to this business, Mr. Speaker, because on Monday, in Toronto, after I am sure it must have been apparent to every member of this House that no plot existed, the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Wahn) is reported in the press as follows:

> Mr. Wahn said the question facing the government then was whether the FLQ was moving into the fourth stage. He maintained that the government had then some evidence to indicate that it was.
>
> He cited "the evidence of treason or near treason of certain intellectuals in the province of Quebec".
>
> "A group of 16 or 17 leading intellectuals urged the government to accept all the terms of the FLQ," Mr. Wahn continued. "The object was to destroy the democratically-elected government of the province of Quebec".

Mr. Trudeau: What is wrong with that?

Mr. Stanfield: Did the Prime Minister ask me what is wrong with that? I disagreed with the opinion expressed by that group, including Claude Ryan, which urged that there should be some arrangement worked out involving the release of prisoners from Canadian jails, and I agreed with the stand being maintained by my right hon. friend and his colleagues. But to describe in that way the suggestion made by this group of men in Quebec, or to suggest that the editorial conference in the offices of *Le Devoir* or the conversations between Mr. Ryan and Mr. Saulnier are "treason or near treason" is—I was going to say McCarthyism, but I think it goes even beyond McCarthyism.

Mr. Fairweather: Unworthy of the Prime Minister.

Mr. MacEwan: It is Trudeauism.

Mr. Stanfield: No, it is not Trudeauism but it is unworthy of the Prime Minister and I hope he will do all he can to see that that sort of thing stops. As a result of all this and as a result of the rumours that have been spread, it is clear that there is an increasing demand for unequivocal information in regard to the apprehended insurrection. It is clear that some feel they have been taken in by the government, but I am not yet in that category. As far as I am concerned, despite the confusion created by conflicting statements made by ministers, and despite the red herrings about plots to replace the government of Quebec, I am still prepared to accept on trust that the government apprehended insurrection. However, like the people of this country I am still waiting to get the facts.

I expect the government before long to produce evidence, or at least indications, not of terrorism, not of kidnapping, not of murders, not of revolutionary plans, not of an intense feeling in Quebec of individual insecurity—all of which clearly existed—not simply to say that it has the confidence of the majority of the people of the country and that the majority of the people accept the fact that the government did apprehend insurrection, not merely to ask the people to continue their confidence in it, but to take the people of Canada into its confidence.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: As I shall explain in a minute or two, I think this is particularly important as far as young Canadians are concerned. I repeat, there is no question about the need for action in connection with terrorism in the province of Quebec. The extraordinary thing to most of us here and to most of the people of the country is why this massive drive, this apparently massive effort against the terrorists seems so far to have produced so little in the way of results. I think Canadians are seriously disturbed about this.

I think we still need to know why Rose was not arrested when he was under surveillance before the Laporte murder. The Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith) says there was not enough evidence to arrest him, and I have to accept his word for that. But why was no reward offered until nearly a month after the kidnapping of Mr. Cross and nearly two weeks after the invocation of the

War Measures Act? Again, the Solicitor General says there was good reason for not doing so. All I can say is that there had better be good reason. At the proper time the people of this country are due for a full accounting in this regard.

The bill we are now considering is not based upon an apprehended insurrection, though I dare say the government would be quite happy if everybody forgot about the apprehended insurrection. The bill is based upon the recognition that the FLQ is the kind of organization that the Minister of Justice described—and I will not take the time of the House to go over that. Some may say that the special procedures referred to by the Minister of Justice and as set forth in this bill, special procedures that are much more restrictive than those in the regulations, are not necessary and will not be effective. At the moment we do not know whether this kind of measure is effective; we have to take a certain amount on faith. Certainly we have no evidence at all that terrorism in the province of Quebec is under control, even for the moment.

Some may say that the measures adopted in the bill will not stamp out terrorism in Quebec, and I very much agree with that. However, I hope they will help to catch the people involved in these atrocities and will help catch others who are actively engaged in FLQ activities. But these provisions will constitute no remedy for terrorism, no assurance that terrorism will not continue after the bill expires on April 30 next, or earlier if the government terminates the measure earlier. I believe that is a correct statement, and as I understand it, so do the people in the province of Quebec to whom I have talked. To say that the present threat of terror in Quebec justifies measures of the sort contained in the bill, provided that they are subject to adequate review, I think is only to state the obvious. These measures are required.

• (4:10 p.m.)

I believe the powers in the initial regulations were excessive, but I say there is sufficient insecurity in Quebec today to justify something along the lines of what is proposed in this bill moved for second reading by the Minister of Justice. However, I repeat again that the bill will not, and cannot, be expected to root out further terrorism in that province. Something like the present bill is necessary because the situation was allowed to get out of hand, but certainly something more is required for a solution in the longer term—perhaps better detection, perhaps better police work, perhaps a redefinition of crimes such as sedition.

Certainly, measures are necessary which are designed to remove serious social conditions and serious causes of dissatisfaction. One way in which the government could show the good faith the Minister of Justice was talking about earlier is by trying to do something real about the unemployment anticipated in Quebec this year, which may run as high as 15 per cent. This is the way the government can show it means some of the thoughts it has been expressing through the mouth of the Minister of Justice.

The point to emphasize today is that we cannot expect measures like those in this bill to be anything more than a temporary method to deal with terrorism, the threat of which is very likely to continue. When we deal with and consider this bill we cannot feel for a moment that we are solving the problem of terrorism in Quebec. We must consider what is necessary to ensure a reasonable degree of law and order in the province of Quebec in the future. Anything the government has done under the War Measures Act, or anything that may be done under this bill when it is enacted into law, will not guarantee that there will be no threat of terrorism in the future. If we are not careful, indeed we may increase that threat.

I do not support this bill because I believe it will root out all actual or incipient terrorists. I support it in principle because terrorism in Quebec is surely out of control, and to preserve the balance of security and democracy to which the Minister of Justice referred. This certainly requires a measure of this sort with some safeguards. The people of Quebec surely deserve this emphasis upon security, perhaps especially because those in authority seem to have been hardly competent in coping with terrorists to date. But a bill of this nature is not a permanent solution; it will not root out terrorists. I say that this government, this Parliament and the government of Quebec have to face that fact. There is no simple solution, but there is an old-fashioned virtue that might be helpful and the absence of which will do a lot of harm: I refer to the virtue of frankness and good faith.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: I say this because it is important and it is necessary in avoiding the sort of disillusionment that can lead to radicalism and slippage into terrorism. We have not had that degree of frankness and openness from the government. The government resorted to the War Measures Act. I am quite prepared to accept the fact that the great majority of the people in Quebec do not question the rectitude of the government in invoking the War Measures Act and do not question that there was an apprehended insurrection. They do not care whether there was an apprehended insurrection; I am quite prepared to believe their main emotion was relief that the government acted. I fully accept that.

On the other hand, I say that many people, especially the young who tend to question the good faith of governments in any event, will ask questions. The claim of apprehended insurrection was a striking and dramatic move that evoked a fervour of approval in Quebec and throughout the country. But I suggest there are a great many young men and women in Canada, perhaps in Quebec especially, who question the establishment, especially after the sort of thing the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion did just before the election in Montreal. These young men and women will ask whether there was an apprehended insurrection or whether the establishment has once again put something over on them.

Mr. Speaker, I dare say the Prime Minister is quite entitled to believe that most Canadians accept his explanation. But that is not the main point for consideration when we are discussing this bill. This is a bill designed to deal with terrorism, and when we are talking about terrorism we are interested in trying to increase security within the rule of law. I say that the Prime Minister and the government therefore cannot be content today with the number of those who are content.

I say the government must remove the confusion and produce the evidence to clearly justify the finding it made, a finding not of terrorism, not of kidnapping, not of murder or intense insecurity but of apprehended insurrection. The government must produce that evidence. It has an obligation to the country, in the fight against terrorism, to make an honest effort to convince those who doubt, especially the young, that the government really did act with good faith and did not invent something. The government has this obligation particularly to those who might well become disillusioned and embittered toward the democratic process. Many of them readily become convinced that the establishment has perpetrated some sort of fraud, particularly, I say again, after the unfortunate intervention of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

Unless there is frankness and such an attempt to convince, the government may well increase the fertility of our soil for future terroristic activity for more than this bill will reduce the likelihood of future terroristic activity. So, I support this bill on second reading. I am pleased the government has introduced the bill, but I suggest the government will not have discharged its full responsibility to Quebec and to Canada until it not only asks the people to have confidence in it but takes the people fully into its confidence.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question?

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. Is the right hon. Prime Minister rising to ask a question?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Yes, Mr. Speaker, if I may.

• (4:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

I would ask the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) if he would answer a question that I wanted to ask him, but did not want to interrupt his speech. He stated that he would support this bill—I believe I am quoting him—because terrorism in Quebec is sufficiently out of hand to require extraordinary measures. I ask the Leader of the Opposition if, in his opinion, it was sufficiently out of hand on October 15 or thereabouts to require extraordinary measures. If his answer is in the affirmative, could he tell us what extraordinary measures he means, and how would they have been brought about if he had the choice?

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I think there clearly was evidence involved in the kidnapping of Mr. Cross and Mr. Laporte of a need for extraordinary measures even before that. I am not aware of what intelligence the Prime Minister had prior to that time.

Mr. Trudeau: Let us assume I had none.

Mr. Stanfield: I think there is pretty good reason to believe that the government should have taken some extraordinary measures, perhaps something of the sort introduced here today, in anticipation. I do not know what information the Prime Minister or his associates had.

Mr. Trudeau: I am sorry the Leader of the Opposition did not understand my question. He said that today he will support this bill because today terrorism in Quebec is sufficiently out of hand. He is not doing so on the basis of rumours or of anything the government may have said; he is doing it today on the basis of his knowledge of the situation. I am asking him, on the basis of his knowledge of the situation—nothing the government might have said or believed, secretly or otherwise, on the basis of rumours, but on the basis of his information on October 15—does he think terrorism in Quebec is sufficiently out of hand to justify the introduction of this type of measure?

Mr. Stanfield: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I certainly would.

Mr. Woolliams: He said that in his speech.

Mr. MacInnis: It is not that the Prime Minister cannot answer the questions, but that he cannot ask them.

An hon. Member: He should have done it two years ago.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, the legislation now before us, to place on the statute books the Public Order (Temporary Measures) Act, 1970, represents another chapter in a series of events that began with the kidnapping of the British diplomat James Cross on October 5, followed later by the kidnapping and obscene murder of labour minister Pierre Laporte.

At that time the members of the New Democratic Party in the House recognized the government's predicament. We gave it our support in refusing to accede to attempted blackmail by the FLQ, and we concurred in the federal government's decision to give to the provincial authorities all the help necessary to apprehend the guilty and to bring them to justice. Our quarrel with the government was when, in our opinion, they overreacted, panicked and invoked the War Measures Act and enacted public order regulations for which the government asked the approval of the House on October 16.

In his opening speech today the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) appealed to the House to forget past events and to deal with this measure, and then he spent three-quarters of his time defending the government's decision to invoke the War Measures Act and attacking those of us who had dared to vote against the government's motion presented to the House on October 16. I have no hesitation in saying that those of us who voted against that motion did so for two reasons: first, because we have not been given any evidence that there was a state of apprehended insurrection in this country and, second, because we could not approve the regulations enacted under the War Measures Act because they deprive Canadian citizens so extensively of basic civil liberties.

Let me deal briefly with those two questions. I said that we voted against the motion because we had no evidence that a state of apprehended insurrection obtained in this country. I want to say that now, more than two weeks since the war Measures Act was invoked, the government has not produced one shred of evidence, either publicly or privately, which would lead me to the conclusion that a state of apprehended insurrection existed in Canada on October 16. This is the kind of situation in which one cannot be dogmatic. It may be that when the government some day produces information which we do not now have, they may prove to be right; but as a Member of Parliament standing in my place I have no right to restrict the liberties of 21 million Canadians without adequate proof that a state of apprehended insurrection exists in this country.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): The Minister of Justice says that we have not managed to convince anybody. I tell my friends on the government side that they have not been able to convince their party. I wonder if they have read the statements of Professor Pauline Jewett, a former Liberal member of this House. I wonder if they have read the statements of Hon. Judy LaMarsh, a former member of the Liberal cabinet.

An hon. Member: Who is she?

An hon. Member: Rumours, rumours!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I wonder if they have read the statements of the Canadian Civil Liberties Union which has stood for years in this country as defenders of civil liberties. I wonder if hon. gentlemen opposite even take the trouble to read the daily press—

An hon. Member: We even listen to you.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): —and particularly to read the press which normally supports the Liberal Party. I wonder if they read the Toronto *Daily Star,* the Ottawa *Citizen* and the other papers across this country which normally support the Liberal Party but which have been extremely critical of two things: first, the government's refusal to give any information to the people of Canada which would substantiate their conclusion that there was a state of apprehended insurrection and, second, the severity of the regulations which they passed under the War Measures Act.

When the government introduced this motion asking the House to approve the invocation of the War Measures Act, the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) hinted darkly that the government possessed information which they could not give us at the time but which, when disclosed, would justify their action. Later, on October 21, I asked the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) if we could have some of this information either publicly or, if it could not be given publicly at the moment, privately. The Prime Minister said the country has all the information there is. This, of course, seemed to contradict the statements of the Minister of Justice, and being an obedient servant the Minister of Justice told the House today that the country has all the information, that the House knows that there were kidnappings and a foul murder and that there was an anticipation of civil disorder. But that is not what the minister said to the House on October 16.

An hon. Member: You are a real doubting Thomas.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): What he said appears at page 215 of *Hansard.* The Minister of Justice said:

> It is my hope that some day the full details of the intelligence upon which the government acted can be made public, because until that day comes the people of Canada will not be able fully to appraise the course of action which has been taken by the government.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Where is this information which is some day going to be made known and which will fully justify and vindicate the government's action?

An hon. Member: Stanbury has it.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): We certainly do not have it. The people of Canada do not have it. All that the minister tells the House now is only, of course, what is common knowledge. There were these tragic kidnappings, and murders.

An hon. Member: And bombings.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): And some bombings, not only going on for the last few weeks but for the last few months. All of these were situations that could have been dealt with under the Criminal Code of Canada. If the government required more extensive powers under the Criminal Code, it could have come to this Parliament, which is the proper place to come, for the necessary powers to deal with the situation which it felt it could not deal with under the existing criminal law of Canada. The minister is only coming to do now what he should have done weeks ago or months ago, if

the situation is such as he has described to the House today.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Government members are still struggling vainly to find some answers for the press who almost daily have been asking the government, "Where is the evidence of this apprehended insurrection?" The Minister of Regional Economic Expansion tried to help out. He went on a Vancouver radio program. He had told the House that there were between 1,000 and 3,000 supporters of the FLQ who had worked their way into vital posts in Quebec, and that the FLQ possesses thousands of machine guns, rifles and bombs. Yet, Mr. Speaker, after nearly three weeks and having all the powers under the War Measures Act, so far as we know they have not found any cache of arms. They have arrested only 424 persons, of whom 359 have been released.

If the government knew there were these thousands of guns, bombs and machine guns, if they knew there were 1,000 to 3,000 FLQ people in high posts, they must have known who they were and where they were. But what has happened? Was the minister simply drawing on his imagination? Are the forces of law enforcement in this country so incompetent that they have not been able to apprehend any of the people referred to by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion?

Then the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion went one further. In order to explain this unusual procedure of invoking the War Measures Act for the first time in Canada's history in peacetime, he said this was done to prevent bloodshed on the eve of the Montreal municipal elections, and he linked the FRAP municipal political organization with the FLQ. Not to be outdone, the mayor of Montreal next day described FRAP as being a haven for terrorists, criminals and revolutionaries. Mr. Speaker, this is Canadian McCarthyism. This is guilt by association. All Canadians abhor the things which have been done by the FLQ, and so a minister of the Crown and the mayor of Canada's largest city immediately smear some political opponents by linking them in the public mind with the FLQ.

Mr. Pepin: Some of them linked themselves.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): This is the worst kind of McCarthyism. The Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) had another alibi. He said that the reason for invoking the War Measures Act was that there were several stages to revolutions in other countries and that in Canada the final stage of a planned revolutionary timetable was about to begin. Revolution was about to break out in this country; the fourth and final stage was at hand. I ask, where are these revolutionaries? The combined police forces of Canada, of the province of Quebec and of the city of Montreal have been at work now for almost three weeks. Where are these revolutionaries? The Minister of Justice tells us today that out of 424 people who have been detained, 65 are still being held. If these 65 can start the revolution, they must be supermen or the government is trying to mislead the House and the people of this country.

Then, of course, in desperation the government found the final explanation for their unprecedented action, a plot for a *coup d'état* in Quebec. They said there was a plot to set up a provisional government in the province of Quebec. When I asked the Prime Minister about this, he said these were rumours started by the opposition and the press. But, Mr. Speaker, members of the press on television the night before last said they were told these stories by people very high up in the government. I asked if we could have an investigation to see who was telling the truth, but the Prime Minister did not seem to take kindly to that suggestion.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) has already quoted from the speech made in Toronto by the hon. member for St. Paul's (Mr. Wahn), a supporter of the government. He is not in the opposition; he is not in the press gallery. I will not quote all of it because the Leader of the Opposition already quoted it, but I quote the last paragraph of what the hon. member said:

> As we now know, there was some evidence of a parallel government waiting in the wings, including members of elite groups such as the Estates-General.

Surely the government has a responsibility to produce such evidence. There is a hint of treason here. If the government knows those in Quebec who were planning unconstitutionally and illegitimately to take over the government of Quebec, it has a duty and a responsibility to apprehend them, bring them before the courts and charge them with treason. But if the discussions were about the possibility of forming a coalition government to meet a crisis, surely this is within the purview of the members of the National Assembly of Quebec. Are we to take it that the federal government invoked the War Measures Act in order to make sure that only a Liberal government continued to rule in the province of Quebec? If so, that represents a major intervention in the political affairs of a province.

Mr. Pepin: You will be quoted on that.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): We have been trying for nearly three weeks to get the government to give us some evidence of the apprehended insurrection. We shall continue to try to get that evidence. I think the fact that the government has dropped any reference to a state of apprehended insurrection in this legislation is proof positive that it is not prepared to substantiate its contention of October 16.

• (4:40 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I think they have found that the Canadian people cannot be fooled about this.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): They have found that the newspapers cannot be fooled.

An hon. Member: You have been trying to do that for 30 years.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): This government should either put up or shut up. On the question of apprehended insurrection the government apparently has decided to shut up. I suggest that the government has failed to demonstrate that kidnappers and terrorists could not be dealt with under the wide powers now contained in the Criminal Code. Perhaps the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion can explain why the government did not consider the criminal law adequate. On the program to which I referred a few moments ago he said:

> It is not the individual action we are worried about now. It's this vast organization supported by bona fide organizations who are supporting, indirectly at least, the FLQ.

That is a serious statement, Mr. Speaker, and one which gives rise to many questions. Has the War Measures Act been used to settle political scores and to intimidate groups like the CNTU and the Quebec Federation of Labour? I think it is significant that to date most of those detained seem to be members of either FRAP or the Parti Quebeçois. Although I disagree with the separatists, it is not a crime to be one as long as they do not seek to use violence and unconstitutional means to advance their objectives.

The fact that the government felt it necessary to invoke the War Measures Act rather than come to Parliament and ask for any additional powers needed under the Criminal Code leads one to feel, from the statement made by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, that the motive is a much more serious one than we had appreciated on October 16. The second reason for our opposing the motion on October 16, Mr. Speaker, was that we considered the regulations enacted under the War Measures Act deprived Canadians of some of their most cherished, basic human rights. This afternoon the Minister of Justice said I had spoken frequently about the potential of the War Measures Act. Wherever I have discussed this matter I have spoken exclusively of the regulations which the government had passed under that act. In my opinion they are horrendous regulations, taking wide and sweeping powers.

As the persons who have been released get an opportunity to tell their story, I think it will become increasingly apparent that this wide net which the government spread under its regulations gathered in a great many more innoncent people than guilty people. We in the New Democratic Party recognize the need for prompt and energetic steps to stamp out terrorism, but we have insisted from the beginning that in the process of stamping out terrorism we must not abridge the freedoms that our people and our forefathers have won for us over the years.

One of the things that concerned us when the government brought in these regulations was the fact that while the government drafted them, the administration of them would be in the hands of the provincial Attorneys General and local police officers. What has been the result? The result is that day after day the Minister of Justice stated in answer to questions that this matter is under the jurisdiction of the Attorney General of the province of Quebec. When we asked whether the detainees were being held incommunicado, whether their families will be notified, whether they will be given the right of counsel, he said that he would be glad to take up this matter with the Attorney General of the province of Quebec.

I say to the Minister of Justice, through you, Mr. Speaker, "You cannot wash your hands of this responsibility. You drafted these regulations and you must accept responsibility if they were so all-embracing that they allowed those administering them to violate basic freedoms of the Canadian people."

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): We need to know, and we are going to find out, how many persons were wrongfully arrested and detained. Will there be any compensation for those who have lost time from their employment? How many have lost their jobs as a result of being arrested? How many were held for days and then questioned for only a few minutes? How many were held incommunicado throughout the entire period of their detention?

The minister told us today that none of the 65 still detained have been charged. When we asked how many will be charged, the minister said he did not know because any charges will be laid by the Attorney General of the province of Quebec. This government has nothing to do with that. That is why it is such a serious matter for a government to pass regulations of a sweeping restrictive nature such as those now in effect, when the administration is in the hands of those over whom the government has absolutely no control. That is why the New Democratic Party opposed the sweeping powers contained in these regulations.

An hon. Member: Some of them opposed.

An hon. Member: Not all of them.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I say to my friends in the backbench of the Liberal party that they may not understand but our members are allowed to vote according to conscience.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): We do not have a regiment of trained seals who just get up when the Prime Minister does. This is something that my friends across the way may find difficult to understand.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: Quiet, seals.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): We recognize the need for the government to deal with this

serious crisis but, as I have already said, we believe it could have been handled under the Criminal Code. We believe that Parliament would readily have extended the powers of the Criminal Code to deal with the emergency. When the government failed to do so, we pleaded with them to bring down specific legislation and, as members know, on October 17 the Prime Minister wrote to party leaders with two suggestions: first, that the government was considering a new statute that could be used in the future if civil disturbances or an apprehended insurrection were in prospect and, second, proposed legislation which would deal with the present specific situation arising out of the terrorist activities of the FLQ.

I agree with the Prime Minister's decision that the proposal of permanent legislation ought to be left until the excitement has abated so that such legislation may go to the Justice and Legal Affairs Committee. At that stage, all kinds of organizations should have an opportunity to present their views. When that legislation is put on the statute books of Canada it will be permanent legislation which can be invoked at any time, so it ought to be carefully considered.

On October 22, in reference to this bill I had delivered to the Prime Minister's office a letter setting forth our views on what we thought ought to be contained in permanent legislation. It also set forth our idea of the protection of civil liberties that ought to be incorporated in any emergency legislation to deal with the present situation.

• (4:50 p.m.)

In view of statements that have been made by the Minister of Justice on television and elsewhere, that there have been consultations with authorities across Canada and with parties in the House, I want to make it clear that the only consultation that has taken place—if it can be called a consultation—is the letter which I sent to the Prime Minister's office. We have not been consulted with respect to the legislation that is now before us. I am not saying that we should have been; I am simply making it clear that we were not consulted, to prevent any misunderstandings which might arise out of the statements made by the Minister of Justice.

I now wish to say something about the Public Order (Temporary Measures) Act, 1970. It represents a very considerable improvement over the War Measures Act regulations. In the first place, it is much more precise; it limits the powers contained in the legislation to the FLQ, to any successor of the FLQ or to any organization which advocates or promotes the means adopted by the FLQ. It is an improvement in that it reduces the length of detention before a charge can be laid from 21 days to seven days.

I think the greatest improvement, however, is that it brings within the ambit of the legislation section 2 (a) to 2(g) the Bill of Rights, with two minor provisos. This means that it guarantees the right to counsel, that it guarantees a fair hearing and that evidence secured by coercion in the period during which a person is detained cannot be used as evidence against him. It preserves the right of habeas corpus. All this is important. But what I wish to say to the minister is that the improvements which he is introducing now could have been in the regulations which were enacted under the War Measures Act on October 16. The fact that he has had to change these regulations when bringing down this bill is proof positive that we were right when we said the regulations under the War Measures Act were too sweeping, too restrictive and abridged too many of the basic freedoms of the Canadian people.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the hon. member is aware that as the regulations were and are drawn, the Canadian Bill of Rights is not excluded, except in the way I mentioned, and that this bill merely clarifies that situation. It is quite clear that the right to counsel and other rights were always maintained. I have said this in the House.

Mr. Orlikow: Tell that to the people who are in jail.

Mr. Woolliams: Then the law was broken.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): If those rights were retained, the minister ought to tell that to the Attorney General of Quebec, who said at a press conference that persons to be detained were to be held incommunicado. Surely, that was a violation of the Bill of Rights.

Mr. Fairweather: Why were injunctions needed when some persons wanted counsel?

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): If the minister is correct and the Bill of Rights was in force even under the War Measures Act, the Attorney General could not have held people beyond 24 hours. Nevertheless, he has been holding them for about 21 days. Surely, the minister is not now telling us that the Bill of Rights continued to be operative despite the regulations under the War Measures Act? Certainly, if he does tell us that, he took no steps at all to make sure the provisions of the Bill of Rights were fully recognized and lived up to.

Mr. Woolliams: Don't blame the Attorney General of Quebec.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): We approve the changes which the government has effected, Mr. Speaker. We say this bill is an improvement over the War Measures Act regulations. Yet the bill is still an arbitrary and repressive measure and we view it with some misgivings. It still allows for 90 days of detention before the trial date has to be set. Bail can be denied if the Attorney General of the province decides to intervene.

Mr. Woolliams: Not for Hal Banks.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): One of the worst features of the bill is the retroactive provision that makes a person liable for punishment by reason of his membership in an unlawful organization even when that organization was not unlawful. This means that a young man who five years ago attended meetings of the FLQ but who has had no association with them since can, under clause 8, be arrested—and the onus would be on him to prove that he was not a member of the FLQ. He may be liable for five years imprisonment.

This retroactive feature I submit, Mr. Speaker, is in complete contravention of the declaration of human rights passed by the United Nations, a declaration to which Canada is a signatory. In article 11 of that Declaration of Human Rights, clause 2 says that no one shall be held guilty of any penal offence on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a penal offence under national or international law at the time when it was committed. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, in view of the editorial comments which have been made in newspapers right across Canada, that the minister would be well advised to re-examine this retroactive feature in the legislation. I can assure the minister that if he does not, we in this party will bring in amendments to give the House an opportunity to express itself on that question.

The legislation still retains the reverse onus which requires a person to prove, under certain circumstances, that he was not a member of an organization. That is in violation of the customary legal provision that everyone is considered innocent until proven guilty. This legislation—let us face it—provides for detention without charge, custody without bail and search without warrant. These are serious abridgements of civil liberties. We have asked repeatedly in this party, as have other members, that there be some provision for a commission of non-governmental people who would have the right to see those detained, make sure that their rights were being safeguarded, that they were obtaining the services of legal counsel and that they were not being ill treated or subject to coercion or duress.

I think we have to question whether such restrictive legislation is required in a situation which the government itself contends no longer constitutes an insurrection. I think Parliament should grant the police the powers necessary to apprehend terrorists and kidnappers, but I do not think the government has shown us that it needs powers as wide and as repressive as those which are contained in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize the need for legislation to deal with the situation arising out of the terrorist activities of the FLQ. We are prepared to vote for second reading of this bill, for three reasons. First, it is the only way to revoke the War Measures Act. After all, we are not faced with the choice of this legislation or no legislation; we are faced with the choice of this legislation or continuing under the War Measures Act and the regulations enacted thereunder.

Second, although this legislation still contains some features to which we object strongly, it certainly is an improvement over the regulations under which we now operate. Third, we are prepared to vote in favour of this bill on second reading so that it can be dealt with in Committee of the Whole. We hope at that time the government will be prepared to accept amendments that will modify some of the more arbitrary and restrictive provisions of the bill.

• (5:00 p.m.)

I appeal to the Minister of Justice not to take an adamant position. Bearing in mind the comments that have been made by reputable writers across Canada, the law faculty of Osgoode Hall and by civil liberties organizations, I hope the minister will be prepared in Committee of the Whole to at least look sympathetically at any amendments which may be presented. In our opinion this measure should be of short duration. It will not do anything to resolve the basic problem which is posed by the existence of the FLQ. The sooner this kind of legislation is revoked, the better for Canada and for relations between the people of Quebec and the rest of Canada. Canadians have an uncomfortable feeling that these powers have been abused.

The Prime Minister said "repressive measures can be a dangerous trap". I fear that the government has fallen into that trap by lumping the FLQ, FRAP and separatists in the public mind. These groups may well have been lumped together in their own minds. How many young separatists who believed that separatism could be brought about peaceably now agree with the FLQ? How many members of FRAP who sought the Prime Minister's invitation to indulge in participatory democracy in Montreal are now disillusioned and convinced that the democratic process will not be allowed to operate? I think that the late Maurice Duplessis, the father of the padlock law, would laugh if he could see his former critic producing the legislation which is now before this House.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent that the hon. member be permitted to conclude his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): I thank the House for its indulgence. I will take just another few minutes. I believe that extra powers are necessary to ensure public security, but neither police nor troops are the final answer. Terrorist groups like the FLQ cannot flourish in societies where social justice and economic equity hold sway. Revolutionaries flourish where unemployment, social discontent and poverty degrade human life to the point of desperation.

There is an old saying: You can do anything with a bayonet but sit on it. The answer to the problem of the FLQ lies in prompt and effective measures to remove the frustration and sense of hopelessness that holds the alienated and disadvantaged in their grip. The test this winter will be what the government does about unem-

ployment. If the government sits on its complacent assumption that all is well, then I believe that more police and more stringent laws will do little to prevent the spread of revolutionary movements.

This bill is designed to safeguard public order, but public order cannot be protected by force alone. The nation most secure is the one whose citizens are enabled to live useful and meaningful lives and to enjoy the benefits of their collective endeavours.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): This government and Parliament have the responsibility to deal with the causes of social discontent. The government must not content itself merely by passing repressive measures to restrain those who resort to unlawful means to express their frustration. To date there has been no indication that this government is going to remove the causes of social malaise which are prevalent in the country. Unless it does, we shall have more crises than we now have. They will become prevalent, not just in Quebec but in other parts of Canada.

• (5:10 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great attention to the explanations of the hon. minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) regarding Bill C-181 which gives the government temporary emergency powers for maintaining public order in Canada.

I have also listened carefully to the comments of the hon. leader of the official opposition (Mr. Stanfield) as well as to those of the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Douglas). The three hon. members, without exception spoke about the need to protect order in Canada, to prevent a repetition of actions such as those we have been witnessing for three weeks. The three of them concluded their speech in the same way.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) spoke for 46 minutes and 30 seconds, of the merits of the legislation and for 1 minute and 30 seconds, towards the end of his speech, he told us about the need for economic and social reforms so as to prevent a repetition of what is happening now. The Leader of the Official Opposition said the same thing as well as the leader of the New Democratic Party.

Therefore, let us begin at the beginning. Let us establish the necessary economic and social reforms and then let us pass laws to protect public order. When there is no security and no liberty within the social order, the political order or the economic order, how can we protect the public welfare and order?

And, Mr. Speaker, I do not agree at all with the point of view of the NDP's leader, who just said: It is because there are poor people that we have to face the present situation. Let us look at the ones we are looking for today: Is Paul Rose a poor man? No, he is a professor who taught in Montreal and in Hull, a well-educated man rebelling against any established order.

Whether the country is governed by a Créditiste government, a tory government, an NDP government or the present Liberal government, there will aways be unruly people like Rose, Chartrand, Vallières, Gagnon, Lemieux and company. We must protect ourselves from such people. They are not destitute people, Mr. Speaker, but scoundrels, which is different. Only this does not prevent us from realizing that social ills exist.

A while ago, I saw government members from Quebec applauding the minister. It is all very well to applaud a statement to the effect that we need social and economic reforms, but they should also be implemented. For thirty years now, I have been clamouring high and low in the province of Quebec: The present system will be reformed by people of order, or else it will be destroyed by the others.

When I said that, 30 years ago, I was laughed at. To some I even sounded revolutionary. But today the revolution is with us. The ministers must be accompanied by soldiers to move about in Canada and in Quebec. Even the leader of the Ralliement créditiste has soldiers at his door, and that, in the province of Quebec!

Mr. Speaker, that is fine, but let the reforms be introduced! What reforms are needed in the province of Quebec where there are over 200,000 unemployed and over 100,000 families on social welfare, living off allowances of $125, $130, $140, or $150 a month? This year, some 300,000 students asked permission to earn a living, in their own country, but they could not find jobs. Employment was found for 300,000 of them but not for the 300,000 others; if those young people cannot find a place in Canadian society, what will they do? They will revolt. They will hitch-hike, drop in at the "Maison du Pêcheur" in Gaspé where they will meet Mr. Paul Rose, Mr. Vallières or Mr. Gagnon who will tell them: Get your bombs ready, get this or that ready, and go ahead.

Mr. Speaker, we deeply regret the kidnapping of Mr. Cross and the vicious murder of Pierre Laporte. However, I will say one thing: if last year, the government had acted when Mr. Lucien Saulnier disclosed to them not rumors, but facts which were taking place in Quebec, Mr. Laporte would still be alive today.

But no, they waited. They waited until there had been six deaths, bombs, assassinations. Indeed, until there had been violent demonstrations and, finally, they said: This time, the government of the province has asked us to act. One year ago, the federal government could have suggested to the province of Quebec and the city of Montreal to ask for assistance. In fact, the Montreal municipal authorities got help from the armed forces at the time of the policemen's strike.

You cannot forever refuse to assume your responsibilities. It has been a month since all the police forces of Canada have been put into action, and nothing has yet been found. They do not know who kidnapped Mr. Cross or who murdered Mr. Laporte. What is happening?

A *Toronto Star* newspaperman found Gerda Munsinger in Austria when all the police forces of Canada could not find her. That newspaperman had met Mrs. Munsinger. Would it not be a good idea to use that newspaperman to find those who have kidnapped Mr. Cross and who have murdered Pierre Laporte? The same newspaperman spent an evening on Hal Banks' boat in New York, but we could not find him when he was here. Indeed, we have a well organized judicial system! Not much is being found, and some say that to improve society, we must dry up the sources from which dissatisfaction springs.

Mr. Speaker, I voted wholeheartedly for the application of the War Measures Act. I do not regret it, for if I had to do it over again, I would do exactly the same thing. When the Prime Minister asked us leave to introduce his motion to revive the War Measures Act, I agreed 100 per cent and I do not withdraw my agreement. However, following some research, I think that we could well have had recourse to the Criminal Code.

Section 4 of the bill now before the House reads as follows:

A person who

(a) *is or professes* to be a member of the unlawful association—

is guilty of an indictable offence—

Mr. Speaker, there are five or six paragraphs in that respect.

No provision refers to vicious murders such as that committed against the person of Pierre Laporte. Which punishment shall we impose to the offenders: life imprisonment or 20 years? Bill C-181 does not mention it. I believe that we should impose capital punishment in such circumstances.

We do support the bill, although we do not agree with all its provisions. This does not mean that we are proud of this government, since it waited until two political personalities had been kidnapped and held by revolutionary elements before doing something. Also it was very slow to act.

Mr. Pierre Laporte, Quebec Labour Minister and House Leader in the Bourassa government, has been viciously murdered by FLQ revolutionaries. Revolution in Quebec did not start yesterday. The revolutionaries have been known to the police forces for several years. They have proof of the existence of revolutionary movements since at least 1963.

It was the time of Pierre Bourgault and company and the time of the RIN. Violence also existed. When we talk of revolutionaries and revolution, we are not starting on a witch hunt as maintained by some people. This is no McCarthyism as said this afternoon by the NDP leader an expression which originated in the United States and which is abundantly used here by NDP members.

• (5:20 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, I heard those people say that the War Measures Act deprived us completely of our liberties. I do not think any member, not even of the New Democratic Party, has been arrested, questioned or has felt his rights or liberties have been denied since the implementation of the measures.

Although Montreal has been held up as an example because of the last municipal election, I say that it is the first time in years that the people have felt secure enough to go and vote for the candidate of their choice.

Was any FRAP supporter molested or prevented from voting? They all went. However, Montrealers said no to the FLQ, to those of their kind, to those whom they have reason to doubt. That is what the people of Montreal did. Those in favour of FRAP, voted for it. If not any more voted for FRAP, it is because they did not hit it off. It is as simple as that. Fifty-two per cent of the people voted, more than ever before in the past 30 years. People felt secure. Not one voter was molested by any soldier, member of the RCMP or the provincial police. No telegraph. Usually, in peace time, when people enjoy freedom, baseball bats are used to keep voters away.

Nobody mentions that. No. They talk about the security of the people to vote. They claim it is a denial of individual freedom. How sensible! It is enlightening sometimes to hear people argue! They sound like an empty drum. And then, they wonder: How is it that people don't understand? It's simple.

In Montreal people who understood have shown it. They had the courage to stand up and get going. I do not very much appreciate the attitude of the 48 per cent who stayed home quietly and who will then say: Well, democracy is going to the devil. Of these 48 per cent some could not go to the poll, they had valid reasons for abstaining, but there are also cowards and others easily frightened who sit in their easy chairs at home because they do not have the courage to express their opinions. But 52 per cent of the voters—which was nevertheless a 30-year record in the history of Montreal—exercised their voting right giving a pat answer to agitators.

The revolutionaries have been publishing manuals since 1963, they publicly incite people to revolt and distribute literature expounding their revolutionary strategy. Everybody knows that.

During the last provincial election, I read a newspaper published by the students of the Limoilou CEGEP, in which they blamed the students of the Sainte-Foy CEGEP for not following in their footsteps. They did not mince their words.

Under the present legislation, those people could be arrested, because there was nothing to prevent it. Besides, the Prime Minister himself admitted it the other day, when he said that two phases of the FLQ revolution had been carried out and that some action was now needed to prevent the third phase, the one now in progress, from turning out to the advantage of the revolutionaries.

The first phase was aimed at stirring up social agitation. Social agitators first attempted to capitalize on the

distress of the unemployed. It is always in the name of the workers, the poor and the destitute that such people operate. They always emphasize the labour power. It does exist throughout the world. In Cuba, it is in the name of the labour power that Castro made the revolution. Just go and see if the worker lives much better down there.

I went to Russia, where six million workers live in fear of the police. So much for the labour power! It is applied and controlled by those who stir up the workers, and then they are shamelessly exploited.

In Moscow, which has six million inhabitants, there are not as many cars as in Rouyn-Noranda. It is true, however, that there are no finance companies in Moscow. But the people in Moscow do a lot of walking, believe me. I saw it for myself.

Mr. Speaker, there are people who would want to enforce that system in Canada, people like Michel Chartrand, Marcel Pepin and Laberge. The other day, I heard Messrs. Pepin, Laberge, Charbonneau and Claude Ryan—the wax figure from *Le Devoir*—speak against violence and say they are afraid of violence.

During 1970 there has been a strike in the building industry in the province of Quebec. At a certain time, Montreal bandits were paid to come in my area, Rouyn-Noranda, Val-d'Or, Malartic, to cause trouble among workers, ordering them to stop working on the construction site or else they would be murdered! They were people from the CNTU and the QFL: Laberge and Pepin! Have you heard them speak against violence? That is why I said in Quebec and I repeat in the House that Pepin, Laberge and Charbonneau are hypocrites, people who take advantage of the workers in Quebec and in Canada.

Socialists, Communists, whatever they are, they lie to the workers. They are the ones who at a certain time met with Mr. Ryan to see whether it would not be the right time to set up a provisional government. They can't get themselves elected through a democratic poll, so they hold little *in camera* meetings where they say: "Should Mr. Bourassa not be able to hold out, don't you think it would be well for us to form a government. René Lévesque, just like the others, hurriedly disavowed the FLQ as soon as things got out of hand in the province. There's one thing for sure: on April 29 last, all the FLQ members in Quebec voted for René Lévesque's party and worked for it.

Mr. Speaker, we know those social agitators. They were the "animators" of the Company of Young Canadians. Those fanatics even came into my region, and not only in one area. What did they sow? Hatred! Well paid by Ottawa—we were footing the bills—they sponsored telecasts at Rouyn-Noranda entitled "*Le bloc*". It will blocks, because they are there yet. I believe they still get money from the federal government, not in the name of the Company of Young Canadians but under some such scheme. Again this year taxpayers are forced to give two million dollars to subsidize programs such as that where people try to arouse workers against the more affluent, the "bourgeoisie" as they are called. Even people from the New Democratic Party call that bourgeoisie. A small

shopkeeper at the corner of the street can make from $10,000 to $12,000 a year. One says: "This is a little bourgeois; let us crush him!" But if the member for York South (Mr. Lewis) earns $75,000 a year, that is fair enough, he is not a bourgeois. But the small wage earner who gets $10,000 or $12,000 a year is a bourgeois who must be crushed.

Others earn more than $10,000 or $12,000 a year within the New Democratic Party. People rise against the petits bourgeois, against the capitalists, saying they must all be downgraded so that poverty can be everywhere and the poor be given power to administer poverty in the country.

Mr. Speaker, the despair of young people unable to find adequate employment today is a ground for their upsurge, as everybody acknowledges it. They become members of organizations that will take extreme ways to change the present system.

• (5:30 p.m.)

This first stage, which began in 1963 with the explosion of FLQ bombs, continued with bloody manifestations organized by the Front de libération du Québec, by the Front d'action populaire and by the Mouvement pour l'intégration scolaire, headed by Mr. Lemieux, in Montreal. These groups specialized in propaganda, agitation, the ideological indoctrination of militants, and the creation of cells, citizens' committees, workers' committees, committees against the war in Viet Nam, committees for strike action, and underground and armed FLQ cells.

The government could not help knowing about what was going on. The Canadian government can not pretend it was not aware of this situation. During the famous Montreal police strike, the newspaper *Le Devoir* of October 14, under the heading "Police continues raids and search", said this:

Messrs. Paul Rose—

—that is the one who is being sought now—

—and Jacques Beaulne, who set up La Maison de Pêcheur, stated that their organization was in the process of setting up several such houses in various places in Quebec so as to continue their Percé experiment and that on Sunday—

—that is, the following Sunday—

—eight organizers from different areas of the province had met to talk about the future houses. These eight organizers have been arrested, said M. Rose, and we have not heard from them since.

We could say the same thing about what happened this year. The first messages received from the FLQ were typewritten. Have you noticed that since the first FLQ leaders or suspects have been arrested, typewritten messages have given way to handwritten notes? That means that those who used a typewriter were arrested and are now in jail. Those who can not type write by hand.

The same Paul Rose who talked to reporters of the newspaper *Le Devoir* is actively being sought by the police forces of Canada in connection with the killing of Pierre Laporte. As for the eight directors of the Maison du Pêcheur, they were undoubtedly leaders or founders of FLQ cells throughout the province of Quebec.

Moreover, the chairman of the Excutive Committee of the City of Montreal, Mr. Saulnier, made pathetic appeals to the central government last year, urging that it stopped financing the FLQ through the Company of Young Canadians. Here is what Mr. Saulnier had to say on October 11, as recorded on page 124 of the proceedings of the Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts, dated 27 November 1969. What are the avowed aims of the organization, of the Company of Young Canadians and the FLQ? I quote:

1. To agitate and organize marches in the educational institutions which bring forth—

—no desire in young people to study, no, but to skip classes.

—the interruption of academic pursuit;

Once the pupils have been delayed, let us stir them up so that teachers and the educational system will take the blame! Well thought.

2. To publish and distribute the names, addresses and phone numbers of industrial workers, thereby identifying them as targets;

A worker was told: Old boy, if you don't follow us, look out for your eight or nine year old kid; he may be kidnapped. Constant threats and intimidation. And those facts were well known in 1969!

3. To infiltrate situations which can develop into major conflicts;

—Stir up conflicts, hate, pit people against one another! If someone owns something and another has a little more, pit the former against the latter.

4. To promote social and political strife by teaching the methods of defining inaccessible demands with the *admitted* purpose of shaking the present social system from its roots;

5. To promote methods of action, and I quote, "which quickly bring about a revolutionary showdown";

6. To encourage the occupation of plants during strikes, in order to create "confrontations"—

by workers. We witnessed this last summer, during the construction strike. Workers fought against one another. Some were called "scabs" because they did not want a strike. Pépin, Laberge and others are ths ones who say: "Respect the minority. Respect us, we are the minority." And how do they deal with the minority of employees who do not want to strike? Sometimes it is the majority who do not want to strike. They force a strike however with a majority obtained by working up union members. Pépin and Laberge know the trick. These people accuse me on television. They accuse me because I tell them in the face what their workers are afraid to tell them. These workers think exactly as I do and the union leaders know it.

When a strike is called, people who usually work together start fighting each other. One group wants to strike and the other does not. In the meantime, the leaders keep drawing their pay. They say: This is democracy, we have to protect our union rights. Then the rank and file are punished in the name of the union movement because they did not want to strike. Neither big Pépin nor Laberge actually suffer from a strike. It is the workers who must bear for months the consequences of a costly strike.

I continue with Mr. Saulnier's statement:

7. To distribute written information on Communist action in other countries.

After all that I was not surprised by the proclamation of the War Measures Act. Among I do not know how many hundreds of letters I received there were two letters of protest one of which bore the signature of the Communist party of Toronto whereas the other one was signed by the labour leaders Laberge and Pépin from Montréal. Two others were unsigned: one from Montreal and one from Québec, which makes altogether four protests.

However, I received letters of congratulations from everywhere. I even received letters which I could show to my hon. friend, the leader of the New Democratic party. One of them came from a former member of his party who ran three times as an NDP candidate in British Columbia. He has just sent back his membership card because the leader of the NDP would not take a stand to maintain law and order in the province of Quebec. He says it bluntly in his letter. Moreover, the leader of the NDP has certainly received this letter and also the membership card!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Caouette: Last year, Mr. Saulnier called for a royal investigation in this respect so he would be able to state all the facts and provide names. He was denied this opportunity. I directed questions to the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) and to the Prime Minister but both replied that they could see no reason for it. A parliamentary committee was set up which established beyond all doubt the existence of seditious and subversive activities and of a terrorist movement operating in the province of Quebec. There was no reaction on the government's part. They waited until the terrorists had abducted Mr. Cross and murdered Pierre Laporte before introducing appropriate legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the government obviously could very well have invoked Section 46 of the Criminal Code to deal with the terrorists.

Let us see now what punishment is provided under the Criminal Code for acts of treason. Paragraph (b), subsection 1, Section 44 of the Criminal Code reads as follows:

47. (1) everyone who commits treason is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable—

(b) to be sentenced to death or to imprisonment for life if he is guilty of an offence under paragraph (d)—

—that is if he—

—(d) uses force or violence for the purpose of overthrowing the government of Canada or a province;

So, it was the Criminal Code that was in question and not some provincial legislation, if Ottawa could take a stand without consulting anyone.

That is why we do not understand why the federal government has not invoked the sections of the Criminal Code concerning treason to carry out its fight against FLQ terrorists. It was treason since they resorted to violence to overthrow the government and destroy the established order.

The FLQ manifesto said among other things:

The Front de Libération du Québec wants the total independence of Quebecers.

Further on, the FLQ appealed to the workers asking them to revolt, to take over plants, machines, schools and universities. Here is what the manifesto said and I quote:

"Workers in production, in mines, in the forests; workers in services; teachers and students; take what belongs to you—

It seems to me it was obvious enough:

Workers of Quebec, start from today to take what belongs to you.

That is what the members of the FLQ are shouting. But instead of trying to destroy what belongs to others, why have they not tried to start building something themselves? They were too lazy to build anything. They are only interested in destroying what others build, what others have built. That was known, it is included in their manifesto. And I quote the FLQ:

Make your own revolution in your districts, at your places of work—

Revolt, club, kill! That was known, Mr. Speaker. But did the provisions of section 47 not enable us to arrest those people? This is what the manifesto said:

—an appeal to overthrow governments, to destroy the established order, an appeal to set up a revolutionary government in Quebec.

The government of Canada should have acted swiftly and used the powers granted by Section 46 of the Criminal Code.

We feel, Mr. Speaker, that the government had the necessary means to meet the emergency that prevailed in Montreal.

We recall previous situations when the terrorists, in October 1969, launched attacks in various places in the city of Montreal, and especially used violence against private property and the Murray Hill drivers, when a man lost his life.

More recently still, there was the Lapalme affair in Montreal. Who stirred up the Lapalme workers, who prevented them from reaching an agreement with the Postmaster General here, in Ottawa, when they were offered more security than they had ever had before? As I said not long ago in the House, Lapalme Inc. is unwilling to renew its contract. However its employees are losing their jobs. The union leaders tell the government: You should hire them. If I were to close my garage tomorrow morning, the union leader of my employees would say: Listen, Caouette has closed his garage, Ottawa is going to hire you! People would say that is ridiculous! In the circumstances, I feel that the government was quite generous when it offered all Lapalme employees a job in the civil service. They would have enjoyed greater security. But no! They would rather be driven to rebellion against the postal administration, the minister, G. Lapalme Inc. to the point of destroying postal trucks, beating truck drivers, breaking windows, slashing tires and destroying public property.

Did you hear Michel Chartrand, Pépin or Laberge protest against violence? No! Instead of advising the employees to join the public service—this would have been normal—they again used hatred to save face. But it did not help the workers, in fact they are still looking for jobs. Are those people defending our country? I doubt it.

The government had the necessary means to deal with the emergency situation in Montreal. Speaking of Murray Hill and Lapalme drivers, it was at the request of Montreal and Quebec authorities last year that our armed forces intervened and got the situation back to normal. This year, the armed forces were called in to deal with the situation. They were not told to go everywhere. No scandal arose because 400 out of six million people in Quebec have been questioned and detained. Not even 100 of them are still in jail. Some will be charged by the end of this week. They cannot all be charged at the same time. However, all of them have been questioned. We find unfortunate that it takes so long. We know that innocent people have been arrested. Quite so. But did anyone think that when Pierre Laporte was kidnapped he too was innocent? He had done no harm and he was viciously murdered. Mr. Speaker, Pierre Laporte did not ask to be killed!

Why then weep for those who are questioned? I do not like to see innocent people being arrested. No! But let us remember Mrs. Laporte and her children. Did anyone ask them permission to kidnap the head of the family? Was Mrs. Laporte's consent sought before the kidnapping of her husband? Was Pierre Laporte brought to trial before being so viciously and abominably killed? Was James Cross brought to trial to be kept in captivity? Is anyone commiserating with those families? Are we only going to talk here of those who have been arrested, did nothing and had nothing in common with the FLQ, etc.? No!

If those people were questioned, arrested, it is because there was something in the wind. It does not mean they are killers. I think that it is all right to question them.

What did the CBC do in those circumstances? I hope there is a CBC reporter in the press gallery. What were

we shown on TV, in the evening, after a few suspects were released at Quebec? Two young girls, I think, were introduced to say that they had been arrested in the most shocking way, that they had only been questioned on the third day following their imprisonment! How shocking! Was the CBC seen to interview either Mrs. Laporte or her children? Did the CBC interview Mrs. Cross, or still, those in favour of the search for the bandits responsible for the kidnappings and the murder? No. They call upon the poor victims, those who have been spending four days in jail, questioned on the third day and realeased on the fourth, fifth or sixth. That is terrible.

Mr. Speaker, I say that there is still a clean-up to do in that field. And it has not started yet! This goes to prove that last year at this time the government had the necessary powers to intervene efficiently, yet nobody blamed the government or started a debate in the House, as was done during the last weeks by the two parties sitting on my right.

The government could also have availed itself, besides the War Measures Act recently enacted, of other acts which are part of our defensive weapons against those who would destroy our institutions, who attack public figures elected in a democratic way, who defy established order and attempt to overthrow existing governments.

I am referring to sections included in our Criminal Code under the general title of "Offenses against public order". I mean section 46 pertaining to treason, section 51 and 52 covering prohibited deeds and finally section 60 and 62 bearing on sedition.

About treason, section 46 states:

Every one commits treason who, in Canada,—
(d) uses force or violence for the purpose of overthrowing the government of Canada or a province;

In paragraph (f), the legislator has added:

Every one commits treason who, in Canada,
(f) conspires with any person to do anything mentioned in paragraphs (a) to (d);

—that is—

—(d) uses force or violence for the purpose of overthrowing the government—

So, such an act already existed! Finally, paragraph (g) of the same section 46 states that every one commits treason, who:

(g) forms an intention to—

—overthrow governments, through violence, and who—

—manifests that intention by an over act;—

We have had such manifestoes, such overt acts by the FLQ people and others before them.

Mr. Speaker, the sections of the Criminal Code I have just mentioned could have been immediately applied during the troubled period we are unfortunately going through.

Sections 51 and 52 of the Criminal Code which deal with prohibited acts, did enable the government to intervene more promptly and crush the revolution. Section 51 reads as follows:

Every one who does an act of violence in order to intimidate the Parliament of Canada or the legislature of a province is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for fourteen years.

Mr. Speaker, the FLQ manifesto which the authorities received, that was published in newspapers and broadcast over some radio stations were actually acts designed to intimidate and to fool the Canadian and the Quebec governments following the kidnapping of Messrs. Cross and Laporte and finally after the murder of Pierre Laporte.

Finally, the federal government and the Quebec government, who must enforce the provisions of the Criminal Code, had also other means of thwarting the moves of the terrorist elements, namely, all the sections of the Criminal Code dealing with sedition.

Sub-section 4 of section 60, of the Criminal Code gives the following definition of "seditious intention". Every one shall be presumed to have a seditious intention who:

(a) teaches or advocates, or

(b) publishes or circulates any writing that advocates the use, without the authority of law, of force as a means of accomplishing a governmental change within Canada.

In some of our colleges and universities, there are professors who are teaching revolution to our students.

The FLQ manifesto was surely a document of this type and it would have been reason enough for the governments to intervene quickly. All the more, Mr. Speaker, as the federal government, the RCMP, the Quebec government, the authorities of the city of Montreal, following raids conducted last year in the quarters of the FLQ and of the workers' committee of Saint-Henri, in the homes of some terrorists who were later indicted and convicted, had in their possession documents which clearly set forth the revolutionary policies of the FLQ and of the workers' committee of Saint-Henri, as well as their desire to overthrow the established order by force, and which provided technical information on the manufacture of bombs, Molotov cocktails and other weapons to fight police forces, police horses, etc. The Canadian government knows all about those documents, copies of which are actually in the hands of some hon. members.

Now, Mr. Speaker, section 62 of the Criminal Code—

• (5:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but I do so to advise the House that his time has expired. Does the hon. member have the consent of the House to continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Public Order Act, 1970

• (5:50 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Caouette: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I will need only a couple of minutes more. I am grateful to my colleagues for their courtesy and will continue my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, section 62 of the Criminal Code provides the following penalties in cases of sedition:

> Every one who
> (a) speaks seditious words,
> (b) publishes a seditious libel, or
> (c) is a party to a seditious conspiracy,
> is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to imprisonment for fourteen years.

It can therefore be said that the federal and Quebec governments had the necessary powers to deal with the FLQ revolutionaries and should have resorted to them earlier, last year, or two or three years ago.

We now have before us Bill C-181 purporting to grant emergency powers for the preservation of public order in Canada. I will say only a few words about this bill.

Our party would like that the provisions relating to treason, prohibited acts and sedition be incorporated into the new bill and also that the penalties for revolutionary elements be more severe and even that the death sentence be applied to those who will kidnap, seclude or murder people who do not share the revolutionary ideal of the FLQ or a similar group.

But that is not the most important thing. As I said at the beginning, in spite of our use of the army, the police and adoption of restrictive laws in order to maintain law and order, the same consequences will appear again if we tolerate the causes of the present bills.

These ills have an economic as well as a financial aspect. The Canadian government must propose bills tending to eliminate the misery produced by unemployment and poverty. And, by the way, I am saying that this will not yet eliminate completely the dangers which are threatening us. It is not because fellows like Rose and company are living in poverty that they rebel; it is because they wish to resort to violence as a substitute to the democratically elected governments.

It is all they want, it is all they aim at, regardless of the type of government we may have here. Let us put them in Eden, Mr. Speaker, and I think they would do exactly as Adam and Eve did: they would rebel against God, and would start to play with the apple.

Mr. Speaker, those ills have economic and financial causes, as I have said. The Canadian government must come up with legislations that would eradicate the destitution created by unemployment and poverty; the Canadian government must enable all the segments of the population to be properly housed, fed and clothed. The whole population, and not only the priviledged ones, must share in the assets and the riches that Canada and our economic system are in a position to supply to each and everyone.

Each and every Canadian citizen should feel free in his own home. Freedom is independence, freedom from want, and financial security.

We ask the Prime Minister, the government, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) and all members of this House to please consider frankly whatever reforms are needed and not merely beat about the bush and try to put poultices on wooden legs by stealing from those who own something to help those who own nothing because this is no solution to the problem.

And let me quote these words from a former President of the United States, Thomas Jefferson, and I think they would apply today just as they did in his own days:

[*English*]

> I believe the banking institutions are more dangerous to our liberties than standing armies. Already they have raised up a monied aristocracy that has set the government at defiance. The issuing power should be taken from the banks and restored to the people to whom it properly belongs.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker, the people of the province of Quebec did not ask for Pierre Laporte's death. The people of the province of Quebec, our poor, our destitute, our unemployed did not ask for the kidnapping of Mr. Cross and Mr. Laporte. They do not want their neighbour's death, no! They do not ask for the right to kill but for the right to live peacefully in their province and their country. These people, our poor in Montreal, for instance, who live in downtown slums and who are literally devoured by rats, do not ask to kill their fellow citizens, but to live decently in such a country as ours.

And at this stage, Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that for the last two years the government has been telling us, for the sake of inflation and the financial system, but not for the sake of the human person, the right to live, the poorer Canadian, the housewife, the unemployed: Tighten your belt, accept privations. At the same time, it tells financiers: Raise your rates, keep exploiting misery, poverty and even man. The government is responsible for this situation. And we hear, in the name of inflation: We have no money to carry out this work, to erect these buildings or to provide services to the people. Then an emergency situation builds up in the province of Quebec: two abductions, bombings, etc. The Army is called up immediately and occupies the province. I approve this move. However, I wonder why inflation has not been invoked when it came to sending troops to Quebec. Have we heard the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Justice or even the Prime Minister say: We cannot afford to send you the Army, this is a time of inflation, we must tighten our belts. No! Once the Army pulls out of Quebec and the new legislation is in force, these people will keep on shouting, with reference to inflation: Tighten your belt. When the government says that, the government members applaud. That is logical. And then, when the members from the Montreal area return home, they are escorted by the Army, because they are afraid. Oh yes! They tolerate the causes of what they are afraid of. They say they are scared, and yet they tolerate the reasons for their fear. That is a little too much!

Mr. Speaker, the Créditistes have this to say: Instead of trying to reform individuals and institutions, how about beginning with a reform of the financial system of our country. Let us put money in the pockets of the citizens. That is what the poor people of Montreal

want in order to buy food, clothes, a decent house where they could be happy, feel they are important, human beings. And when we will have tamed finance, we will put an end to revolutions, we will prevent revolutionaries from destroying a country like ours which I consider as one of the finest in the world. But let us try at least to recognize it and to act accordingly in order to save not only our country but the people who live in it and build it.

Public Order Act, 1970

Some hon. Members: Hear. hear.

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. It being six o'clock, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow at two o'clock p.m.

At six o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

23226—58

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, November 5, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

CANADIAN CITIZENSHIP ACT

AMENDMENT RESPECTING PERSONS FORMERLY MEMBERS OF ORGANIZATIONS CONSIDERED SUBVERSIVE

Mr. Hubert Badanai (Fort William) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-183, to amend the Canadian Citizenship Act.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Badanai: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is the granting of citizenship to persons to whom citizenship has been denied because of membership in organizations considered subversive but who have not been involved in any subversive activities and have no criminal record against them, and provided they can qualify for citizenship in every other respect.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

ACTION TO ALLEVIATE PREDICTED WINTER UNEMPLOYMENT

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister, now that the President of the Canadian Labour Congress has joined the Chairman of the Economic Council of Canada in painting the most dismal unemployment picture this winter for many years, whether he can tell the House what action the government proposes to take to alleviate unemployment during the coming winter?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, first, the government has already adopted a number of measures aimed at stimulating economic expansion and reducing unemployment following progress in slowing price increases, as outlined by the Minister of Finance in the throne speech debate. Second, the March budget acknowledged that higher unemployment was a probable consequence of restraint measures adopted to deal with the inflation problem, which the Economic Council recently acknowledged represented a most serious shortfall from national goals. Both the OECD and the IMF have recently indicated that inflation is the most critical national and international economic problem, as well.

An hon. Member: What chapter is that?

An hon. Member: Read the new edition.

Mr. Trudeau: Third, the CLC also told the government in its March brief that it could expect a slowdown in the rate of wage and salary increases as a result of the restraint program, of which there is still no evidence. Organized labour's unrestrained efforts to obtain higher wages and salaries intensified the need for federal policy restraints—

An hon. Member: You are a good reader.

An hon. Member: Get a new speech writer.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I hesitate to interrupt the right hon. Prime Minister but I would think the statement he is making now is of a general nature. Of course, I appreciate that the question was also of a general nature but I believe this is the kind of statement that ought normally to be made on motions.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, am I right to assume from the answer given by the Prime Minister that he is resting upon the measures already taken, which it has been estimated will result in extraordinarily severe unemployment this winter? Can the Prime Minister say whether he intends to announce any additional measures? I ask this question with great emphasis at this time, Mr. Speaker, because it will obviously take some time to translate new measures into action that would have any effect. Is the Prime Minister prepared to announce new measures at this time or is he prepared to have the people suffer the degree of unemployment now predicted for this coming winter?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I doubt whether this is a question. I am sure the Leader of the Opposition will appreciate with me that the latter part of the question makes it an argument. The first part, of course, is a legitimate question, and perhaps the right hon. Prime Minister would like to reply.

Mr. Trudeau: Any such announcement will be made in due course by the government, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Prime Minister in all sincerity whether the fine words, uttered by the Minister of Justice yesterday were simply words that are to be taken as such and to be followed by no action?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I would direct my supplementary question to the right hon. Prime Minister. In view of the considerable trouble the Prime

Minister has taken to prepare the statement he was reading from, I wonder whether he might wish to continue reading in case he might have something to say farther on about the interest rates of banks and the exorbitant profits they are making?

Mr. Trudeau: I would gladly read farther on—

Mr. MacEwan: He has his money in a sock so he wouldn't know.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Translation*]

DISTRIBUTION OF NATIONAL DIVIDEND

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a supplementary question to the Prime Minister.

In view of the government's intention to give fresh impetus to the Canadian economy, would the Prime Minister consider distributing a national dividend which would increase the purchasing power of Canadians?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, if the House would unanimously agree to the national dividend theory, the government would be glad to adopt it.

QUEBEC—ACTION TO ALLEVIATE UNEMPLOYMENT

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister.

Considering the high rate of unemployment in the province of Quebec, is the Prime Minister, in co-operation with the premier of Quebec, contemplating special action to provide jobs for the unemployed in Quebec, in order to counteract any further terrorist activities in that province?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will appreciate that his question is somewhat along the same lines as the one asked by the Leader of the Opposition. Thus, I do not think it is in order.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Speaker, I most respectfully suggest that my question applies more specifically to the province of Quebec and that the Prime Minister was preparing to make a reply which I would be happy to hear.

Mr. Speaker: That is exactly what I was afraid of.

[*English*]

UNEMPLOYMENT—PROVISION OF WINTER WORKS PROGRAMS

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): I would like to direct a supplementary question to the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. In view of the estimate of the president of the Canadian Labour Congress that unemployment will reach 11 per cent of the total working force this winter, is the government giving consideration to co-operating with provinces such as Manitoba which have already announced substantial winter employment programs, in order to promote winter works programs to take up some of the slack?

[Mr. Saltsman.]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Winnipeg North is asking a question much the same as that asked by the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe. I was afraid that the question might be asked for all the provinces of Canada and that is why I thought I ought to intervene when the first one was asked. I do not want to be unfair to hon. members. The Prime Minister may wish to reply to both questions, the question asked by the hon. member for Winnipeg North—

[*Translation*]

—and the question put by the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe (Mr. Ricard).

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker—

[*English*]

—with regard to the latter question, it is based on false premises. I cannot blame the hon. member because he is basing himself on Mr. Macdonald's statements. But that, of course, is no assurance of veracity.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Trudeau: I am talking of Donald Macdonald of the Canadian Labour Congress.

That Mr. Macdonald appears to be confusing actual and seasonally adjusted unemployed figures. The seasonally adjusted rate for September was 6.9 per cent; the actual rate was 4.7 per cent. No responsible source, of course, which does not include Mr. Macdonald, has predicted a seasonally adjusted rate of 11 per cent or even 9 per cent this winter.

Mr. Orlikow: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Prime Minister whether the government is giving consideration to a winter works program, supplemental to the regional development programs, in order to help to alleviate some of the very substantial unemployment we have and will have this coming winter?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, as I have pointed out before, the winter works program totalled something less than $50 million. We have replaced it by manpower retraining and mobility programs to the tune of several hundreds of millions of dollars. It is typical of the NDP that they would want to go back to solutions which were discarded and discredited some time ago.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Stanfield: It is also typical of the government to do nothing.

SUGGESTED REPEGGING OF CANADIAN DOLLAR

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister. Is the government giving consideration to immediately repegging the Canadian dollar at approximately 95 cents? Otherwise, there will be really massive unemployment during the coming winter.

ACTION TO ALLEVIATE UNEMPLOYMENT IN CORNWALL

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. In light of the fact that an additional 300 people have been laid off in the city of Cornwall by Courtaulds (Canada) Limited, this action adding to the already excessive rate of unemployment in this area—I ask Your Honour to be indulgent with me, especially for this question—and particularly since these lay-offs are a direct consequence of the unpegging of the dollar, may I ask the minister what steps the government intends to take to alleviate this very serious situation in the Cornwall area?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, this is something we are looking into right now.

Mr. Baldwin: How about putting up a provisional program?

Mr. Woolliams: The government has been looking for 3,000 FLQ members, and we have not seen them yet.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

WAR MEASURES ACT—ARRESTS, RELEASES, CONTINUING DETENTIONS AND CHARGES

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Justice. How many of the 65 persons who are still detained under the War Measures Act are to be charged today? Can the minister tell us how many will be charged under the War Measures Act and how many will be charged under the Criminal Code?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, perhaps by way of preliminary I can bring the hon. member up to date on the figures. As of 12.05 p.m. today, 429 people had been arrested, 372 have been released, 57 are still detained and one has been rearrested. My information is that at 2.30 this afternoon 28 persons will be arraigned and charged—27 in Montreal and one in Granby. There will be charges under the regulations and charges under the Criminal Code.

WAR MEASURES ACT—ABILITY OF RELATIVES TO VISIT PRISONERS—REPORTED MISTREATMENT OF THOSE DETAINED

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I ask the Minister of Justice if his attention has been drawn to the report of Mr. Jacques Hebert, the president of the civil liberties group in Montreal which has been investigating the conditions among the detainees and his complaint that few relatives have been advised that they can now visit the prisoners despite the assurance to the contrary of Mr. Choquette? He reports that there have been victims of psychological and sometimes physical methods that are absolutely unacceptable. Has the minister had an opportunity to look into this

matter? If not, does he intend to look into it in order to see that the rights of persons who have been detained have been properly safeguarded?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): I am aware of the report to which the hon. member referred. The primary responsibility, of course, lies with the Attorney General of Quebec. I will be discussing that report with him.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Since the minister has the primary responsibility for drafting the regulations under which these people have been detained and the government has the sole responsibility for passing them, following his discussions with the Attorney General of Quebec will the minister make a report to the House on the alleged treatment of those who have been detained by the police authorities?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I will consider that suggestion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): When the minister is making inquiries of the Minister of Justice of Quebec, will he ascertain whether a man named Manolesco, who is alleged to have been caught in the great sweep made under the War Measures Act, is being charged under that Act or is he simply being charged under the Criminal Code for practising witchcraft without a licence?

* * *

[*Translation*]

PUBLIC SERVICE

PARTICIPATION OF EMPLOYEES IN ELECTION CAMPAIGNS

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister.

Could he tell the House if a public servant may, in the course of his duties state openly and officially that he is for a political party-during a campaign prior to a general election or a by-election?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is asking the Prime Minister for an opinion. He is asking him if a federal public servant may take part in an election campaign.

Obviously, he is asking him to express an opinion or to interpret an act. The question, in that sense, is out of order.

Mr. Rondeau: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

I apologize for having expressed myself badly, but I would like to know if there are regulations prohibiting a public servant from taking part officially or openly in the campaign of a political party during an election.

Mr. Speaker: Here again, I doubt that the question is in order. The hon. member is asking for a legal opinion. I do not want to be unfair to him, but if he is interested in a particular case and wishes to consider it at the time of adjournment, he can give the Chair notice to that effect.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*English*]

NATIONAL SECURITY

QUEBEC—PRECAUTIONS AT PORTS OF DEPARTURE TO PREVENT ESCAPE OF MURDERERS, KIDNAPPERS AND OTHERS

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. As the figures change rapidly from day to day I do not have the exact figures, but it has been stated there are 43 persons who cannot be found and at least those who committed the murder and kidnappings have not been found. Have there been any restrictions placed on the ports of departure in the province of Quebec to prevent these people leaving that province to go to another country where charges cannot be laid against them and from where Canada would be unable to extradite them?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): I cannot provide any details of that at the moment, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Woolliams: This matter is very important with reference to the competent administration of the law. In view of the fact the minister does not have those details, will he take my question as notice and make a statement later in that regard?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I did not say that I do not have the details, Mr. Speaker, but I suggest it might not be in the interests of trying to apprehend the people involved if I were to reveal them.

Mr. Woolliams: Possibly I can narrow the question so that it does not involve the matter of security. Have any restrictions been placed on the ports with regard to people leaving the province of Quebec? Surely that would not affect security and it might even assist the police.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I can assure the hon. member that precautions were taken, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

TRADE

EFFECT OF PROPOSED NEW BRITISH TARIFFS ON CANADIAN EXPORTS—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex): I should like to direct this question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In view of the announced intention of the British government to create new tariff rates to protect British farmers, a course which even precedes Britain's entry into the European Common Market, will the minister consider making an early statement to the House dealing especially with the effect such action may have on Canadian food exports both to Britain and to the ECM countries and, in addition, outline possible government action to protect Canadian interests?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The British have, indeed, announced such an intention, but it is understood by every country involved that discussions will take place within the context of the five-power agreement which provided for wheat imports by the United Kingdom. These discussions will now take place.

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): I should like to apply the preamble of the question which has just been asked to the particular subject of British Columbia lumber. Will the discussions the minister has mentioned cover exports of B.C. lumber to the United Kingdom market?

Mr. Pepin: One of the purposes of my recent trip to Europe was to establish optimum channels of communication with all the parties involved—the United Kingdom, the members of the European community, the new applicants and all countries concerned with the process of *élargissement*. This has been done. One thing which is of particular interest is that the British have identified 12 sensitive items; in their own view it would be damaging to the British economy if these were put under the exterior tariffs of the community. It so happens that eight or nine of these sensitive items are of great importance to Canada. We are already at work attempting to develop a sense of community of interest between Canada, the United Kingdom and the E.E.C. itself, trying to convince the community that maximum access, on the lowest possible tariff or, hopefully, no external tariff at all, would be in the interest of everyone involved.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I wonder when the minister will make the statement on the European Common Market and Canada's relations with it that I understood him to promise in reply to a question I asked him some weeks ago. I should like to know when the minister proposes to make a full statement instead of these spasmodic comments on partial aspects of the question.

Mr. Pepin: I have already told the Leader of the Opposition personally that I had some difficulty in bringing my report to the attention of my colleagues because of recent events. This has now been done and I shall be working in the coming days on a speech on this subject. I shall use the first opportunity to deliver it, either in the House or outside.

Mr. Rose: Since the minister did not tell us, may I ask him directly whether the 12 sensitive items he mentioned include lumber, plywood and pulp?

Mr. Pepin: I was trying to dodge the issue, Mr. Speaker, because I am not sure of which items in the forest product area are included.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Pepin: Speaking from memory, I believe these items are included. Most of the items on the list have to do with basic products, the sort of thing the British economy needs to acquire at the best possible terms for transformation and conversion into its own exports.

Mr. Stanfield: Can I have an assurance from the minister that his statement will be made in the House, where,

I understand, he promised to make his statement in the first place, so that there may be some discussion in response to what he has to say?

Mr. Pepin: One of the possibilities open to the opposition is to provoke such a debate—I have in mind an occasion when the opposition might wish to chastise me, or the department, or the government with regard to an export situation which is now such that Canada expects a $2 billion surplus this year.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, this is exactly the abuse of ministerial position and the rules of the House to which I am objecting.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Stanfield: Whether or not the minister thinks that we are attacking him or wishing to have a discussion on the difficulties confronting this country is not for him to decide. I should like him to give the assurance for which we asked.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Is the minister rising on a point of order?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to know which article in the rules forces me to make a speech on any subject.

Mr. MacInnis: Your own words do.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Annapolis Valley has a supplementary.

EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET AND CANADA'S AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS—DISCUSSION AT CONGRESS

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. Is the question of the European Common Market and the position of Canada's agricultural products going to be a specific item for discussion when the agricultural congress meets at the end of the month? As a supplement to the question, may I ask when hon. members are going to receive their invitations to the congress which is only two weeks away?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the first part of the conference, which is the outlook conference to be held on November 23 and 24, will deal with the outlook for all agricultural products, taking into account such specific items as the hon. member mentioned. The second two days of the congress are specifically designed to deal with the recommendations contained in the task force report, and members of the agricultural committee will receive within the next day or two, if they have not received already, an invitation to attend that portion of the congress.

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. I should like to ask the minister whether before this debate takes place, either on his own volition or otherwise, he will pay a visit to the province of British Columbia in order to discover that in fact lumber, plywood and pulp are important export commodities in the Canadian economy?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

GRAIN

CASH POSITION OF FARMERS AT END OF 1970-71 CROP YEAR

Mr. Gordon Ritchie (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, may I direct my question to the minister in charge of the Wheat Board. Would the minister agree with the statement made by Mr. Runciman, president of United Grain Growers, that the cash position of the prairie grain farmer will not be any better at the end of the 1970-71 crop year than it was at the end of the present year?

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member knows that a question asked in those terms is not in order.

* * *

THE LATE PIERRE LAPORTE

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO FAMILY

Mr. Norman A. Cafik (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I should like to direct to the Prime Minister. Is the government giving any consideration to presenting to the House of Commons a special vote to provide funds to give financial assistance to the Laporte family in view of the tremendous sacrifice that they have made for all Canadians?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the question of the need of Mr. Laporte's family has been discussed privately between the government of Quebec and the federal government. At this time there is nothing more I can add. I hope that the suggestion made by the hon. member will not prove to be necessary.

* * *

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Prime Minister. Has the Prime Minister received a telegram from Liberal provincial member Timothy Reid, of Toronto, demanding that the federal government—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member knows that this sort of question is not in order. I would not think that a question asking whether the Prime Minister had received a telegram from a member of a provincial House could be asked at this time.

Mr. McGrath: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: There cannot be a supplementary to a question that is out of order.

Inquiries of the Ministry

NATIONAL DEFENCE

REACTIVATING OF DISBANDED INFANTRY BATTALIONS TO MAINTAIN INTERNAL SECURITY

Hon. D. S. Harkness (Calgary Centre): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. In view of the necessity, as demonstrated during the past three weeks, of maintaining adequate numbers and suitable types of troops, particularly infantry, in order to maintain internal security and to render aid to the civil power in Canada, is consideration being given to reactivating the infantry battalions which have been disbanded during the past year?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, we are going to study very closely the outcome of the current activation of the forces in connection with their support of civil order. We will see to what extent the response has been adequate—I feel it has been fully adequate—and if any changes are indicated they will be announced in due course.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INDUSTRY

TEXTILE COMMISSION—COTTON AND POLYESTER FIBRE INQUIRY—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT

Mr. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

Does he intend to make a statement in the House concerning the establishment of the Textile Review Board and the inquiry into the importation of cotton and polyester yarns?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): No, Mr. Speaker. All this is in agreement with the policy which I announced on May 14. Today I have issued a release giving the names of the three appointed commissioners who are: Messrs. Annis, St-Laurent and Campbell. One of the first tasks of the board will be to look into the cotton and polyester yarn situation.

[*English*]

TEXTILES—POSSIBILITY OF INCREASED COMPETITION FROM PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): At present Canadian textile producers are facing serious difficulties due to foreign competition. My question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce is: Will Communist China be taking over Taiwan's quota on textiles, and will Canadian manufacturers be faced with increasing competition from imports from both countries?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): No, Mr. Speaker. The government of the People's Republic of China has its own voluntary restraint agreement with us with respect to some textile items and this will continue; no change is being made. There is no thought of transferring the Taiwan so-called quota to the Republic of China.

[Mr. Speaker.]

GRAIN

PLAN TO CONSOLIDATE PRAIRIE FARM UNITS—SUBMISSION TO AGRICULTURAL CONGRESS AND HOUSE

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): May I direct a question to the minister in charge of the Wheat Board. Can the minister indicate to the House whether his general plan on the consolidation of farm units in the Prairie region, mentioned in his statement tabled in the House last week, will be ready for presentation to the coming agricultural congress which will meet in Ottawa?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): I expect not, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gleave: Given the basic importance of such a farm consolidation plan, as mentioned in the report, can the minister indicate when it will be ready for presentation to the House?

Mr. Lang: No, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

INFORMATION CANADA

FEDERAL IDENTITY EMBLEM—CONSULTATION WITH DEPARTMENTS ON DESIGN

Mr. A. D. Hales (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the minister responsible for Information Canada. It is based on an answer tabled in the House on Monday of this week wherein the minister stated that the sum of $24,000 had been disbursed by his department to Communication Arts Centre Incorporated of Montreal for the design of the special emblem that departments are to use. Did the minister give consideration to soliciting the very valuable help that is available in the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce in the designing of this new emblem?

Hon. Robert Stanbury (Minister without Portfolio): There were consultations, Mr. Speaker, with that department as well as others.

* * *

GRAIN

WHEAT—FINAL PAYMENT UNDER ACREAGE REDUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Minister of Agriculture but he has apparently slipped into oblivion or gone somewhere. Perhaps the Minister of Manpower and Immigration might be able to answer it. Could he indicate when the final payment under the "lower income for tomorrow" program will be made?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I think I can provide some information in that regard. I was informed last weekend that approximately 2,600 cheques had gone out and that the office was expecting to be mailing cheques at the rate of 2,500 a day starting last Monday, with the hope of having 80 per cent of the final cheques in the hands of the farmers by December 18.

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

EFFICIENT COMMUNICATION BETWEEN DEPARTMENT AND CANADIAN DELEGATION AT UNITED NATIONS

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

Could he tell the House whether he intends to set up a fast and efficient communication system between Ottawa and New York, so that the Canadian delegation at the UN will no longer find itself in ridiculous situations such as the one that occurred yesterday at the time of an important vote?

* * *

[*English*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

TAKEOVER OF RYERSON PRESS BY UNITED STATES COMPANY

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. What steps does his department propose to take to prevent the takeover of Ryerson press by a United States company?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am wondering whether this question was not asked before, though it may have been in other terms. If it was not, perhaps the minister might want to reply.

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I pointed out in the House the other day that the only law in my department that might have any application at all is the Combines Investigation Act. I pointed out to the House that there was no evidence which indicated to me or my officials that the sale of Ryerson Press was made under circumstances which contravene any provision of the Combines Investigation Act. It may well be that we should have a new Combines Investigation Act with different provisions. That is why this subject was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the minister could inform the House if the government is contemplating the introduction of legislation which will protect other publishing firms in Canada from suffering the same fate in the future?

Mr. Basford: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that question should be addressed to me. If the government has any such intention it will be announced in due course in the proper way.

Mr. McGrath: By that time there will be no companies left.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Inquiries of the Ministry

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

SOUTHEAST ASIA—REPORTED REQUEST BY MALAYSIA THAT CANADA APPROACH CHINA ON GUARANTEE OF NEUTRALITY

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs. How has Canada responded to Malaysia's request that Canada should sound out China about joining other big powers in guaranteeing the neutrality of Southeast Asia, and does the government support such a solution to the difficulties in that part of the world?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think this question is based upon a misleading news report about an interview given by the Foreign Minister of Malaysia in which it was suggested he had made such a suggestion to me. He has since corrected that statement. We did talk about the situation in Southeast Asia but all the minister said was that he hoped that when Canada established relations with China we could discuss the problems of Malaysia with that country.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister directly whether or not he looks at the suggestion favourably?

Mr. Sharp: Mr. Speaker, I was not asked to express any view and I do not do so now.

APPOINTMENT OF PAUL GERIN-LAJOIE AS HEAD OF INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs when the appointment of the new head of CIDA will be announced, and whether it will be Mr. Gerin-Lajoie?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding that the announcement had been made. Certainly the appointment has been made and the new head of CIDA is Mr. Paul Gerin-Lajoie.

* * *

LABOUR RELATIONS

RAILWAY WORKERS' WAGE DEMANDS—POSSIBLE WORK STOPPAGES—EXCESSIVE TRANSPORTATION COSTS

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour. In view of the recent reports that labour unions representing some 85,000 railway and transport workers are demanding wage increases ranging up to 40 per cent, what steps is the minister or the government taking to prevent these demands from escalating into work stoppages and excessive increases in transportation costs, to the serious detriment of our national economy and especially of the farming industry?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should know that the railway unions

in Canada are among the most responsible in the country, and I have no fear at all that their demands will lead to any wildcat strikes.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

COMPLETION OF DESTROYER CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—EFFECT OF COST ON BUDGET

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. Is he in a position to indicate what the future is for the DDH-280's, and can he assure the House that the program will be completed as near as possible to the original capability or role determined for these ships?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I cannot give a full indication at the moment about the program, but I can respond to the hon. member's earlier question by indicating that work is continuing on all four ships.

Mr. David Anderson (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all remember the *Bonaventure* and I am wondering whether the minister can indicate what the cost over-run of this program will be?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I am wondering whether that question is in order. If members wish, perhaps I should allow the minister to respond, but it seems to me this is the kind of information that normally should be sought by a written question.

Mr. Forrestall: Because this is important, Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the minister could indicate that the defence budget will not be impaired as a result of an increase in the cost of this program?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): My understanding is that it will not be, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

INCREASE IN DEPARTMENTAL STAFF ENGAGED IN PESTICIDE RESEARCH

Mr. Randolph Harding (Kootenay West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. In view of a recent report printed in the Ottawa *Journal* on October 31, 1970, to the effect that the agricultural department's pesticide unit is vastly understaffed to meet the sharp increase in research needed on pesticides—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I will allow the hon. member's question in a moment but I wonder whether it would not be more procedurally correct to ask the question directly rather than basing it on a newspaper item. I know this has been done before but I should like to encourage hon. members to ask questions directly rather than by quoting from newspaper reports. The hon. member may proceed with his question.

[Mr. Mackasey.]

Mr. Harding: I just have one more line.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Harding: In view of the sharp increase in research needed on pesticides and their effects on our environment, has the minister's department any plans to increase the professional and support staff required to do this essential research?

Mr. Marcel Lessard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I am informed that progress is being made in locating and hiring additional staff. Plans are also being developed that could affect the organization as well as the number and composition of staff assigned to the administration of the Pest Control Products Act. It is easy to speculate on what changes might be made in an area of work that is expanding and very much in the news.

* * *

[*Translation*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

PROVISION OF JOBS FOR UNEMPLOYED PROFESSIONALS

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Labour.

Since the Professional Employment Council indicates that the number of jobs affecting directors, accountants, engineers and other professionals has declined by 29 per cent in the last 12 months and that the number of professionals looking for a new job has increased by 14 per cent during the same period, could the minister tell the House what he intends to do to reduce the number of educated unemployed people and to create stable jobs for the youth who wants—

Mr. Speaker: I am sure the hon. member will admit that his question is essentially the same that was asked today by the Leader of the Opposition, the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe and others. I believe this question should not be asked again at this stage.

* * *

[*English*]

HUMAN RIGHTS

EFFECT OF QUEBEC BILL ON DOCTORS' CIVIL LIBERTIES

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Justice whether he is aware of the interference in the civil liberties of the medical profession by Quebec Bill CF-41, and does the Bill of Rights protect the individual liberties of doctors in that province?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Obviously the hon. member's question seeks a legal opinion from the Minister of Justice and I would not think it is in order.

REVISED STATUTES OF CANADA, 1970

AVAILABILITY BEFORE END OF YEAR

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Justice. In view of the fact that in a number of bills before us this session there is a precise reference to the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1970, can the minister say whether these Revised Statutes of Canada, 1970, will be before us in this calendar year?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): I am optimistic that they will be, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

MANPOWER

SUCCESS OF RETRAINING PROGRAM IN PROVIDING JOBS

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (Southwestern Nova): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration and is supplementary to an answer given by the Prime Minister a little while ago. Can he make a statement to the House explaining whether the training and retraining program carried out by the department has been successful in providing jobs after these people have been retrained?

Mr. Speaker: I assume the hon. member is asking whether such a statement can be made on motions. It cannot be made now but the minister might want to reply in those terms.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I am sure I could make a very effective speech, following the example of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the minister should not do that now. Orders of the day.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, I should like to rise on a point of order to ask the President of the Privy Council about the business of the House for the rest of this week and for next week.

Mr. MacEachen: The business for the remainder of today and until its completion will be the emergency powers bill, followed by the statutory instruments bill, the statistics bill, the packaging and labelling bill and the Buffalo-Fort Erie bridge bill. On Tuesday, November 10, the business of supply will be called for an opposition day under the auspices of the NDP. As the hon. member knows, Wednesday November 11, is Remembrance Day and the House will not sit on that day.

Mr. Baldwin: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister able to elaborate on his answer to my question yesterday about the government's intention with regard to the bill now before the House and the times of sittings with respect to that bill?

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, it would be the intention of the government to suggest, after consultation, that today's sitting be extended if there were a real possibility of the bill being completed. However, it is difficult at this moment to anticipate what progress will be made this afternoon and it might be better if we reviewed the question informally shortly after eight o'clock this evening.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PUBLIC ORDER (TEMPORARY MEASURES) ACT, 1970

PROVISION OF EMERGENCY POWERS FOR PRESERVATION OF PUBLIC ORDER

The House resumed from Wednesday, November 4, consideration of the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton) that Bill C-181, to provide temporary emergency powers for the preservation of public order in Canada, be read the second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce): Mr. Speaker, it is frustrating and discouraging to note that there are still some persons and I emphasize "some persons" because the majority are with us inside and outside of this House who have not yet grasped the seriousness of the Quebec situation and who continue to doubt the need for this bill as well as for the emergency measures adopted on October 16. They continue to discuss the situation as if it were an academic exercise, an opportunity for political rhetoric, or a chance to score political points.

Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) started off by triumphantly stating that "the government has now in effect accepted our leadership in this matter". What does that kind of statement add to a matter as serious as this? If the Leader of the Opposition has truly shown leadership, the Canadian people will recognize it, but I submit that leadership is shown by action and not by words. While the Leader of the Opposition accepted the bill in principle, he repeatedly attempted to pick at the government and the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). One minute he seemed to favour the bill and the next minute he did not. The Canadian people, and in particular the beleaguered people in the province of Quebec, are not concerned at this time with the winning of political or debating points. They expect us here, in Parliament, to take the situation seriously and to work together to find a just and peaceful solution to this problem.

I said there are those who are not convinced of the need for this bill and the emergency measures that were taken. They continue to demand evidence of the apprehended insurrection. For those of us who live in

Quebec the evidence is obvious. I should point out that my home is in Montreal and my wife and children are still living there. We, in Montreal, have lived with the evidence and have known it intimately. We have heard the bombs blasting in the mail boxes, we have walked the streets where the blasts took place.

An hon. Member: Why don't you do something about it?

Mr. Allmand: We have worked and lived in the buildings which were partially blown apart. Some of us from Montreal knew Mr. Cross, and many of us knew Mr. Laporte. We did not know him as an image on television or as a name in the newspapers, but as one of our colleagues. We have also lived with, listened to and looked at those who call themselves the FLQ. We have heard their hate; we have felt their hostility, and not from a distance, as if we were watching a drama on cinema. We felt it at the St. Jean Baptiste parade riot in 1969, at the McGill Français march and at the riots at St. Leonard.

An hon. Member: Why did you not do something then?

Mr. Allmand: The opposition members are asking why we did not do something about it. We have been doing something about it. I wonder what they would have done if they had had the responsibility.

Mr. Orlikow: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the hon. member who has the floor should be allowed to continue his speech.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, many of us—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I understand the hon. member for Winnipeg North seeks permission of the hon. member to ask a question.

Mr. Allmand: Yes, Mr. Speaker, let him ask the question.

Mr. Orlikow: I wonder if the hon. member has any information for members on this side of the House as to what was the increase in the number of personnel in the RCMP assigned to the province of Quebec to look into this matter in the last three or four years since the bombings began.

Mr. Allmand: I am not sure of the answer to that question but I do know that this government has been concerned and has tried to act within its powers. There is a very thin line on either side of the question as to whether one goes too far or whether one does too little, but of course that is the problem with which we are dealing. Many people have said we have over reacted, while others have said we have not gone far enough. I say we have been concerned.

I am trying to impress on the House that those of us who live in Montreal and Quebec know at first hand what it is like to live with terror. The Leader of the NDP (Mr. Douglas) has repeatedly stated that the people of Canada are still waiting for the evidence that the War Measures Act and this bill were necessary. He asked whether we have read the remarks made by Pauline Jewett and Miss LaMarsh and articles which appeared in the Toronto *Star* as well as those published by the Civil Liberties Union of Canada. He gave us a list of names of people from Toronto, Ottawa and other places, but he mentioned none from Quebec when he spoke yesterday. I should like to ask him whether he has listened to the remarks of Frank Scott, for example, one of the most eminent civil liberties lawyers in Canada or of the "Ligue des Droits d'Hommes" which is the Montreal group concerned with civil liberties, or any Quebec newspapers. Many of these groups and people are not our political partisans. I am not a member of the cabinet and the government might have evidence that I do not have or that I am not aware of, but the evidence that I do have, which is public to all who wish to examine it, is sufficient to my mind to support what the government has done and what the government is doing.

I will repeat this evidence. First of all, we have the expressed intention by the FLQ to engage in terrorist activities including assassination. We have this in their printed literature, which includes instructions on how to create revolution, how to make Molotov cocktails and many other things that are related to violent terrorism. We have also heard these intentions expressed in their speeches. Second, we have information that the FLQ had adequate fire power and personnel to proceed seriously towards its stated goals. Third, we have actual cases where terrorist activities were carried out through bombings, kidnappings, and murders. So, we have their expressed intention in writing and words; we have information that they have the means, and we have cases, in which these intentions have actually been carried out. To me, this is adequate justification for what the government has done.

• (3:00 p.m.)

Nevertheless, some keep asking, where is the revolution? Where is the attempt to overthrow the government? They keep on expecting some type of spectacular uprising, some *coup d'état*, some kind of open revolution or civil war. It may be that there is such a plan, but I do not know. It is not what I would expect at this stage. If the FLQ came out in the open to stage that type of uprising or a *coup d'état*, they would be easily dealt with; our superior police and armed forces would easily rout and capture them, and the revolution would be finished.

This is not their method. It is not their method even as they describe it in their manual for urban guerilla warfare, or their method as it is carried out in other countries. No, Mr. Speaker, these new revolutionaries hide in their holes and hovels, coming out occasionally to bomb, to kidnap, and to murder at times which best suit their purposes. Their goal is to disrupt society persistently, to keep it off balance, to break its will to continue. This type of urban guerilla warfare is not aimed at the immediate overthrow of the government but at the will of the people to maintain their institutions, their way of life.

This type of terrorism is aimed at the will of people to serve in public office. It is aimed at the will of the people to speak out as they would like to speak out. It is aimed at the will of the people to write what they would like to write, at their will to serve as a judge or on a jury, their will to invest in Quebec, their will to plant their roots in Quebec and to continue to live there. That is what the terrorism is directed at but, Mr. Speaker, these terrorists have miscalculated the will of the Quebec people, the Quebec government and the Canadian government.

We are not ready to let our institutions deteriorate. We are not ready to let terrorists take away those liberties that our ancestors fought so hard to win. It is true that this bill and the regulations introduced on October 16 do limit some civil liberties, but I suggest to you that many others more expert in these matters than I am say this limitation is not very wide.

I attended a teach-in on the present measures with Frank Scott who, as I have already said, is known to be a great civil liberties lawyer, and he stated that the measures that have been introduced are very mild and very limited. As the Prime Minister has said, as the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) has said, nobody really wanted this type of legislation or this type of measure. But, Mr. Speaker, it was the lesser of evils in the situation in which we found ourselves.

We must remember that in democratic societies there is no such thing as unlimited rights. In Quebec, we have the doctrine of "abus de droit", abuse of rights, where one's rights are limited when they come into conflict with the rights of others. In our legal system we have the doctrine of the balance of convenience, through which we allow courts to grant an injunction against the rights of others where we feel there may be a conflict of rights. We insist that the rights of individuals must be limited with respect to the rights of the collectivity, the rights of society.

But let us examine who interfered with civil liberties in what I consider to be a major way. In my opinion, the terror and the violence have been the real cause of restricted liberties in Montreal. Since the commencement of the violence there has been a limit on the liberty of movement enjoyed by the people of Montreal simply because of fear. There has been a serious drop in consumer sales. There has been a cancellation of public social events. Children's events have been cancelled. The children of Montreal no longer may enjoy a Santa Claus parade like children in other Canadian cities. Political meetings in Montreal have been cancelled. There have been many instances where people living in this situation of terror and violence have not been free to do the things that they ordinarily would do if they were not living under such threats.

The new bill before us continues many of the things that were in the regulations, but it removes those parts which were most abhorrent, and it introduces greater protection for those who are accused. The principle object of the bill is to make the FLQ an unlawful association, and those who are members or supporters of it guilty of an offence. Those who are accused under the law will still not have bail unless it is agreed to by the Attorney General, and they still may remain in jail for 90 days before a trial date is set. On the other hand, the period during which they can be held before being charged is reduced from 21 days to seven days.

The measures in the bill are restricted to the FLQ and its successor organizations, which means they cannot be used to weed out and prosecute other types of people who may not be considered desirable by provincial governments, especially governments outside Quebec. The bill provides the right to counsel. It specifically refers to that right, although it is the opinion of the government that that right was not interfered with under the emergency regulations.

Another important provision, with respect to the evidence which can be used to prosecute people under this bill, is the clause which states that a person must have attended several meetings or many meetings of the FLQ, instead of one, before being considered a member of the organization. A serious defect in the regulations under the War Measures Act was the provision that if a person attended even one meeting of the FLQ that fact could be used as evidence against him. The provisions in the regulations dealing with arrest and search without warrant are also continued. To a great extent, the bill is an enactment of the regulations which were made under the War Measures Act.

There has been some discussion about the retroactivity of offences under this bill. Mr. Speaker, I submit that there is no retroactivity of offence under the bill. The offence set out in the bill is that of being a member, or a supporter in various ways, of the FLQ, and that means being a member or supporter after the bill is declared to be in force.

It is true that in the bill there is reference to events, which can be used as evidence, before the bill has come into effect, but these things, of themselves, are not offences. It is not an offence to have attended a meeting or meetings of the FLQ within the past month. Under the bill, it is not an offence to have done things on behalf of the FLQ prior to its introduction and the enactment of the regulations on October 16.

These things raise presumptions against an accused that, as of the day the bill is proclaimed, he is a member of the FLQ. But according to our laws of evidence and legal procedures that presumption can be overturned by casting doubts on it. If a person shows he has taken steps to disassociate himself from the FLQ after the meetings that have been referred to and the evidence brought before the court, then the presumption is rebutted and then the Crown must prove beyond reasonable doubt that the person was a member of the FLQ when the bill was proclaimed. So, the offence is not a retroactive offence. The offence is that of being a member or supporter once the bill comes into effect.

• (3:10 p.m.)

Some people, Mr. Speaker, have stated that this bill cannot deal with the deep causes which lie behind the

terrorism and unrest and, therefore, it is not the proper measure to deal with such problems. We all realize that this bill is meant merely to deal with terrorist activities and I do not think anyone would suggest that it is meant to deal with the causes which lie behind terrorism and unrest. It is interesting to note, however, that during the crisis which arose in Quebec the principal occupation of the Quebec government at that time was to put into effect the medicare program and that they were fighting against stiff political opposition to do this. At that time the Quebec government was fighting for a measure to benefit the people who were supposed to be oppressed. This was not a measure to benefit the establishment but one that favoured the less fortunate citizens.

In this House yesterday a question was asked what the governments of Quebec and Ottawa were doing to alleviate the situation for this group of people. There are many examples, Mr. Speaker, but a good one is what was taking place during the month of September and all through the summer months. I refer to the medicare issue. The government was trying to deal with something that would help the people of Quebec and that would relieve a severe economic and social condition. Whilst these discussions on medicare were taking place, other officials of the Quebec government were outside the province trying to encourage investment in the province and negotiating with people who were prepared to invest in order to provide more jobs.

There are many examples, both in the program of this government and the Quebec government, of efforts which were aimed at the problems which are the cause of unrest. But the real cause of the terrorism, Mr. Speaker, is not the social and economic conditions of the people. I submit the real cause of this terrorism is something which is based on hatred and hostility. A psychiatrist of the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, who has dealt with some of these convicted terrorists, has stated, as a result of his examination of them, that they did not have any social or economic goals as a result of their terrorist activities and that they did not really understand the problems of Quebec.

We will continue to work for the economic and social betterment of the people of Quebec but we will do it through the democratic system. If we fail to do the right thing, the people will vote against us in general elections and put us out. We will accept the verdict just as the governments of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have done in the past months. There have been general elections in those provinces and when it was obvious what the people wanted, immediately the leaders said to Lieutenant Governors, "We are prepared to give up the government to those who have been elected by the people." We believe that governments should be changed through democratic elections in this country, and that is the way that will persist.

Mr. Baldwin: Did you hear that?

Mr. Allmand: When the Leader of the NDP was giving his speech yesterday, he suggested that members of this party did not vote on October 18 according to their conscience.

An hon. Member: Shame.

Mr. Allmand: Many times the Leader of the NDP has made this insinuation against members of this party. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there are examples of members of all parties of this House, both in committee and in the House, voting against their party. I know several members of the government caucus have, and indeed on one or two occasions I have done so myself. I do not think that voting according to conscience is something that only applies to members of the NDP. When legislation has been presented in Manitoba, there have not been too many mavericks voting against the NDP majority in that particular legislature. I want to assure the House that we in this party will all vote according to our conscience on this measure and I, for one, will support it with a very clear conscience. Montreal is my city, Quebec is my province and Canada is my country. No group of terrorists will take them away from me.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Allmand: Nor will any fuzzy-headed procrastinating politicians, more concerned with partisan politics whittle away our ability to defend these things.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I understand the hon. member would like to ask a question of the member who has just resumed his seat. Does the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand) agree?

Mr. Allmand: Certainly.

Mr. Gilbert: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. member knows where the 1,000 to 3,000 FLQ members referred to by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) are, and if he can indicate the names of the institutions into which these people have infiltrated?

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of question which has been asked continually and with which I attempted to deal. I do not know whether there are 100, 200 or 3,000 members of the FLQ, but I submit that is not important. I want to make it clear to this House that the new type of urban guerilla warfare is not aimed at immediately overthrowing a government but to break the will of the government to continue to support its institutions, to break the will of the people to serve, and the right to speak. To do this all you need is 50 or 100 terrorists who are well organized. If they continue to assassinate and kidnap periodically they hope to upset the balance in society by throwing into confusion all those who serve in positions of authority. If they can really break the will of people to serve in Parliament, to serve as judges, to serve as jurors, to write, to speak, then they have gone a long way toward accomplishing their goals.

These are the things they are trying to do. They do not come into the open. Three thousand or 5,000 people could not act openly to overthrow the government, but with a very small number of guerillas they can accomplish something far more important, and that is break the will of the people to defend their democratic institutions.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I think it is of some historical interest that today is the 365th anniversary of the Gunpowder Plot whereby Parliament was to be blown up.

An hon. Member: Were you there, John?

Mr. Diefenbaker: The hon. gentleman heard of this for the first time when I mentioned it just now. It is a coincidence, too, that in those days and for a period thereafter, Members of Parliament in Westminster were accompanied by armed men to protect and preserve them against a group of unknown conspirators, other than Guy Fawkes and four or five others who were immediately arrested.

We meet in this House to deal with a bill that is the outgrowth of action taken by the government several weeks ago. I knew Mr. Laporte. The suggestion was made that since he became, by his death, a national martyr, some fund might be set up. I give that my unqualified support.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

• (3:20 p.m.)

Mr. Diefenbaker: I believe that all of us, as Canadians, lost something by his death. Hearts were deeply touched when word of his death was brought to this House around midnight on the seventeenth of last month. It is well, as we approach the matter before us today, that we should think of James Cross and the terrible period of the last few weeks through which his wife and family have passed. I know that the hearts of all Canadians are with her and the family and we all hope that, providentially, James Cross may still be alive.

I listened to the last speaker with interest, as I always do. He came into the House with a message that was obviously from the heart. This House listens to those who display that attitude of mind. I want to add that, however much I may disagree with the views that are expressed by some hon. members in this House on this question, I resent to the limit the kinds of attacks being made upon hon. members, and the suggestion that they are political hacks bent on securing political benefits. This is Parliament and there must be, in the nature of things, disagreement. There must be the give and take and thrust of debate; because only in debate can this institution bring about those changes which the composite viewpoint of the House wishes to achieve. I repeat: there is no reason or justification for the kinds of attacks that are being made on a political party to which at no time have I been other than an opponent. It is of interest that some of those who themselves have attacked the NDP the most viciously saw the light only a few years ago and left that party for the seats of mighty across the floor.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Yesterday I, unfortunately, was unable to be in the House to listen to the remarks of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner, Ottawa-Carleton). However, I have read them. Even reading them indicates to me that they were eloquently delivered. But, Sir, there is nothing more difficult for a lawyer of distinction than having a case that is difficult to argue, if not almost impossible to justify.

An hon. Member: Be careful.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Everyone of us in the courts has faced that. I wish I could have heard the minister yesterday as he endeavoured to explain the unexplainable and to explain why information has not been given to this House. Nevertheless, I thank the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce for clearing up doubts. We now have it from one who knows.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Diefenbaker: We have it from one who has lived in Montreal amid the dangers and perils of the last couple of years. He says the reason the government had not done anything was that it was so busy with medicare and so anxious to bring foreign investment into Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I wish to make it clear to the House that at no time did I suggest that during the last three years the government was working on the matter of medicare. I mentioned that it was so engaged during the period of the crisis of the last few weeks, and during the summer. One of the most important measures it was trying to bring forward was medicare, for the benefit of the lower income people of Quebec.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: If that is an explanation, I accept it. I understand the feelings of the hon. member. In grappling with that problem, that terrible thing, that instrument of social change known as medicare, it was almost impossible for the law officers of the Crown and for the police forces to act. They must have known the extent of the danger since the hon. member knew. He has been able to tell the House all about the dangers of bombings, threats and plans. On the fifteenth of last month I placed before this House the indictment made by Mr. Saulnier on behalf of Montreal. In its 45 or 50 pages that were placed before a committee of this House, there was set forth the peril to freedom that the FLC constituted—

An hon. Member: That's a new one.

Mr. Diefenbaker: They want to be the FLC for all Canada, but they will not be. The government did not act

and now we know why. With their heads full of medicare and their hearts filled with the desire to improve investments to the tune of millions of dollars, they had not had time to think of a matter such as the FLQ. I am glad the hon. member has cleared the air in such an effective, terse and interesting manner.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Goyer: Mr. Speaker—

[*English*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: If any hon. member who wishes to interrupt will rise, I will be happy to answer him.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. member rising on a point of order or on a question of privilege?

Mr. Goyer: Mr. Speaker, it is simply to repeat to the right hon. member what I said, that—

[*English*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I can say to the hon. member and to those who have recently been elevated to the exalted position of Parliamentary Secretary, that if the hon. member makes a few more interruptions like that he will yet take the place of one of the other ministers.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, we, in our party, through our leader placed our views clearly and definitely before this House and country.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: During the debate on the sixteenth and seventeenth of October we took a strong stand, pointing out that the action being taken under the War Measures Act was something that had never been contemplated. Indeed, if one were to go back to 1960 and read the contribution of the Prime Minister of Canada at that time, the Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson, it is clear that the War Measures Act could not be considered for use for any purpose except war, or in that period which is, as it were, a twilight before the actual beginning of war. During the period when Mr. Bennett was prime minister there were many hon. members who disagreed with him when he said the War Measures Act should be abolished. But that is all in the past. We took our stand. We pointed out what we saw wrong in what was being done. We suggested amendments and improvements. The Liberal press across this country generally supported the need of the War Measures Act regulations being kept in effect for only the immediate period of time. The Winnipeg *Free Press* used the expression "No longer than necessary". The editorial concluded as follows:

• (3:30 p.m.)

Its powers must not be used more than is needed; and it must not be kept alive a moment longer than necessary.

This morning the *Globe and Mail* set out its views in an editorial. The heading covers the viewpoint of that paper: "No case to continue rights suspension". I am not in agreement with that viewpoint.

We in this party stated our views very clearly. We said that there should be a statute limited in its application to a certain period and that, when passed, the War Measures Act should cease to be used as the instrument for prosecuting these individuals.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: That was the view of the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition and that was the view I expressed when I spoke. I suggested there should be a reward offered. I have great respect for the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith) as a parliamentarian. He loves Parliament. The other day I watched him squirm, twist and turn mental somersaults. After having stated no reward had as yet been determined, a few minutes later a reward was announced in Quebec and he suddenly stated in this House in effect, "Yes, we decided two weeks ago". I will come back to that matter with quotations because the minister was not his usual, effective self. I felt sorry for him.

Mr. McIlraith: Maybe he will come back to it and it will be someone else again.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I must not miss any of those pearls.

Mr. McIlraith: Maybe you will come back to it and it will be someone else again.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I still do not know what the observation is, but I will read it in *Hansard*.

I suggested that a committee should be established to ensure that unnecessary injustice is not committed against any Canadian. A committee has now been established, apparently as the result of the initiative of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Montreal, two or three days after he advocated it was needed. As an example, what about Bernard Lortie who was arrested when he gave himself up because he had the same name as an individual that was being sought? When he gave himself up the police looked over his record. They stated they were 80 per cent sure he was the dangerous criminal. They were 100 per cent wrong, and they must have known it. He gave his complete record. At the end of 24 hours the police must have known that he was not the man for whom they were looking, yet they incarcerated him for several more days. This is what happens when absolute power is placed in the hands of any man or group of men. We placed our views before this House and the country. Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, if it discharges its responsibility, must always be the conscience of the government.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I repeat, an opposition that discharges its responsibility is the conscience of the government. The hon. member who preceded me said that members of the government can vote according to conscience. I am not going to argue that. However, there was a look

of dubiety on the faces of the Solicitor General and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) when I mentioned the dangers a moment ago.

I am now going to quote an authority that no member opposite can challenge. I do not know how many hon. members have read this "Appeal for Realism in politics". This document was produced by various individuals, including the present Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Trudeau). The manifesto was translated into English by Mr. Pitfield so there will be doubt as to the correctness of it. After all, Mr. Pitfield has fallen into no pits lately.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: I quote:

> Democratic progress requires the ready availability of true and complete information. In this way people can objectively evaluate their government's policies. To act otherwise is to give way to despotic secrecy.

Who can describe in more effective terms what has happened in this House during the past several weeks? We have not been able to pry out any information. Two or three cabinet ministers, in their perambulations have given information outside the House that turned out to be misinformation.

I have great respect for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand). I do not think I have heard a better speech in the last two or three years than the speech the minister gave when he spoke on this debate. It was a remarkable effort. Then, apparently carried away by his press notices, he opened up his heart. He told the Canadian people of the dangers of a group of 3,000 to 5,000 individuals in the FLQ in Quebec with a population close to 7 million. He also spoke of FRAP. There is something signally wrong in the fact that after all these weeks of investigation the law officers and investigators have not come up with any cases. They have taken 400 people into custody and released 340. We have not found out whether the CBC gentry and Radio Canada have yet returned to the protection of their positions. I endeavoured to find that out, but as the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) pointed out, in effect, "Do you think I know about things like that? All I do is report."

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I now ask the Minister of Justice to find out if there has been any communication regarding these men? According to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, there is an inference that these three or four individuals engaged in subterannean communication by code. By interspersing code words in the news items, these thugs and murderers were given the information they needed. Are these gentry and Radio Canada still in there? They were guests of Her Majesty for a short time. Now that they have been released, are they again in their positions in the CBC? The Minister of Regional Economic Development stated that this philosophy of the FLQ had found its way into all levels of society. One wonders, did it find its way into the provincial police of the Province of Quebec? Did it find its way into the city police of Montreal? Certainly, the government knows whether this be so. How can the government explain, with the multitude of police officers who are searching for the kidnappers, what has happened? It is a frightening condemnation of Canadian investigation into crime that nothing effective has been done up to this moment.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Why would not the government let the Canadian people know the position concerning Mr. Cross? Is there any hope he is still alive? Surely, information like this should be made available to the Canadian people. I repeat what Mr. Pierre Trudeau, as he then was, said, along with Marc Lalonde, Maurice Pinard, Ivon Gauthier, Claude Bruneau, Raymond Breton and Albert Breton—the committee for political realism—that the opposition is the conscience of the government. I would suggest this for reading by the cabinet. I do not intend to deal with the various recommendations contained therein but they are interesting. They banish nationalism for all time. I presume this is the reason the Armed Forces have been reduced today to a trickle of the needed requirement. It says that Canadians are not to be nationalistic any more. This may be the reason NATO finds itself in danger of Canadians being withdrawn. Then it deals with political leadership. This is in 1964. Here is a striking phrase—"We deplore the absence of leadership in public affairs". What an indictment of the preceding Liberal administration. Then it says: "What is needed is a realistic policy." Today, the government speaks of the dangers of foreign investment, and intends to set up all kinds of arrangements to ensure that Canadians invest in Canada. But listen to this:

> We are not any more impressed by the cries in some English circles when American financiers buy Canadian enterprises than we are by the adoption in the Province of Quebec of economic policies based upon the slogan "maîtres chez nous".

So I could go on. It says that what we need above everything else is realism. The constitution? It says it is worthless to monkey with that; it is only an excuse.

> The derangement resulting from nationalism is particularly revealed today by the exaggerated importance given by our leading citizens to constitutional problems. Constitutional problems in Canada are far from being so serious as some would have us believe.

I could read on, but I shall not. I suggest to members of the cabinet that from now on this should be their primer, because it represents thoughts from above.

I again speak of the stands we have taken on the War Measures Act. We were opposed in our stand; we were misinterpreted. I have noticed a tremendous change in Liberal members during the past few days. They have been droopy for the last year, but they have found something now in the tragic events of recent days. And are they happy!

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Oh no, not because of what is happening, but by reason of the fact that people have for the

moment forgotten about unemployment; the problems of agriculture have passed into desuetude and labour problems are out of the way. Suddenly, we hear whispers that we might have an election.

Mr. MacEachen: I haven't heard that one, thank God.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Ah well. Is that the minister himself speaking? The minister doesn't say that over television or over an open line. He will be in difficulty if he does.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: You are scaring Tommy Douglas.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I have never been one of his followers. I have never been as closely associated with him as was the Prime Minister. But I know one thing about him. I have never found him to scare too easily.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: We placed our views before the House on the Friday and the Saturday, the 16th and 17th of October. The Prime Minister, through his House Leader, agreed to our suggestions, which were ridiculed at the time we made them. When the government did agree to changes regarding the regulations we thought were necessary, every member of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition voted in favour of the resolution. Let me underline this once and for all. I say to the Minister of Justice that he has a greater regard for Parliament than some of his colleagues have shown. In bringing in this abridged form of the War Measures Act Provisions and in fixing a term and placing this bill before Parliament, we of this party are united in its support. At the same time, we are placing ourselves clearly on record that in committee we will advocate that one or two of the terms in the new measure should be materially altered, and, above all, that each of us want to assure that no injustice such as was done to the young man I mentioned shall be repeated in other cases.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I turn, now, to the next matter I wish to discuss. This is something I cannot understand. Why did the government refuse to provide a reward? They have not been able to explain their failure to do so because there is no excuse which can be given. I remember the days when to be a member of the communist party was an offence. I prosecuted one or two of these cases; it was one of the reasons I changed my views concerning the outlawing of a thought, or of thinking. When rewards were offered evidence was forthcoming. I am interested in one change that the minister made in the regulations. Originally the provision, which is still in effect, was made that if one attended one meeting of the FLQ, one was thereby guilty of an offence, or at least there was a presumption of being a member of the FLQ against each person. I do not know who found himself in danger, but I now see they have changed the wording to "several meetings".

• (3:50 p.m.)

After four weeks the government finally decided on November 2 to announce a reward. No one can relive those dark and fearful days of the incarceration of Mr. Laporte, terminating in his death. I think on the night we heard of his death the hearts of Canadians everywhere beat in unison. That night Canada was a cathedral. Why was no reward offered? During the days when I prosecuted I found rewards always—and I say always—brought forth information. An individual who is a conspirator, with no money in his pocket and no principle in his head, is always willing to talk. No one but the government can tell us why a reward was not offered, but the government does not enlighten us.

I raised the matter the day after the kidnapping took place. It was also raised several times thereafter. But strangely enough nothing was done. Then, on October 6, as reported in *Hansard* at page 8801, I raised the matter by asking whether the government was giving consideration to offering a substantial reward. The Prime Minister replied:

> I intend to answer the question whether any consideration has been given; the answer is yes.

Finally, some businessmen in the Toronto area decided that if the government was not going to offer a reward, they would. The businessman who communicated with the government on behalf of some fine person did not want his name used, or those associated with him in Toronto, and for obvious reasons. However, he has now agreed to have his name used. I raised the matter in the House, and I will be frank and say that when I asked the question the telegram that was sent confirmed that the Prime Minister had not yet received it. The making the offer wire was sent on October 7. It was clear, it was definite, it was final.

What was the reaction to this telegram? It was addressed to the Right Honourable Pierre Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, and read as follows:

> I, Andrew Davidson,—

Then, his firm name appears.

> —represent a group who is prepared to put up $50,000.00, on a strictly confidential basis—

I mentioned what that meant at the time.

> —to anyone for information that will lead to the release of Mr. James Cross.

The telegram was signed by Andrew Davidson.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: This was the offer of a man who was uttering the thoughts of Canadians everywhere, yet the government still did not offer a reward. In the last few days there have been other offers. I know of one from a Mr. Jack McDowell, a former member of the Manitoba legislature, who offered $1,000. I do not know whether he had an acknowledgement.

I should like to read the acknowledgement to this act of patriotism by Mr. Davidson and those associated with

him. On October 8 a communication was sent to Mr. Andrew Davidson at his address at 1125 Dundas Street East, Cooksville, Ontario which read as follows:

On behalf of the Prime Minister I acknowledge receipt of your October 7 telegram. Kindly be advised that your message will be brought to Mr. Trudeau's personal attention.

That was signed by Henry Alan Lawless, secretary. Not even a letter of acknowledgement was sent to this man who was prepared to put up this money, which to me shows a disregard for the proprieties that cannot be justified. It is like telling him to go to the hot place without compliments. Not a word of appreciation has been sent to him since.

I am not going to put the Minister of Justice in an invidious position by asking him whether this matter was ever brought to his attention. I am sure it came to the attention of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion because he had knowledge that no one else had, as did the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien), who also spoke out of turn. The minister of regional affairs was not in the House when I referred to him a moment ago, but I see he has just come in.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): What did you say about me?

Mr. Diefenbaker: What I said was a most warm-hearted congratulatory wish.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Diefenbaker: This is why I felt so sorry for him when he was publicly spanked by the Prime Minister.

I now come to one other matter, and I am watching my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Order. I have been doing the same thing. The right hon. gentleman has just about reached the time allotted to him by the rules. He may continue with the agreement of the House. Is it agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I thank the members of the House. I will not burden them with quotations from the "minister of economic reconstruction", but I would suggest to him in all seriousness that from now on he stay out of the field of reciting events which the Prime Minister does not want the country to worry about. This is a course that he ought not to take.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): You know me very well.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am glad to hear the minister say that. There is nothing to take the place of experience.

I conclude with one other matter. Mention has been made today by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce of the awfulness of the experience that was his and the people of Montreal's in recent weeks. Yet no prosecutions were taken; nothing was done. For a year the government of Canada had the Saulnier report. According to Mr. Saulnier, there were two ministers of the cabinet who were opposed to a royal commission being set up to investigate the tyranny that was being perpetrated and the callous rebellious conduct that was taking place. There were two members of the cabinet, one originating in Montreal and the other is now in Ottawa. He said these two members were against the investigation.

• (4:00 p.m.)

On March 17, 1970, I think it was, the Prime Minister had a letter from Mr. Saulnier setting out the situation but nothing was ever done about it. Now what is this government doing? As if we had not had enough experience with revolutionaries, we are still continuing to let individuals from the United States come into Canada to disrupt and defy Canadian law and ridicule the police force, and to preach terror, murder and bloodshed.

A question was asked today, I think by the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), as to what was being done on the frontier to keep these individuals of the FLQ from going abroad. I am interested in finding out what is being done to keep these people out.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Goyer: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member for Dollard on a point of order.

Mr. Goyer: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order merely to correct the right hon. member on certain facts—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I should like to point out to the hon. member that he may not rise on a point of order merely to correct the statement of another member. He may, however, do so in the course of his own speech. I feel this is not really a point of order.

[*English*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: That's no point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Goyer: Mr. Speaker, would the right hon. member allow me a question?

[*English*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Not from a person showing such ignorance to the House as displayed by the hon. member up to the present time.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

An hon. Member: Disrespect for Parliament.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am always willing to answer questions from responsible members.

An hon. Member: Name them.

Mr. Baldwin: That is difficult to do.

An hon. Member: There are very few over there.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Why are these revolutionaries from the United States allowed to come into Canada to advocate revolution and having the benefit of the national CBC to spread their poison across this country at the expense of the Canadian people?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am told that they are paid, but if I ask the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) he cannot give that information because that might cause competitors to take advantage. What about Hewitt who comes to Winnipeg tomorrow, the minister of education of the Black Panthers, one of the most threatening—

An hon. Member: You can think of the words.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Yes, I can think of a lot of words to describe him and they all begin with "b". He is coming in, and when I ask these ministers over and over again why let these revolutionaries in, what do they say? They knew what was happening in Montreal and in the province of Quebec. The answer to objections being taken to keep out these people is, in effect: After all, if they speak to selected groups we should not keep them out. Freedom of speech must be upheld. Freedom of speech does not include the right to incite revolution.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Diefenbaker: These people should not be let in to Canada. In the United Kingdom, with generations of experience of liberty and freedom, one of these revolutionaries was kept out. They said, in effect: You cannot come in here. It is time this government acted to protect Canadians from the insidious influence of these people who openly advocate destruction of the government of Canada by force. I hope, and I have hoped, that the experience of the last few weeks would have caused a change of view on the part of the government. The other day the answer given respecting Hewitt was that he is going to Winnipeg to speak to a responsible group. That is no justification whatsoever for permitting United States thugs to come into Canada and act in a way that constitutes an offence against the Criminal Code of this country. They should be prosecuted. That is the welcome they should receive if they do come.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Is the hon. Minister of Regional Economic Expansion rising on a question of privilege?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Yes. Mr. Speaker.

Since yesterday, a good number of hon. members, especially the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas), have spoken about the alleged number of FLQ members. They repeat what I am supposed to have said in the House but their figures are wrong. They do not quote the right figures.

I will simply quote the words of the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands.

Mr. Speaker: I regret to interrupt the hon. minister, but there is no question of privilege here. The hon. minister should—

[*English*]

An hon. Member: He doesn't know the difference either.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

An hon. Member: Sit down.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[*Translation*]

I would like to suggest to the hon. minister that he could rise to speak when his turn comes and in due time, if only for a few minutes, in order to set the record straight. The hon. Secretary of State. (Mr. Pelletier).

[*English*]

Mr. Peters: This speech will shed a lot of darkness on the subject.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I have just heard the remark of the hon. member and I am afraid I shall never be able to enlighten him or see through the darkness of his mind.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pelletier: Having given up on that utopic objective, I should like to comment on the bill generally, on its timeliness and on some speeches heard in the House since the legislation has been before it.

I have nothing to add to what has been said until now on the substance of the proposal which, in the circumstances—I repeat, in the circumstances—is readily acceptable by those willing to face reality.

As concerns the procedure for implementing the legislation, I know that time has not yet come to deal with it and that remarks concerning one clause or an other will be in order during the committee stage only.

I also believe that by and large most objections from the leaders of the Progressive Conservative Party and the New Democratic Party have been well disproved. I shall make only one exception. I can hardly understand that the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) would state: "We hear whispers" about a forthcoming election. Mr. Speaker, I submit that if he hears such rumours at the present time, the case has to do not with parliamentary debates but with a medical branch that I shall not name.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pelletier: It might also be remembered that in the remote past someone heard similar voices, and though he said in this House that he holds me for a nonentity, I would be most aggrieved to see the hon. member being burnt on the Prince Albert market place.

But my purpose, Mr. Speaker, is mainly to deal with a certain number—

• (4:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Mackenzie King had monopoly rights on that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pelletier: I too, Mr. Speaker, listen only to the remarks of responsible members. The right hon. gentleman can therefore go on making his own; he does not bother me at all.

Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to say that at times a government can be more upset by the arguments put forward in favour of a piece of legislation it has introduced then by the arguments against it. This will lead me, as you have no doubt guessed it, to talk about many interventions of the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) and, in particular, about the speech which he delivered yesterday afternoon. I regret that he is not in his seat—I was not here either when he made against me some rather virulent accusations, which I have just picked up in *Hansard*. Besides, I often find it somewhat difficult to get in touch with the hon. member for Témiscamingue. For instance, I remember waiting seven weeks to reply to a question he had asked me, so that if I were to postpone my remarks today until he were here, this could take long.

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The hon. member for Abitibi on a question of privilege.

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Secretary of State, if he wants to be honest, to tell the House whether, during the seven weeks he mentioned, he was here himself?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. I am not sure whether this is a question of privilege. I would however suggest that it is contrary to our rules to allude to the presence or absence of hon. members and I do not think this is contributing to our proceedings.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Pelletier: Very well Mr. Speaker. I assure you I will comply with this advice most diligently.

[*English*]

Mr. Woolliams: Nor his personal attacks.

Mr. Duquet: That is what you do all the time.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pelletier: Mr. Speaker, I was about to say that I find quite upsetting the arguments used yesterday by the member for Témiscamingue to support this measure.

I wish to add that, for some time now, the leader of the Ralliement créditiste has expressed similar views to support the War Measures Act being invoked. I congratulate him for having seen the danger that was threatening the province of Quebec and Canada because of the present crisis; unfortunately my congratulations must stop here. I must also tell him, through you, Mr. Speaker, that I am not the only one who has been deeply troubled about some of the stands he took. When, for example, he suggested that, without trial, presumed members of the FLQ, already detained, should be placed before a firing squad and that ten of them should be executed for each one of the hostages held by the FLQ, I do not think that he was speaking in a responsible manner, nor in a manner worthy of a civilized nation.

If we followed the advice of the hon. member for Témiscamingue in that matter, we would be using the same monstrous methods of which we are the victims at the hands of the FLQ, we would lower ourselves to the level of the terrorists whom we are fighting.

At best I can only ascribe to thoughtlessness the remarks of the hon. member for Témiscamingue. But I am astonished that thoughtlessness could last so long, as it is well known that he has repeated this suggestion several times, apparently without realizing that it pertains not only to a police state, which in the same breath he meant to condem, but also to the Nazi and Fascist states of the thirties. On reading these suggestions I could not help but recall, Mr. Speaker, an admission made by the hon. member for Témiscamingue several years ago to the effect that in his youth he had greatly admired Hitler and Mussolini.

At that time I was a newspaperman and I remember having stood up for him against certain Toronto papers which had taken his statement seriously and because of it, thought the member for Témiscamingue was a Nazi who would not shy away from assassination. I stood up for him at the time; I must admit that in the last few days I have been wondering whether I did the right thing.

I should also like to point out that the member for Témiscamingue has twisted the truth, when he stated many times, without any evidence or foundation, and I quote:

> The government knows who are the FLQ leaders.

This statement not only flies in the face of facts, but I dare say that it is utterly ridiculous. In times such as those we are now going through, the ridiculous easily takes a tragical turn.

Just yesterday, speaking to the House, the leader of the Ralliement Créditiste made the following assertion, which was echoed—not at all to my surprise—by the rt. hon. representative for Prince-Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) who, by chance, is leaving the House as I say these words.

This is what the leader of the Ralliement Créditiste said:

If last year, the government had acted when Mr. Lucien Saulnier disclosed to them not rumors, but facts which were taking place in Quebec, Mr. Laporte would still be alive today.

That accusation, Mr. Speaker, has been reiterated many times by the leader of the Ralliement Créditiste. It has been brought forward again in the House this very afternoon. I believe it is absolutely essential that the facts be clarified and replaced in their true light. First of all, when the hon. member for Témiscamingue says that the charges laid at that time by the chairman of the executive committee of the city of Montreal did not bring about any initiative on the part of the government, his statement is not based on facts. I should like to point out that all the details then submitted to the attention of the government were carefully considered by the government and that the latter felt at that time that there was not enough evidence to take proceedings against the said individuals. It has also been established—which was known by everybody—that had there been enough evidence the Quebec authorities had all the freedom they needed, had even the responsibility to institute the said proceedings.

With respect to the suggestion that a royal inquiry on security be appointed, it must be said that this also was discussed. And the replies given about it were far from evasive, no matter what the right hon. member from Prince Albert said a while ago. On the contrary, the reaction was most specific. As for the references and insinuations he also made on the particular role played by the two ministers, I wonder whether the right hon. member from Prince Albert has realized it, but his allegations are far from reflecting the facts.

When one says that the government has not taken any action, in my opinion, he is deluding the people of Canada because actually the government did do something. Indeed, there was action taken concerning this whole problem by having recourse to the police forces. And as regards the Company of Young Canadians, some sort of control was exercised. This House has even brought in basic changes to the Company of Young Canadians Act through a government bill.

Of course, facts do not greatly disturb the hon. member for Témiscamingue who, in his speech yesterday said:

What are the avowed aims of the organization of the Company of Young Canadians and the FLQ?

One would think that the hon. member is not aware of the reforms that took place. He certainly is not aware of the change in orientation within the Company, and I am terribly surprised. As a matter of fact, when he puts the Company on the same level as the FLQ in 1970, at the time I am speaking, the hon. member for Shefford, (Mr. Rondeau) his seatmate, was asking less than a month ago, for two more volunteers from the Company of Young Canadians to serve on a project undertaken in his riding because he feels that this project will help the citizens he represents.

The hon. member for Témiscamingue also said that the special law was not required and that the provisions of the Criminal Code are sufficient. This will be my last comment, Mr. Speaker, but I will venture to say—and I do not think the hon. member for Témiscamingue will be offended—that as I do not consider myself as having in judicial matters the ability to judge such a delicate subject, I am not inclined to recognize that he has any either.

I believe that we are facing a sad but real need. I was sick at heart when I agreed with the government's decision to proclaim the War Measures Act. I will not be happy, either, to vote in favour of the bill now under study. I will do it only because I believe that criminal attempts, extraordinary situations call for extraordinary measures and, with a clear conscience, however painful it may be, the party in power cannot shirk its duties.

As for me, I respect very deeply the views of those who oppose this bill. I envy them to have been able to persuade themselves that the terrorist threat does not require emergency measures, which inevitably limit the personal freedoms that, for my part, I consider fundamental, if not sacred.

Had I arrived at the same conclusions, I should benefit from a moral comfort which I envy them. But such is not the case. They have the courage of their convictions. And as we see how seriously terrorism is threatening freedoms and even human lives, we must also have the courage of our own convictions.

And we formulate but one wish, Mr. Speaker: that the need for these special measures disappear as soon as possible, that freedoms should be not only restored but strengthened, that we should get out of the present nightmare the tragic paradox of which is that the rights of the individual are threatened from all sides, that is to say, on one side by terrorism and, on the other side, we have to recognize it, by the very abuse of measures that terrorism makes necessary.

• (4:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Nowlan: Would the minister permit a question?

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Will the hon. minister allow the hon. member for Annapolis Valley (Mr. Nowlan) to ask him a question?

[*English*]

Mr. Nowlan: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was very interested in the remarks of the minister. I should like to know if the minister could tell the House whether he was one of the ministers, presumably along with the Solicitor General (Mr. McIlraith) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), who reviewed the evidence given to the committee to which he referred in his speech, and referred to in the Broadcasting Committee report? I draw particular attention to the last sentence in that report, which was tabled in this House on December 5, 1969, which specifically recommended that Mr. Saulnier's evidence be submitted to the appropriate ministers for consideration and review. Before the Solicitor

General speaks to the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier), may I ask the Secretary of State, was there any formal review of that by a cabinet committee or by any individual minister, and was there a formal reply sent to Mr. Saulnier outlining what the appropriate ministers of the government thought about that evidence at that time?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pelletier: Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that the allegations have been submitted to the minister in charge. Not being the minister in charge, I cannot say what transpired by way of reports and exchanges of correspondence between a cabinet member and the Chairman of the Executive Council of the City of Montreal.

[*English*]

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I wish to begin my remarks this afternoon with two fairly short quotations from a well known Canadian author. They are in French, and are as follows:

[*Translation*]

As a consequence, when a man is unjustly treated by a given form of authority, all other men are guilty, because they have led the authority to such abuse by their silence and their consent. If they ceased to approve, the authority would fall down.

[*English*]

The second short quotation, particularly for the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), is:

[*Translation*]

Democracy acknowledges that one person may be right and 99 wrong. And this is why in a democracy freedom of speech is deemed sacred: that lone person must always have the right to proclaim his truth in the hope that he can get the 99 others to change their minds.

[*English*]

As hon. members may have guessed if they did not know, these two quotations are from the writings of Pierre Elliott Trudeau and are contained in articles in a weekly called *Vrai—True*—Published in 1958. They were relevant and right then; they are relevant and right now. It is the man who has changed, and the views of that man have changed. Those of us who stand by the views which he then expressed ought to have at least the ear of people who may disagree instead of the loud, shrill tongue which the Minister of Justice used yesterday. I want to remind hon. members of the House right at the outset that there have already been abuses in the application of the War Measures Act and the regulations under it, great abuses.

• (4:30 p.m.)

The Prime Minister, who was a teacher and citizen, wrote that when one man is unjustly treated all other men are guilty. This was the kind of consideration we had in mind when we wanted to be convinced with much more than the government then gave us, that there ought not to be a situation permitted where men could be unjustly treated

As the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) informed us, Mr. Speaker, as of today 372 Canadians have been incarcerated, swept into jail, kept there incommunicado from six to 16, to 18 days and then released. In most cases they have been unable to speak with their wives. After the first few days of their incarceration, they were allowed to write a note which the police or some jail guard read to their wives over the telephone. I am not guessing when I say this because I have spoken with quite a few men who were in jail and who came out. According to my information, all of them have been finger printed, photographed and now have a police file. I understand some have lost their jobs. All of them find it difficult to explain to their neighbours and their children why they were incarcerated for days and not interrogated for any more than ten or 15 minutes. Yesterday when I asked the Minister of Justice a question along this line he looked sort of disdainful—I hope he looked as disdainful about the fact that it was done. Those I have spoken to inform me that they were asked questions, the most stupid and irrelevant questions imaginable, that had nothing to do with the situation for which they were arrested and taken out of circulation.

These 372 men and women have no remedy, Mr. Speaker. One of them is a famous singer who has already suffered loss of contracts. There were authors, as well as ordinary workers, but none of these 372 Canadians who suffered this abuse of the law has any recourse or remedy because of the immense and unnecessary power the government insisted on taking on October 16, 1970.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lewis: Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that among those arrested were people whose job was that of community worker. There were people who organized the poor to protest against their condition, people who, as a matter of fact, were in the pay of the provincial government of Quebec to do just that and who did nothing other than that, because they were released without charge after a ten minute irrelevant interrogation. It is important to note that these leaders of the poor, of the unemployed and of welfare people in the communities, were among those arrested.

Why were they taken out of circulation if it was not for the purpose of making it impossible for those organizations to continue to serve the poor people of Quebec?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Lewis: The minister shakes his head but facts are facts. They were jailed; they were released, and there were no charges. They were hardly interrogated, so there could have been no reason in the minds of the police for arresting them. I am not saying that the Minister of Justice or even the Attorney General of Quebec is responsible. One of the great disadvantages of these excessive powers is that they come eventually into the hands of the police. Day to day and hour to hour, it is the police who administer these powers, not the Minister of Justice or the Attorney General of Quebec. I am not saying that the police are not as good citizens as anyone

else, but they are a group of men mainly concerned with criminals and crime. They ought to be concerned with the members of the FLQ, and I will come back to that in a moment, but they are not people who can appreciate the work done by the leader of a group of poor people. The moment these leaders say something against the government, which no doubt they do and I hope they continue to say such things but for good social reasons, they are hauled into jail.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Lewis: Members opposite can groan as much as they like. If they have the courage to see things as they are they will recognize that there was abuse, instead of groaning at what I say.

An hon. Member: Phony.

Mr. Lewis: I say, Mr. Speaker, that as these facts of the unnecessary and unjust treatment of 372 Canadians today—by tomorrow it may easily be 380, 390 or closer to 400—become clear, then I am confident that the sense of decency and justice of all the people in Canada will overcome the panic and hysteria which the Prime Minister of this country deliberately created by some of his speeches made over television to the people of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Let the people of Canada decide.

Mr. Lewis: When they look at the situation more closely they will want to know, as we do, all the facts, if indeed the government ever had any more facts. I will come to that in a moment, too, but they will want to know all the facts that led to the proclamation of the War Measures Act.

I ask hon. members, and if I may through the galleries I ask the people of Canada, to look at what the results have been of the imposition of these extraordinarily repressive powers.

An hon. Member: No more terrorism.

Mr. Lewis: Three hundred and seventy-two people have suffered, but what have the police accomplished? In my speech on the first day, October 16, I said that I doubted whether this step would be efficacious for the purpose intended and, unfortunately, I proved to be right. I will come to the reason I said that in just a moment. One did not have to be a genius to see that it would not be efficacious. The fact is that what we have had over many years is a total failure of all the police forces involved to do a job that should have been done before the crisis landed on the people of Canada and the people of Quebec. I said that on October 16 and I repeat it. The federal police, the provincial police and the Montreal police knew of the FLQ for eight or ten years. I have read a report which states that they even know how many cells there are in the FLQ. The report says 22.

An hon. Member: You know more than the rest of us.

Mr. Lewis: There was the brutal murder of Mr. Laporte after the War Measures Act was introduced, but there were some half dozen murders before that over the last number of years. There have been bombings since 1962 or 1963. The dynamite and ammunition and arms that were stolen were not stolen just last year. There have been suspicions for years now that the FLQ had stolen them.

As a member of this House and a citizen of Canada, I think I have a right to ask the government, where was the Royal Canadian Mounted Police? What did the government do to strengthen that force? What did the government do to increase the number of French speaking members in that force to deal with this particular situation in Quebec? What did the government do to increase its security arrangements in Quebec in order to avoid the deaths, the kidnappings and the crisis that was later created? So far as one can tell, Mr. Speaker, little indeed was done.

• (4:40 p.m.)

I read a report in the Toronto *Telegram* on October 26 by a writer, Robert MacDonald. May I be permitted to put several paragraphs on the record. The story begins this way:

> Montreal's combined anti-terrorist squad failed dismally to infiltrate the terrorist FLQ because it had no money in its budget for that purpose, according to some police sources here.

The next paragraph, in quotes, reads:

> 'That lack has been the major weakness in our entire investigation of the Cross and Laporte kidnappings,' commented a police official.

The next paragraph, also is in quotes, and reads:

> 'Oh, we will be getting the money now but it is like closing the barn door after the horse has been stolen,' he said.
>
> The squad, known as The Combatters, has been in charge of the FLQ investigations. It had a pre-crisis hard core of about 30 top men which has been swelled to over 100 at present.
>
> Montreal police predominate its membership but other key men are from the RCMP and Quebec Provincial Police.
>
> 'No wonder much of our information on the FLQ is about two years out of date. We had almost no one working from within the terrorist cells,' said one official.
>
> The squad had some members moving about the city in hippie-type attire with long hair and beads but simply had no money to have special agents move in completely with the FLQ organization and the same lack of funds applied to paying informers.

Of course, I do not know whether the story is true. I do not know whether the officials who spoke to this reporter related facts. I am not saying they are facts. I am saying, however, that the fact police officials said these things to this reporter is important. I have read the same kind of thing in the reports of many other reporters in a number of newspapers.

If it is a fact, as I believe it to be, that through all the years when we knew of the existence of the FLQ and of the bombings and murders that have taken place this government sat back and hoped that the organization would disappear, then I say, Mr. Speaker, this government carries a very great responsibility for what has happened in Quebec, and that is so even from the point of view of police responsibilities and police work. There is no excuse for the government's facing the crisis in October, 1970, if, as has already been said, one year ago

it received the report on security wherein the dangers in Quebec were emphasized. But again, nothing was done to deal with this situation.

I am raising this subject, Mr. Speaker, not only because it is important for the people of Canada to know what was done to get rid of the terrorists and criminals in Quebec before October 16, 1970, but because the government is responsible for its omissions as well as for all it has done, and because the failure shown by all police forces with regard to this particular situation is frightening. Anyone who has no illusions about this situation will admit, if not to me then to himself, that the present action will not necessarily rid us of the kind of activity the FLQ has carried on in Quebec. Whether or not the government is successful in putting the FLQ members behind bars,—and it has not been so yet—the situation in that province and in other disadvantaged areas of Canada is such that one cannot be certain this sort of activity and criminality may not recur. The failure of all our police forces to deal with the situation before October, 1970, makes one concerned about the future. That is why I have risen to speak this afternoon.

The Minister of Justice in his speech yesterday began by saying to us, "Let us not rake the past; let us deal with this bill." Then, having salved his conscience on that point, he went on to spend most of his time raking the past and attacking the NDP, particularly my leader and myself.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, why did he do that? I sat and listened to him, and wondered. There were 16 of us in this House who voted against that measure. And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, without raising my voice that I am proud we had the depth of conviction to make a stand for the principle we believed in, even in a moment of panic and hysteria. I make no apologies for that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: But we were 16 members of this House who voted against the measure, and the minister said that the vast majority of the people in Canada supported what the government did.

An hon. Member: True.

Mr. Lewis: Somebody says, true. One hundred and ninety Members of Parliament voted for the measure. What was it really that needled the minister's conscience and that required some 30 minutes in which to attack those 16 people who voted against his bill, when he had the support of all the people in Canada? I will suggest why that was, Mr. Speaker: first, because the minister himself was uncomfortable about what had happened. I give him credit for that kind of conscience.

Mr. Greene: Now, the hon. member is being a psychologist.

Mr. Lewis: Second, he knew that questions were being asked across this country by many people who had originally supported the government's step, and third, he had seen a large number of newspaper comments which questioned the necessity even of the bill now before us.

An hon. Member: Which way will the hon. member's party vote?

Mr. Lewis: So, he did the usual thing that I suppose we all do in politics. Instead of dealing with the matter he ought to have dealt with, namely, the bill and what he had said, he set out on a shrill attack. I am not complaining about that.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Lewis: I was rather flattered that the minister took the time. But I want to underline that he would not have had a reason for so doing if he were not, in his conscience, concerned about what had been passed by his government and by him—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: —and if he were not aware of the fact that increasingly more people in Canada are questioning the rightness of that action.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: I wish to ask the minister a question. I shall ask some of the other ministers questions, too. It is about a matter he ought to have dealt with yesterday. He said on October 16:

> It is my hope that some day the full details of the intelligence upon which the government acted can be made public, because until that day comes the people of Canada will not be able fully to appraise the course of action which has been taken by the government.

I ask the Minister of Justice, Mr. Speaker; was he telling the truth when he said that?

An hon. Member: Sure, he was.

Mr. Lewis: When he said that, were his words based on information or was he deliberately writing a scenario to justify an action which could not be justified until then?

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Lewis: That is what I ask the minister directly. Did he have information for that very important statement? I repeat: what the minister said was that until the people of Canada have the information which is in his possession we will not be able to appraise the real reasons for the action. Let me tell him that we are still not able to appraise it—not the members of this House and not the people of Canada. If he had information, he had a duty to give it to us. He has not repeated that kind of statement since the Prime Minister set the line by saying that all the information is now public and nothing else counts.

An hon. Member: Pipe down.

Mr. Lewis: The minister shut up, as every member of the cabinet does, when the Prime Minister nodded his head. He has not repeated this very important statement. When he made that statement, either it was a statement of fact, or it was a statement of fiction. If it was fact, the minister ought to tell us what he was talking about; if it was fiction, then the Canadian people were taken in, in a way that is dishonourable in politics and in this Parliament.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: I ask the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand, Langelier) this question.

An hon. Member: It is his turn now.

Mr. Lewis: When he said to the House that there were between 1,000 and 3,000 FLQ members who had infiltrated the highest places in Quebec, was he talking fact or was he talking fiction?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please.

• (4:50 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. Does the minister wish to ask a question of privilege?

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Mr. Speaker, this is exactly the sentence that was quoted by the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas). I have never in this House stated what is purported to have been said.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): Here are the words which—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. It is the duty of the Chair to point out once again to the minister that he cannot disprove what has been said by an hon. member unless he takes part in the debate. Otherwise, questions of privilege would be too numerous, which would delay the business of the House.

[*English*]

Mr. Lewis: Strictly speaking, Mr. Speaker, the minister is right about what he said.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Lewis: Don't yell "hurray" so fast. Strictly speaking, the minister is right about what he said in this House, although I was not far off even at that. I will read that in a moment. Over the air he said, from 1,000 to 3,000 members. I have seen that in reports.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Lewis: If the minister says he did not say that in this House, he did say it outside the House. What the Minister did say in the House is recorded at page 224 of *Hansard* and reads as follows:

> But, from the moment when threats are caried out, then the danger increases. And by whom are they carried out? By two or three men with guns who have kidnapped one or two people? No, Mr. Speaker!
>
> The situation is much more serious than that. Any person having knowledge of the FLQ organization in the province of Quebec at the present time cannot but be aware that the state of Quebec and the federal state are truly in danger in Canada.
>
> Why? The most pessimist say that the FLQ has some 3,000 members.

Mr. Marchand (Langelier): "Most pessimist".

Mr. Lewis: The Minister of Regional Economic Expansion was a trade union leader. I say to him that in my long experience I have not heard any lawyer be quite as tortuous as the minister is now being about what he said on another occasion.

Mr. Greene: Of course, you were not much of a lawyer.

Mr. Lewis: Why should the minister have said, "The most pessimist"?

An hon. Member: You are the accuser.

Mr. Lewis: That's right, and if you will keep quiet I will prove it.

Why did the minister refer to what most pessimists say if not to frighten the people of Canada? Why did he not refer to what most optimists say?

Mr. Greene: Why did you misquote his statement?

Mr. Lewis: Why did he refer outside the House to 1,000 to 3,000 members? The next part is equally or even more important:

> I do not know if that figure is accurate, but I am aware that there are quite a few.
>
> And I know something else; these people have infiltrated every strategic place in the province of Quebec, every place where important decisions are taken, and without giving complete details let us say that at the present time they are in a position to cause the Quebec and the federal governments, as well as the city of Montreal, irreparable harm, with the support of outside organizations which are not necessarily in agreement as to the measures taken because it is well organized.

Was the minister telling us something that he knew was fact, that there were FLQ members who infiltrated every strategic place in the province of Quebec, every place where important decisions are taken, and that they are at the present time in a position to cause Quebec and Canada irreparable harm? If it is fact, the minister has a duty to tell this House and the people of Canada those facts. If it is fiction to frighten the Canadian people, as I suspect in fact it is, then I say that is as reprehensible as the former.

When the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien) says there are facts which the people of Canada may never know, I say to him and to this government if what he said is true we are entitled to know. The minister has no right to hide behind it. If what the minister said is not true, he is misleading the people of Canada in a way which is too serious in a situation like the present.

I ask the Minister of Justice what he meant by the phrase "erosion of will"? To what was the minister referring? What did the Prime Minister mean by, "confusion

in the province of Quebec"? Where they talking about the fact that some people in Quebec believed there should be negotiations with the terrorists? If that is the extent of the erosion of will, I ask the Minister of Justice whether that justifies bringing the War Measures Act into operation?

I wish to make clear, Mr. Speaker, that I do not fault the government for refusing to negotiate with the kidnappers. No one in our party raised any such question during the first week that Mr. Laporte, and Mr. Cross were in jeopardy, because they were in jeopardy. I agree that it was impossible for the federal government or the government of Quebec to start on a course which meant giving in to a terrorist organization. Let me make that clear. However, if they were not merely referring to a number of men who, in their judgment, felt that two lives should be saved by negotiating or to the confusion in the cabinet of Mr. Bourassa, and it is well known there was division, what was it? Since when does confusion and erosion, whatever in heaven's name those words mean, provide reasons for proclaiming a statute such as the War Measures Act? I wish to state that all the statements to which I have referred were not made by members of the opposition. We did not make accusations against FRAP. It was the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): May I ask the hon. member a question?

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. The Chair feels that if the minister wishes to direct a question to the hon. member for York South, he should direct it to the Chair so that the Chair can decide whether the question is in order. At the same time, the Chair might also know the answer.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, you are always in my mind. I was directing the question through Your Honour to see if the hon. member for York South would accept it. The hon. member just said that no members of the opposition have made statements. I wonder whether he did say to the students at Carleton University that there was:

—probable infiltration by the FLQ into the Quebec police forces—

—for which he blamed the failure to recover kidnap victims James Cross and Pierre Laporte.

That was reported in the October 24 issue of the Ottawa *Journal*.

Mr. Lewis: As a matter of fact, and I did not speak from notes, I do not recollect that those were the words I used.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

An hon. Member: Misquoted again.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. The hon. member will have an opportunity to pursue the answer after the supper adjournment.

Message from Senate

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed the following bills to which the concurrence of this House is desired:

Bill S-4, an act to implement an agreement amending the Trade Agreement between Canada and New Zealand.

Bill S-7, an act to repeal the Leprosy Act.

[*Translation*]

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of Private Members' business as listed on today's Order Paper, namely, Private Bills, Notices of Motions (Papers), Public Bills.

[*English*]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I believe that if we were to proceed with the private members' hour, one of our motions would be called. We are quite prepared for this hour to be given to the debate now in progress.

Mr. MacEachen: Mr. Speaker, I am quite ready, in the normal course, to co-operate with the hon. member. It was not possible to negotiate such an arrangement earlier. We are prepared to go ahead with the private members' hour or to continue with this debate. I suggest that in future the hon. member consult through the normal channels in order that we on this side may be prepared.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. The minister's memory must be failing.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. At this time the Chair can only ask if there is unanimous consent.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I rise on a question of privilege. I ask the minister to check his memory. Earlier today I discussed with him the possibility of giving up the hour between five o'clock and six o'clock. I am only suggesting now what has already been discussed and agreed to.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. MacEachen: All I can say is that I have totally forgotten that conversation, but I accept the hon. member's word. If he said those things, I must have forgotten. I do not remember that at all, but I accept the hon. member's suggestion that he did. I know he talked about what we might do later tonight. But it is not very important in view of what has been said.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The House has heard the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. Is there agreement that we dispense with Private Members' Hour and pursue the study and debate of Bill C-181?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Public Order Act, 1970

PUBLIC ORDER (TEMPORARY MEASURES) ACT, 1970

PROVISION OF EMERGENCY POWERS FOR PRESERVATION OF PUBLIC ORDER

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton) that Bill C-181, to provide temporary emergency powers for the Preservation of Public Order in Canada, be read the second time and referred to a Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Lewis: The Minister of Justice questioned me and I told him, as far as my memory went, these are not the words I used. However, I did suggest, as I did in this House on October 16, that there had been such infiltration and this was one of the difficulties the police faced. I was talking about what the ministers have said, and I was questioning the reason for the statement made by the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) about FRAP, a statement which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) immediately rejected, saying he did not approve of it. This statement smeared a lot of innocent people, and could not but have been designed to hurt FRAP in the municipal elections. The minister said at the time he did not want to enter into the municipal elections, and having said that he entered them with both feet. Not only he, but his friend the Mayor of Montreal, Jean Drapeau did so. According to members opposite, this Mayor of Montreal, who does not have the reputation of being the most progressive man in Canada, is now a great hero. He followed the minister in making the same kind of statement against FRAP.

An hon. Member: What is wrong with it?

Mr. Lewis: What is wrong with it? It happens to be untrue; the minister knew it and he retracted it as did the Prime Minister. That is what was wrong with the statement. It happens to be untrue. It happens to be true that there were many people in FRAP, most of them having nothing to do with the FLQ, who believed in the democratic process and who entered into the municipal election in Montreal democratically for the purpose of breaking the one party state which now governs Montreal. Anyone who set out to smear this organization, anyone who set out to smear all the people in this organization, has a great deal to account for in terms of proper democratic procedure.

Then, we heard rumours about a plot to upset the government of Quebec. The Prime Minister kept on saying they were rumours. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I know from completely reliable sources that at least two members of the government spoke to other people and told them about this plot before I saw stories in the press. If the Prime Minister does not know this, he can easily find out. It is not for me to name the ministers, but I say on my responsibility as a member of this House that I know from the most reliable sources, the people directly concerned, that at least two ministers spread this rumour long before I saw it in the press.

[The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel).]

Why was this rumour spread? Why did the Prime Minister not deny it when he knew it was not true, that there was no such plot, that there was only a lot of chit-chat in the editorial of *Le Devoir* and a lot of chit-chat between Mr. Ryan, Mr. Saulnier and Mr. Bourassa? When this matter was raised in the House, the first day, I telephoned Mr. Ryan, Mr. Laberge and Mr. Pepin. I spoke to Mr. Ryan; I could not get the other two gentlemen. He told me what happened, exactly as it appeared in his editorial in *Le Devoir* last Friday. The Prime Minister knew of these facts. The members of the cabinet knew of these facts. They knew perfectly well that as long as these rumours were allowed to continue, two things would happen. One was that Mr. Ryan and the group of men with him would, in the minds of the rest of Canada, be discredited and seem like traitors. They also knew that if the people in Canada from coast to coast read that there was "a plot to take over the government of Quebec" the only thing they would think about would be the FLQ using force to take over Quebec.

This is what I said over the air. This is what the Minister of Justice took exception to yesterday. I will say it again in this House in his presence, that I believe from the facts that the reason no one in the government denied these rumours about a provisional government was that the government liked the idea that these false rumours were going about because they hoped it would underpin their War Measures Act in the eyes of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Shame.

Mr. Lewis: This is the only possible reason why honourable men, men honourable in all other respects, would want to see other honourable men smeared and regarded as traitors. There can be no other reason why they would not deny those rumours, because they knew the facts, except that they liked a rumour which helped them to fool the people about the kind of thing which is taking place. The fact of the matter is that those of us who opposed the imposition of the War Measures Act are now proved to be entirely right by the bill which is before the House today.

Some hon. Members: Oh.

Mr. Lewis: This bill merely recites the reason for the War Measures Act having come into force as having been apprehended insurrection, but no longer are we dealing with apprehended insurrection as far as this bill is concerned; we are dealing with public disorder, and the facts I have already recited show that the powers which the government took were far too wide even in the regulations under the War Measures Act. It may be very well for the Minister of Justice to say that when we emphasized that the War Measures Act gave the government total power we were not being intellectually honest, or something like that. Well, when I have to take lessons in that line from the hon. gentleman or from any other member of the Liberal party, I shall quit politics.

An hon. Member: Quit now.

• (5:10 p.m.)

Mr. Lewis: I am tempted to say to the minister that a Liberal preaching intellectual honesty is like a street-walker preaching virtue. When we said the government was given power under the War Measures Act I always added, and my leader always added, that we knew it was implemented by regulation and that there had been only one regulation. Although I hope the War Measures Act will be withdrawn within a few days, the point I made as long ago as October 16 was that no man should be given the kind of power that the War Measures Act gives. If the act had remained in force, as was the intention of the government, until April 30 next, I shudder to think what other orders in council we might have had, had the situation in certain parts of Canada, in the mind of the government, so required.

My leader explained yesterday the reasons we felt we should vote for this bill on second reading. I agree with the reasons he gave, as do, so far as I know, all my colleagues. But I want to make it clear that, as far as I personally am concerned, I am not entirely convinced that these extended, extraordinary powers are in their totality needed. However, it is the only way we know to get the War Measures Act revoked immediately; certainly, this is what we wish as quickly as possible. It is the only way we know whereby we can bring this bill to committee of the whole and there try to improve it.

I understand that not only members of the opposition but members in the government ranks have some amendments to propose. If the government is going to be adamant in this regard, its action will be entirely inexcusable. If the government insists on retaining the retroactivity provisions in clause 8 of the bill, if it refuses to accept an amendment that seeks to set up what I call a supervisory commission, if it refuses to include in the bill an amendment that I expect a member of the official opposition to present in regard to an independent committee, if it refuses to take away some of these unnecessary powers now contained in the bill, then I will have reason to wonder what it is the government wants, merely power or power for a purpose.

I will suggest in debate in committee of the whole that the bill need not be weakened in the slightest; that it can be improved by interfering less with the civil liberties of people yet be entirely sufficient for the task the bill intends to tackle. We do not weaken the bill when making suggestions from the point of view of its purpose; we seek to improve it from the point of view of the rights and liberties of people. This is why I expect the government to pay attention to what we say.

Since my time is almost up, may I conclude by repeating what I and my leader said on October 16. My reading of history leads me to the conclusion that no group of people consisting of perhaps 30, 50 or 100 men and women only—certainly this is what police work indicates is the size of the group in Quebec—no group of terrorists, can possibly threaten democracy unless social and economic conditions are such that it feels strengthened by the frustration of the young, the despair of the old and the resentment of the many. It is this kind of condition in society that strengthens subversive, terrorist elements. Without this condition these elements would not even attempt the things they did. And if they did attempt them, they would be easily caught.

As far as I am concerned, naming the FLQ as an illegal organization in the bill does not worry me because, in my opinion as a lawyer, they are not a political organization. They are a criminal conspiracy, a seditious conspiracy. They are in fact an organization against the law. Therefore, if you want to call them illegal in an act, I do not get upset about it because obviously they are an unlawful, criminal, seditious conspiracy, and they have been for eight years.

Mr. Woolliams: And they are contravening the Criminal Code of Canada.

Mr. Lewis: They are contravening the Criminal Code and have been for eight years. But this little group could not have constituted a threat in Montreal and Quebec in the way they did were not the conditions of the people in the province so dire and regrettable.

Let me repeat what I said on October 16. The government that was supposed to unite Canada has created a situation where separatism in the province of Quebec is stronger today than it ever was in my knowledge of the province, and I have known it well for many years.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I realize the hon. member indicated that he was moving to the conclusion of his speech, but I must advise the House that his time has expired. Is there consent among the members of the House that the hon. member conclude his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Lewis: I will not be long, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacEachen: We want a strong and eloquent conclusion.

Mr. Lewis: You have had it already; don't ask for too much. If I get started again, I shall have something to say to the house leader as well. However, I will not take the time. I was speaking of certain conditions but I did not say they produced the FLQ. I am not saying, as the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) thought I was saying two weeks ago last Friday, that these social and economic conditions produced the FLQ. They do that, too, because terrorists grow in that kind of soil. Criminals and terrorists are produced in a wide variety of psychological ways that I am not competent enough even to try to understand. What I am saying is that they would be no danger to Montreal, to Quebec or to Canada were not the government, indeed all of us together, responsible for social and economic conditions that in many parts of Canada, including the constituencies of the house leader and the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen), which are unforgiveable.

These conditions are particularly bad in the province of Quebec.

May I emphasize what I said. This bill will not guarantee, any more than would the War Measures Act, that there will not be terrorism in the future. It is not going to guarantee that terrorists may not receive sympathy from some people, as was the case with the FLQ. It is not going to guarantee that there will not be serious disorders in the future. The only thing that can make this less likely—though nothing is certain in this life—is a program that is directly aimed at the province of Quebec.

As a member of the House I would not raise any objection to such a program, assuming that it was sensibly planned for the people of the province rather than for foreign corporations, as has been the case until now. If it were sensibly planned for the people of the province of Quebec, as a member of the House, I would feel the future unity of Canada deserves special sorts of measures as the NDP suggested three or four years ago, special arrangements to meet a dangerous situation in that province. Some little time ago I may have hoped that the government would take a positive, constructive attitude and produce some really progressive plans. Mr. Speaker, I regret to say that the more I watch our Prime Minister and the rest of his cabinet in action, the less faith I have in their grasp or even in their understanding of the real problems.

• (5:20 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. T. Lefebvre (Pontiac): Mr. Speaker, I have listened carefully to the speech delivered by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) on Bill C-181, entitled "An Act to provide temporary emergency powers for the preservation of public order in Canada," and I will come back to it later on.

On October 16 last, we were informed of the government's decision to invoke the War Measures Act for the first time in peacetime. On that occasion, the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) asked the unanimous consent of the House to introduce his motion. He told us that such powers were absolutely necessary to deal with a state of apprehended insurrection in the province of Quebec, following a message received from the Quebec government and the Montreal civic authorities, as reported on page 193 of Hansard.

There was unanimous consent, and the Prime Minister stated precisely the reasons why the government had decided to enforce the War Measures Act. Furthermore, he made it clear that he was truly sorry and deeply worried that the situation called for such action.

Mr. Speaker, I also supported that measure reluctantly, but being convinced it was the only logical step to take in the circumstances, I voted for the enforcement of that act. I am still convinced that this was the only adequate solution left to the government.

The Prime Minister promised the same day, as reported on page 194 of Hansard, and I quote:

Following the passage of enough time to give the government the necessary experience to assess the type of statute which may be required in these circumstances, it is my firm intention to discuss with the leaders of the opposition parties the desirability of introducing legislation of a less comprehensive nature.

Later on, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) made the same promise. He stated specifically that a new act would be introduced in the House within thirty days.

Mr. Speaker, the minister kept his word and, on November 2, he introduced, to replace the War Measures Act, an act whose short title is *Public Order (Temporary Measures) Act, 1970.*

I wish to congratulate the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice for having kept their word, and I am more proud than ever for being a government member.

The present situation in Canada and more particularly in Quebec is very serious. Let us hope that we shall soon be able to forget that period of our history and pursue together the unification of this country so that it may be the most peaceful in the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to support the government and to vote for that new legislation, for I am still convinced it is not yet time to give ground. We must give the police forces the necessary powers to perform their most important duty, namely to destroy the FLQ once and for all, bring back to Quebec and the whole of Canada peace and quietness and dispell the fear spread by bandits whose aim is to destroy our society.

I am not afraid at all to support that new piece of legislation because I am convinced that should the police arrest innocent people by mistake, they will still be far better in the hands of the police than in those of the FLQ bandits.

[*English*]

How does a member of this House feel, Mr. Speaker, when he is confronted with a law such as we were confronted with a short time ago, giving wide powers to our police forces for the first time in Canada's history in peacetime? Like our Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and most other members of the House, I abhor violence in all its forms, and dread removing liberties from any citizen, unless it is proven to me that the situation is such that no other way is open to us. That proof was given, Mr. Speaker, and the citizens of Canada by a wide majority supported the government in its decision. Every person in my constituency who either wrote to me on this subject, or spoke to me by telephone or in person, supported the Prime Minister and our government.

No one in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, as far as I know, has lost his or her liberty by our actions, except possibly their own Member of Parliament. Like many other members of this House my residence in the Ottawa area and at Davidson in Pontiac county are under guard by the army, or watched over by the RCMP. As a result, my movements have been restricted and I cannot move about as freely as I have been accustomed to doing. I am quite sure that no one in my family likes the atmosphere created by armed forces personnel standing guard over us. However, Mr. Speaker, I must say that we have found

these guards to be perfect gentlemen and very impressive in carrying out their duties. They are a credit to the Armed Forces and to the RCMP. Let us hope that the present situation will soon change and that our family life will return once again to its normal state.

I believe that the new law introduced by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) will give the necessary powers to our police forces in order that they can carry out their duties and, at the same time, protect those persons arrested. Under this bill, persons arrested must be charged within a maximum of seven days rather than the 21 days stipulated in the regulations under the War Measures Act. They will have a right to counsel and jury trial, rights which are not mentioned in the present regulations. Some innocent persons may be picked up and this would be very regrettable, but we must think of our society as a whole, and this new law is the only means by which we can protect the individual as well as our total population in these troubled times.

In supporting this legislation, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to emphasize to my colleagues the importance we must attach to removing the causes for dissatisfaction among some segments of our population. We cannot convert the members of the FLQ because I think they have embarked on a road of no return, but we should show the average citizen in poorer circumstances, who may harbour some sympathy for the FLQ manifesto, that we are taking steps to remedy his situation.

It is an enormous task, but I am convinced that this government can do it with the co-operation of all hon. members in the House, and that all the citizens of our country will reap the benefits. The Minister of Justice, who made a brilliant speech yesterday on this bill, explained why new measures are needed to combat new problems as they arise in our ever-changing society. We must meet this challenge, Mr. Speaker, and meet it now. Canada has perhaps lost her innocence, as the Minister of Justice said. I am convinced, however, that she has not lost her wisdom and her determination to bring about the just society. The legally elected government of Quebec and the municipal government of Montreal concurred in a request that special measures be taken. The federal government accepted their request and proclaimed the War Measures Act.

• (5:30 p.m.)

This new act will replace it and will liquidate itself on April 30. Let us hope that the situation will change before this date. Let us hope that even this new act will never be proclaimed again; but let us forever be ready to invoke it if the need arises. The Canadian people have the right to expect and demand this of us, and our duty is to accept it and fulfil our mandate for Canada.

[*Translation*]

Before concluding my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a suggestion to the cabinet. I wish that more funds be appropriated for the economic development of underdeveloped areas. We will thus contribute greatly to improve the living conditions and to decrease the feelings of frustration among many young Canadians and fathers.

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, all members know that it seldom takes me long to express my opinion.

After hearing the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) flinging abuse at the member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) and at the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), perhaps I am entitled to take at least a few minutes and reply to such nonsense.

I do not intend to stoop down to his level but I quite regret that, after attacking the members for Témiscamingue and Prince Albert, he forgot to say what he thought about Bill C-181, whether he is for or against it.

He could also have told us briefly his opinion, if he has one, on the necessity of this measure. I am afraid that the Secretary of State did not dare express his opinion about it because he is feeling himself somewhat guilty about the situation now prevailing in Quebec and elsewhere in Canada.

The Secretary of State blamed the member for Témiscamingue for wanting to bring before the firing squad the FLQ leaders who apparently remain unknown only to the government.

If an attempt by some individuals to overthrow a government by the means we know is not what is commonly called treason, I do not know what it is. Canada may be the only country or one of the few countries in the world to consider acts of treason almost as news items. I myself sometimes wonder if the present government is not satisfied with the situation and if in a sense it did not bring about the present conditions in Canada.

As for me, Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. member for Témiscamingue and leader of the Ralliement créditiste was right in demanding that those who are officially known as leaders of the FLQ in Quebec be brought before the firing squad. Following the statement by the Créditiste leader, we received a great number of messages expressing satisfaction, not only from people in Quebec but from all over Canada.

The hon. Secretary of State also took pleasure in recalling the constant accusations levelled against the Créditiste leader because of his alleged admiration for Hitler and Mussolini in the past. However, the Secretary of State was careful not to tell the House exactly what the same leader had stated, in 1962 or 1963 I believe. But a man like the Secretary of State is always wont to recall such things.

The Secretary of State has been repeatedly accused of irresponsibility in the House, because whenever he was asked to do something about the CBC, he answered that he was not responsible for it.

Several hon. members, including myself, the mayor of Montreal, Mr. Saulnier and many others have asked the Secretary of State and the government to bring some order to what has been called the "pink babies", that is the Company of Young Canadians, following acts of

violence in Montreal on or about October 7, 1969. Once again, the Secretary of State answered that he was not responsible, that he was "irresponsible" one might say.

Mr. Speaker, if the evidence produced by Mr. Saulnier was not enough to prompt the government to take some action in order to prevent the present situation, I wonder what could have then.

Mr. Saulnier made the following statement that I quoted on December 15, 1969, as reported on page 1992 of *Hansard*:

We now know that in Canada, individuals and groups are working actively to implement a plan which will carry the destruction of freedom of our form of democratic government and, in this plan, the people's will, as expressed in the ballot box, is excluded—

• (5:40 p.m.)

—These individuals and groups are inspired and financed, in many cases, by foreign political powers related to an "International" that does not share our notion of man's fundamental liberties.

And Mr. Saulnier states further:

In other cases, the same ideas and the same plan of action are supported by the government of Canada through the Company of Young Canadians.

It is not me who says that, but Mr. Lucien Saulnier, chairman of the Executive Committee of Montreal. I go on with my quotation:

For many months now, we have seized a substantial quantity of documents which justify me to put forward the previous assertions, and with the greatest certainty. It is enough today, and it is my duty to do so, to raise publicly a corner of the veil.

The partial disclosure to which I will limit myself today are but a small example of the things I know and of which I have privately informed the Prime Minister of Canada a few times.

This government could not plead that it was not aware of the facts, since it knew exactly everything the Company of Young Canadians was teaching in its clubs or organizations, namely, how to prepare Molotov cocktails, how to grow marijuana, how to organize a defence against the police forces. The government knew all that.

And Mr. Saulnier added that if the government wanted other evidence than what he had offered, on behalf of the city of Montreal, he could fill the committee room with witnesses.

This was not enough evidence for the government to undertake any action against terrorists and revolutionaries in Canada, who were often financed through public funds.

Mr. Speaker, we have before the House Bill C-181 entitled "an Act to provide temporary emergency powers for the preservation of public order in Canada."

Mr. Speaker, never would I have believed that in a country like Canada, abounding in possibilities of all kinds, we would have to vote such legislation to protect our security and our liberties. Even so, this is presented to us as provisional legislation. First we had the War Measures Act. Now we have an interim piece of legislation, to be replaced by another, probably a permanent one, for the preservation of order. I wonder a little to what extent this act to provide temporary emergency powers will be observed.

Previously, we had other legislation in our country, Mr. Speaker. The Criminal Code included provisions for the preservation of public order in Canada.

The death penalty existed for treason and capital murder and, in 1967, the present Prime Minister who was then Minister of Justice had that penalty abolished. In cases of treason and kidnapping without assassination, maximum penalties of 14 years of penitentiary were then imposed. Under the new proposed legislation, these penalties will be reduced to five years.

Thus the bandits, the revolutionaries, the scoundrels of all kinds can get away with almost anything under Canadian law.

If the legislation for the preservation of public order in Canada is not better enforced, I wonder what will happen.

There is an act dealing with seditious words. We have not used it often. A book was published by the RCMP in 1952. So, it dates back some time. It states with respect to sedition that if we had always applied that act, we would have avoided many things. Here is what we read on page 129:

—Thus, persons waging an open war on the Crown are guilty of treason, whereas those who commit less violent offences, but promote resort to force as a means to overthrow the established institutions are guilty of sedition.

Mr. Speaker, several persons in Canada have been guilty of sedition these past years, and I am thinking in particular of Michel Chartrand who on several occasions has committed such indictable offence.

And there are many others like Pierre Vallières, Charles Gagnon who have been engaged in seditious activities in Canada in recent years. And what has been done about it? Nothing. Let me quote a little further in this same section:

It is also the responsibility of all citizens to help prevent crime because disorder could easily lead the state into confusion.

Is this not the present situation, Mr. Speaker? Because no action was taken against those persons who voiced seditious statements, the government and many citizens of Quebec and in the rest of Canada are now in the midst of confusion. This section reads on as follows:

—However, where sedition is concerned, the responsibility of each individual is still more involved because seditious action seeks to overthrow by illegal means established order and government. Because of the tremendous effects of sedition on the state, it cannot be repressed merely by the efforts of public servants employed as peace officers, attorneys, etc.

Each citizen must realize that his country requires him to do everything in his power to avoid committing acts of sedition and to reveal to the appropriate authorities all information he may have regarding acts of this nature.

This, Mr. Speaker, is an appeal to the citizens to co-operate with our police forces so that those who are a cause of disorder in Canada may somehow be arrested.

But strangely enough, the Canadian people do not seem as anxious to help the police forces put an end to such disorder in Canada as one would like them to be. There must be some reason for that—

An hon. Member: Why?

Mr. Laprise: Why? There must be some reason, Mr. Speaker, and I believe that if the Canadian people were satisfied with their government, with the system under which they live, they would be anxious to help the police forces by giving away those who violate law and order. I will come back to that later on, because such is not the case.

Many people may have reasons for not co-operating and for not being satisfied with the system under which they live.

There are precedents with regard to sedition. In 1918, one Mr. Russell, informally recognized as a Communist, because there was no Communist party at that time, made seditious remarks during public meetings. I will quote one which he made at the Walker theatre on December 22, 1918, as reported in the book from which I quoted a moment ago:

> Blood is shed in Russia and it will be shed also in Canada, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, or else we will get our rights. We will not hesitate to walk in blood in order to obtain what we believe are our rights.

Mr. Speaker, Russell was found guilty of sedition after that statement.

For years, and mainly in the province of Quebec, statements have been made at least as seditious as Russell's in 1918. Nevertheless, nothing has been done about it. I wonder why we always wait until the last minute to do something.

The bill now under study is designed to replace the War Measures Act which it has been necessary to proclaim because of the October events in Quebec. In fact, it was necessary to put this act into force because of Mr. Cross's and Laporte's kidnappings and because of the sadistic murder of the latter on October 16.

The theft of arms in huge quantities and of thousands of sticks of dynamite, some sixty bombings which caused the loss of several lives and thousands of dollars of damages, that was not enough to wake up the government. The death of families or fathers of families as a result of acts of violence, does not seem so bad to the government. The matter is discussed for two or three days, and that is the end of that. I am thinking of what occurred not very far away from here, on June 24 last, near Parliament Hill, when a woman was killed by a bomb that exploded at the National Defence building. People talked about it for two or three days, then no more was heard about it.

Apparently, everything was forgotten as if it were nothing but a commonplace incident, a collision between two cars.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we should now enact legislation to restore order. However, much more is needed. Force will not be the answer for some 200,000 unemployed workers in Quebec, nor for hundreds of thousands of families living with crumbs granted with all kinds of humiliating formalities, by social welfare. Force will not be the answer for the blind and the disabled who have to put up with an income of $55 and sometimes of even $45 a month. Force will not be the answer for thousands of young people without jobs, most of them well-educated, having a profession or a trade, but insecure as regards their future. Force will not satisfy workers of all categories who see a substantial part of their pay cheque being forfeited to the state.

Mr. Speaker, force may succeed in subduing criminals, political or otherwise, provided it is used with intelligence and, in the present case, this has not been obvious. However, peace and order in Canada can only be brought back when all members of society in this country will have been given the right to economic freedom that industry, agriculture and our various services can provide them with.

The leader of the Ralliement Créditiste has been claiming for a long time that our economic system shall be either reformed by the men of order or destroyed by the others.

Times have not changed. This is not the first crisis we experience. There were many others, including that of 1919, which was characterized by uprisings that strongly worried the authorities at that time.

One also remembers the no less famous crisis of the thirties, in which a very large number of our best men were forced to hitchhike from Halifax to Vancouver looking for a job that would enable them to live decently.

Mr. Speaker, during a debate on January 18, 1937, as reported on that day in *Hansard,* Lionel Chevrier, who was then Liberal member for Stormont, shortly after the Liberal party was put back in office, said:

> Today the working masses are suffering; in nearly every country in the world they are the victims of individualism with its doctrine, its utilitarianism and its unrestricted competition which has degenerated in economic dictatorship, the people are ready to believe that the only remedy to their evils lies in a complete overthrow of the social order.

Do we realize that it is about the same thing today? I go on with the quotation:

> It is necessary to prove to those who suffer and are embittered against society that the remedy does not reside in the destruction of the existing order, but in its reform, for otherwise it will be impossible effectively to defend society against the assault of revolutionary forces.

If Mr. Chevrier were still a member of the House today, he would repeat the same words because we are in a situation much similar to the one that prevailed in 1937.

Mr. Speaker, may I call it six o'clock?

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair to resume same at eight o'clock p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

Public Order Act, 1970

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Speaker, when I called it six o'clock, I had just quoted what the member for Stormont said in 1937, in order to prove to what extent the present situation resembles one we have already witnessed.

Still, each time, the effects are more and more harmful, and the dangers of disorder much greater, to the extent where we wonder whether it is not already too late, whether the administrative structure of our country is not in the process of crumbling.

The same conditions prevailed in Russia, China, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Hungary, Cuba and elsewhere. The same methods were used there, that are now being used in Canada to stir up the people: subversion, sedition, uprisings, contestations, terrorism, kidnappings and murder. There were even times when government institutions were used to achieve those ends.

For instance, I feel that the CBC was used as a stepping-stone by all the leftists and revolutionaries in Canada, Europe and Asia. An FLQist revolutionary was so well situated at the CBC that employees and announcers, paid by public funds, were passing messages between FLQ leaders and cells.

Never have so many misleading news later been denied by the same announcers! Never have we seen so many false rumours broadcast over the waves as between October 5 and 16! And the Secretary of State was not aware of this? Come on!

Because of the bad turn of events, steps had to be taken. The police intervened and several personalities disappeared from the CBC. No one seems to feel the worst for it, since October 16. On the other hand, those who were removed from the CBC as a result of their subsersive activity are now bawling.

Recently we heard a union leader of CBC speakers and employees ask for an inquiry into his dismissal.

The Montreal newspaper *La Presse* issued an article on the facts I just mentioned, namely that the FLQ had infiltrated the CBC. A senior CBC executive wrote to *La Presse* management to complain about their accusations. On November 3, 1970, Jacques Tremblay replied in his editorial, and I quote:

> Don't you think that during the two weeks before the proclaiming of the emergency measures some individuals, well-known for their verbal violence and their advocacy of all kinds of hatred, have had the first place in your so-called information features?
>
> Why were all their declarations unfailingly treated as of national importance? And if those people known for their hatred-filled statements and their advocacy of violence have been so often seen on your screens, is it not normal to say that your network has been a forum for them? At least this is our impression.

This was the impression of *La Presse* and several others too who have been able to see that on television.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

And I, for one, on the Thursday night before the proclamation of the War Measures Act, on the eleven o'clock CBC news, I saw one Jean-Claude Devirieux, cut abruptly a bulletin he was reading to tell us he had heard a rumour which he had no time to control, but was giving as such. And then he resumed his reading of the bulletin.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is not proper for an announcer, whether from the CBC, Télé-Métropole or any other television or radio news service, to take it upon himself to cut a news bulletin to broadcast rumours from all quarters. Mr. Speaker, if this was not a message sent to some FLQ cells or leaders, I wonder what it was.

Thus, it is not surprising to hear people complain of the low quality of the services offered by the CBC and of the too great independence given to the corporation with the complicity not only of the present Secretary of State, but also of his predecessors.

Bill C-181 has some deficiencies which will need to be corrected when it is considered in the committee of the whole. We are facing murders and murderers. However, I do not want you, Mr. Speaker, to think that I am aiming at those at your right. No. I simply say that we are confronted with events which have happened in the province of Quebec.

No provision in the bill tends to punish murder carried out following kidnappings or bomb explosions. The bill is retroactive, but it does not state to what extent. That will have to be determined.

A person may be found guilty for having participated in or having been present at a number of meetings. Here again, I think this is too vague. Two meetings may be enough to convict a certain person while for another one, several meetings, perhaps even eight or ten, will be necessary. Those, Mr. Speaker, are a few points that will have to be spelled out during our discussion of Bill C-181 in the committee of the whole.

As for me, Mr. Speaker, I do not like to have to discuss such a bill at the present time, when there would be so many other things to do to improve the standard of living of the citizens we represent. I hope this bill will enable us to work efficiently and that the government will pass the measures required to ensure the distribution of consumer goods among all Canadians and to improve the standard of living of the Canadian people, so that they may live in peace and freedom.

• (8:10 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Hyl Chappell (Peel South): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Thomas (Moncton): Filibuster!

Mr. Chappell: I have been around this House long enough to know that personal attack does not improve debate.

Mr. Woolliams: Why don't you sit down and let us get on with the debate?

Mr. Chappell: I have been in the courts long enough, I am sure for as long as the hon. member who has

interrupted from the other side, to know that it does not improve an argument. But there are times when things that are said are so off course that they must be corrected.

When the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) was describing the interrogation of those arrested and later freed, he pictured the interrogation as incompetent. He thus attacked the police and the Attorney General of Quebec. Although it is possible he may be right, I ask whether it is fair for the police force of Quebec and the Attorney General of Quebec to be attacked in this House on the basis of something allegedly said by one or two of these people, when they have no opportunity to answer those allegations.

The hon. member spoke at length about the number arrested and eventually freed without charges being laid. He was critical, also, of the action of the authorities in taking their fingerprints. I ask you, Mr. Speaker: How could the Quebec police force know which of the 29 were to be charged until they had taken the fingerprints of each to ascertain which, if any, matched fingerprints on documents and articles seized?

An hon. Member: Why don't they fingerprint everybody?

Mr. Chappell: I say, also, that some very serious charges have been laid. These charges may be against the leaders. Would it be wise to lay charges against those on the fringes in these circumstances? In any event, there is no evidence at all that some of those who have been set free may not be charged in the future. The hon. member also attacked the RCMP. Why, he asked, has the RCMP not caught these people? In fairness, I must point out that the RCMP are not responsible for policing Quebec with respect to ordinary law enforcement; their numbers are not sufficient to enable them to do so, in any case, and it is not right that it should be implied they have this duty and ought to have carried it out.

He also quoted Pierre Elliott Trudeau, the author, and adopted his statement that if one person felt he was right he should continue to maintain his stand even though 99 opposed it. I do not disagree with that. Then he said the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), by bringing this act into force, had done more to separate Quebec from the rest of Canada than all other actions to date. I say this: if the hon. member is serious in his remarks, I will expect him to try to convince us next week that every tomcat carries a marriage licence.

Some hon. Members: Explain.

Mr. Chappell: I consider the subject now under debate to be as serious as any we have discussed in Canada for some time. On October 14 I spoke of the need for democracy to demonstrate that in time of emergency it can quickly produce the teeth and muscle necessary to defend itself against those who would destroy our way of life and force their will upon us. I refer to the group of people who call themselves le Front de Libération du Québec. I have observed from history that terror can succeed if there is vacillation—

Mr. Woolliams: And procrastination. I will help you with that one.

Mr. Chappell: —and undue softness on the part of the authorities in dealing with it. At such a time the people must be reassured that democracy can guarantee protection and preserve freedom from mob violence, or in panic and confusion they may be stampeded into a lower form of government. But if democracy moves firmly and quickly, confidence can return just as quickly. It is the duty of the government to take such action when necessary.

I supported the introduction of the War Measures Act on October 16. Although somewhat cumbersome and broader in scope than was required, it was the only tool immediately available. To those who still criticize its proclamation in spite of the overwhelming support in favour of this action from the Canadian people, I say that if one is about to be stabbed in the back one cannot spend too much time looking for the exact defensive weapon. I support the bill before us and congratulate the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and the government for having been able to consult with the provincial Attorneys General and the leaders of the opposition parties and still bring it in within two weeks.

Freedom consists of freedom of the press, freedom of speech with the right to criticize and protest, freedom of movement, which includes the right to carry on one's chosen activities without fear or interference. It does not include the right to destroy the basis of the society which is our guarantee of freedom. Mr. Laporte died as a Canadian in a national emergency. He died in an attack against Canadian freedom. I urge this government to forthwith join with the Quebec government in providing full compensation for his family, and in undertaking to do the same for any other person in Canada who suffers the same fate at the hands of this group. I think all Canadians wish to share in this responsibility.

To those who doubt my statement that there was overwhelming support for what the government did on October 16, I say I have received a multitude of letters, telephone messages and telegrams and less than 2 per cent disagreed with the government's action.

• (8:20 p.m.)

The FLQ, with its savage attitude and ruthless means, has done more to unite the people of Canada and to show that democracy can work in its own self-defence than any other single incident in our history. The people of Canada realize that with the FLQ we are not dealing with ordinary criminals, but with individuals who have jointly and severally audaciously established a format of terror for terror's sake. Their crimes are not attacks against individuals but against the values of an entire nation. On that basis, their behaviour approximates a state of civil war rather than a state of crime. They are, in essence, outlaws owing no allegiance to anything but their own vices.

I cannot believe that these people are offshoots from poverty. They do not direct their efforts toward

improving the lot of anyone. Their activity is not spontaneous or activated for the good of anyone. They have taken training both outside and inside Canada. They have studied the means of insurrection and have spread the teaching of how to kill, disorganize and terrorize. They have their killing cells, their criminal financing cells and their propaganda cells. This last is the most insidious and dangerous of all.

For the past several years they have been infesting some Canadian youth. We all know that during the last decade youth has been challenging the establishment, that physical violence has become the daily companion of protest, with rock throwing replacing debate. In this atmosphere this group, with its well disguised propaganda cells, has infiltrated and gathered recruits from the radical wings of university students and other groups where they have found dissent and dissatisfaction. They have used these youthful converts to infiltrate further into the teaching profession, labour unions and communications.

This group chose the name Front de Libération du Québec hoping for some popular appeal among those who are uniformed and do not appreciate that their aim is to attack society itself. By espousing causes that appear to be related to their aims, they gained outspoken support from some of the leaders of labour and the Parti Quebecois. Some of these supporters even sought recognition of this group as a political force.

I cannot accept that they seek to help the people of Quebec. These people are gangsters, a new type of fanatical outlaw who desires power at any cost. While moving to implement their plans to destroy freedom, they and their supporters moan and scream about any interference with their freedom. A few members of the civil liberty groups—and I say only a few—and their fellow travellers, and some who should know better, have said that this legislation is not necessary, that it will interfere with the freedom of ordinary people. What a deception! Law abiding, ordinary Canadians need have no fear. Those of us who served during the last war should be more conscious of the effects of the War Measures Act than others. Most of us lived under it for years without even knowing it existed.

Recently we unanimously accepted a gross invasion of our freedom by introducing the breathalyzer law; yet we all agreed to accept it in order to preserve a greater freedom—the right to drive on our highways in safety. Under the Combines Investigation Act a supplier of merchandise can have his premises invaded and his papers taken without warning. He can be required at a preliminary hearing to make disclosures under oath, including the names of all possible witnesses, and in some cases he can even be required to give evidence against himself at his own trial. The reason for this law is to protect the public from unjust increases in prices. Surely, if we can go this far to protect ourselves from improper price increases, we can go just as far to protect ourselves from terrorists. The critics of this new legislation overlook the basic principle that such laws are not weapons to punish but are, rather, a shield to protect the people and their freedoms.

What good are criminal laws unless criminals are caught? What good is there in apprehending offenders unless there are charges to fit their crimes and justice is quickly but surely meted out? I believe that the greatest deterrent to crime is the near certainty of being caught and punished. If our laws are not effective and criminals are not brought to justice, then they and their sympathizers ignore the laws even more. They become bolder and, in a sense, heroes among themselves and their sympathizers. Their lawlessness increases.

I believe that there was and still is a very real danger in the present situation to persons and property, along with a serious disruption of freedom of movement and speech. Decent, honest, ordinary people are afraid of retaliation, afraid that when they stand up to speak, or when they listen to someone else speak, what they want to say or hear will be drowned out by the interference and static of those who seek to harass them. The War Measures Act will be returned to the shelf. However, we must still cure this social sore before it becomes a fatal cancer. These people to whom I refer must be excised from our society.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Neither Quebec nor, in fact, any other province can bring in such legislation which is in essence criminal law. It is supported by all members of the House from the province of Quebec, the great majority—in fact, an overwhelming majority—of the members of this House, and by the provincial premiers, including Premier Schreyer who in a sense is the only really responsible NDP member in Canada in that he is the only one who holds elected responsibility.

I say, how could we claim to be responsible and not introduce such legislation when it is requested by the responsible government of the province in question?

I agree with the Minister of Justice that we should take two steps. The first is to deal with the specific problem to see how this new legislation works and what is needed for the long term. Before taking the second step there should be time for debate and an opportunity to hear representations from legal and social thinkers from across Canada. We require time to clean up and redraft scattered, diverse and in some cases outmoded descriptions of criminal activity.

This bill increases the power of search, arrest and detention. The detention gives time to complete the investigation. Police should not lay charges unless there is sufficient evidence. If they do, they are criticized. They must have time to find the evidence before the accused can hide it or escape the jurisdiction. Thus, there is need to detail them for a few days. Too often people think of police as a foreign element. They are not; they are enforcing our laws for our protection. Of course we need to watch the police, but for God's sake let us give them reasonable powers to carry out their work, and let us not stand and abuse them as they have been abused in the House today.

Clause 4 of this bill makes it a crime to be a member of the FLQ. Needless to say, they do not have an office, a

secretary or membership lists. Membership will be most difficult to prove, at least in the very early stages. But the clause has much merit because it signifies to all that the representatives of the Canadian people will not tolerate this type of activity. I am more concerned about whether the bill goes far enough, and I was somewhat disappointed with respect to the long time which the opposition spent on the problem as compared with the short time which they spent on the solution and the best means to deal with the situation.

An hon. Member: Let us hear your solution.

Mr. Chappell: As the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) said, we must give them the tools to do the job. I ask: Should we not create offences from their criminal acts of behaviour and legislate that certain acts in themselves carry a presumption of membership in the FLQ and an intent to overthrow the government by force? I shall not attempt to list them all, but under the circumstances that exist today could there not, and should there not, be a presumption in respect of one who has a machine-gun in his possession, or one who has dynamite or detonating devices in his possession, or one who has FLQ literature, not a single copy for his own consideration but an amount that is obviously for distribution, or those who associate with these people who are known to be involved?

Should we not also consider forcing them to become compellable witnesses in certain limited circumstances, and thus require them to disclose the names of people obviously with them at the time the crime was committed but whose identity cannot be established? If we do some of these things now, we may once and for all rid ourselves of the greatest attack on Canadian democracy.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that I would have participated in this debate had it not been for the attack made yesterday by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) on the leaders of this party.

An hon. Member: Here he comes now.

Mr. Woolliams: How many leaders have you?

Mr. Brewin: We have at least two.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): No, you have 20.

Mr. Brewin: We have many potential leaders but only two actual leaders, and now I am referring to the two actual leaders and I am saying that the attack upon them yesterday by the Minister of Justice is what provoked me to add a few remarks to this debate.

The Minister of Justice invited the House to participate in a constructive debate on the actual measure before us. I am not quoting him exactly, but I think he deplored the rehashing of the controversial issue as to the appropriateness or otherwise of invoking the War Measures Act. Having done this, he then devoted almost all his speech to an immoderate and partisan attack upon the leaders of this party. What was their offence? Their offence consisted of opposing the invocation of the total powers conferred upon the government by invoking the War Measures Act. When I say total, I mean total.

The Minister of Justice tried to make it appear that my leader had made some misleading remarks when he referred to the powers existing under the War Measures Act. I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the House that the powers under the War Measures Act are in fact vast and unlimited. They are not confined to any particular regulation that may be made under the War Measures Act. The power to make regulations and orders is as widespread as you like and includes censorship, arrest, detention, exclusion, deportation and appropriation, control and forfeiture of property.

These are the powers that are conferred by the War Measures Act, but in this particular instance the government has only seen fit to employ one part of these powers which they conferred upon themselves by invoking the War Measures Act, namely, the particular regulation that was in fact enacted. But I point out once again to the House and to the minister that the wording of section 3 of the War Measures Act gives the Governor in Council the power to do and authorize such acts and things, and make from time to time such orders and regulations as he may, by reason of the existence of the emergency, deem advisable. It is not only the power to make orders and regulations that was taken by this government when it proclaimed the War Measures Act, but the power to do any other thing and authorize any other thing or act that it saw fit.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): May I ask the hon. member a question? Would he be good enough, after he finishes reciting that section, to move on to section 4 or section 5 where it says that only orders and regulations passed under that act have the force of law.

Mr. Brewin: I am looking at the act itself and I do not see the passage to which the minister refers. I am aware of the jurisprudence, as I am sure he is, which has made it clear from time to time that the powers under this act are virtually unlimited. The act speaks for itself. We in this party stand firmly behind our leaders and we reaffirm our conviction—

An hon. Member: All of you?

Mr. Brewin: There is a slight difference of opinion.

Mrs. MacInnis: And there is freedom of expression here.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Mr. Brewin: We have no totalitarian tendencies in this party. We have differing convictions and we express them. We express our differences. We are not afraid of voting according to our conscience. I do not have to agree with the rather small minority of my colleagues who took a different view, but I respect their right to do so. I notice the government party has always claimed the

same freedom of conscience, but I have seldom seen it expressed. I am waiting for the day the Liberals express their own convictions by doing otherwise than voting for the party which they support. That will be the day, Mr. Speaker. I have not seen it yet, and I have been here quite a few years.

An hon. Member: You should be in the House more often.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Speaker, there was an exception. Mr. Ralph Cowan at least sometimes voted against his party, but he did not stay here very long. He did not get the nomination again.

Mr. Lewis: He was read out.

Mr. Brewin: Yes, he was read out. However, I reaffirm our conviction that the invoking of the War Measures Act should only be occasioned by the circumstances and conditions stated in it, and they are the existence of real war or civil war. Insurrection is a civil war. I say that these conditions have not been demonstrated to us in any way at all. I tell the Minister of Justice that there are many thoughtful people in Canada who believe our leaders—I am referring specifically to the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) and the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis)—showed an admirable courage and sound conviction in fighting against what they considered to be a serious danger to the fundamental rights of Canadians. I believe that when history comes to be written, more and more Canadians will come to share this particular conclusion.

Certainly we acknowledge, and there is no doubt about it, that there has been evidence presented to us of grave and serious disorder created by the FLQ through its odious actions in Quebec, serious disorder which required action. But since this matter came up, we in this party have always made it clear that we were ready, and we are ready today, to support appropriate action to strengthen the authorities in order to deal with this crisis. However, in all the weeks since this matter arose, no evidence has been produced of the existence of the conditions which alone justify the invoking of the War Measures Act. We have had rumours, we have had dark hints galore, we have had phony plots—but a complete absence of hard facts and evidence to justify what has been done.

What are the results of all the searches? Of the 450 people detained, only 40 are to be charged. Do 40 people without arms—there has been no evidence that any of these people have had caches of arms—indicate insurrection? I do not think anybody but the most nervous type would say that it indicated insurrection. I agree with what the Minister of Justice said, that the meagre result of the searches and arrests is not in itself proof that there was not a serious crisis; but it does create doubts as to the existence of a crisis of the sort that could properly be described as insurrection. It does not look as though the insurrection was a very real threat. Alternatively, one must come to the conclusion that the searches were not competently carried out. One or other is the inevitable conclusion.

The production of this bill which we are discussing is itself evidence of the lack of necessity for taking the extreme step of introducing the War Measures Act. The minister himself said the present bill is in much more precise terms. I am glad to agree with him: it undoubtedly is. Why could not this bill have been introduced weeks ago? Is the government's drafting capacity so small that we must wait for weeks while innocent people are detained and then released? Surely it was possible to produce this bill sooner. I suggest it could have been produced and brought down sooner and, subject to certain amendments that we are ready to propose, we would have passed it promptly and it would have sufficed, instead of invoking the tremendous powers of the War Measures Act.

I now want to turn to the legislation that is before us. In my view it is—and I only repeat what has been said by the leader of my party—a very great improvement on the regulations introduced under the War Measures Act and by the invoking of that act. Mr. Speaker, I want to spend a moment saying why it is such an improvement as to justify, subject to certain amendments, our supporting it on second reading. First of all, the bill is temporary in its nature and does not confer such sweeping and extensive powers on the Governor in Council.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. There are many private discussions and conversations taking place in the chamber and the Chair has difficulty hearing the hon. member. I wonder whether hon. members who are engaged in conversations would continue them outside the curtains.

Mr. Brewin: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sometimes it is a little difficult to compete against a number of voices speaking in the chamber at the same time.

An hon. Member: It is hard listening, too.

Mr. Brewin: I know some hon. members find it very difficult to listen. They have never been very good listening types. Mr. Speaker, I was going to give—I thought hon. members opposite might be pleased to hear it—the reasons why in my view this legislation is a tremendous improvement upon the invocation of the War Measures Act and the regulations orginally passed. The first point I want to make is that it does not confer such sweeping powers on the Governor in Council. It expressly introduces—which did not exist before—many of the protections provided by the Canadian Bill of Rights, including the right to counsel which in practice has been ignored during this operation, whatever the legal niceties may happen to be.

I think it is important that the legislation now before us does in fact introduce many of the provisions, and I think it should introduce more of the provisions of section 2 of the Bill of Rights. The definition of "illegal

association" has been very much restricted and narrowed, and the period of detention without trial abridged. Above all, this bill revokes the War Measures Act. In view of these very real improvements, for which I think the whole House can take credit—I do not think any one party should take full credit for it, because the vigilance and the concern of all Members of Parliament have had something to do with it—I think the fact is that this is a vastly narrower, more reasonable and more appropriate measure than was presented to us before, and on that basis I think it deserves some sort of support.

However, Mr. Speaker, in my view it is absolutely essential that certain parts of this bill be amended, because it still contains provisions that are intolerable in any country that values its fundamental freedoms. One thing that should be odious to the Minister of Justice, his government and party, is the provision that in effect calls for the retroactive operation of the law. The minister shakes his head. I have heard him say outside this House that these provisions are not retroactive. I say that clause 8 clearly has a retroactive effect because it refers to proof of membership, and presumed proof of membership is not based upon what one has done since this act came into effect. It is based upon what one did before and after the act came into effect. So that if five years ago or ten years ago, if the FLQ had been in existence then, you had attended a couple of meetings of the FLQ, perhaps quite ignorant and innocent of what it was, you could be hauled before the courts and told, "This is prima facie evidence of your membership. Now prove you are not a member and have not been a member. We are not satisfied with your proof of ignorance, so you are liable to five years in jail."

• (8:50 p.m.)

I say it is contrary to the jurisprudence of civilized countries to make actions criminal on the basis of things that were legal when the actions themselves in fact took place. The Universal Charter of Human Rights makes it perfectly clear that acts that were not criminal by national or international law before their commission are not to be punished. Here you are perhaps talking about membership today. Technically you can argue that membership today is not retroactive. If you prove membership today by relation to acts in the past and then say, "The onus is on you to get rid of the acts of the past", I say you are giving effect to *ex post facto* criminal law and no civilized country will recognize the validity of this. The international community of nations has made it clear that this is prohibited and wrong and is not in accordance with the fundamental rights of justice as recognized throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, I am very pleased that the new bill reintroduces large sections of the Bill of Rights. But it cuts out one that is in the Bill of Rights and which I think should be preserved. This is the right to have bail fixed, not by an official of the government, not by police officials and not by an attorney general but by the courts of this land. That is what the courts are for. We propose to urge the Minister of Justice and this House to remove from the bill this provision which deprives a few persons of the right to bail which is conferred by the Bill of Rights and in the manner which has been traditional in our courts. Again, the right to bail is recognized in international law.

Mr. Speaker, we in this party do not propose to delay or obstruct passage of this bill. We are prepared to accept it on second reading, but we propose to do our duty in examining the legislation as carefully as we can. Where we find provisions we consider offensive to fundamental freedoms and fundamental rights, we shall ask that they be amended. I hope that this government will show its confidence in Parliament by taking seriously the amendments which will be proposed by members of the opposition in this and other parties, to see whether we cannot get a better bill and one which has less danger of being oppressive. If they do not, it will be an indication of their unwillingness to take Parliament seriously.

It has been my conviction that the highest and most important function of Parliament is vigilance in regard to fundamental rights and democratic freedoms. I hope this Parliament will prove worthy of the trust that the people of Canada put in it to be defenders of their liberty, to be defenders of their fundamental rights and to make sure that at this moment of grave trial in Canada we do not abandon time-honoured principles which are so important to all Canadians.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul-M. Gervais (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, listening to the previous speaker, I realized that he said in the same sentence that the government acted too late, but on the other hand, that the measures invoked were extreme. I must say I find it difficult to reconcile the two statements.

In any event, because he is a former prime minister, I regret having to say that the words of the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) were ill-advised; he took the opportunity to indulge in bombast and made vain attempts at humour.

Mr. Speaker, I can assure the House that the people of Quebec and of the other provinces of Canada cannot see anything pleasant or funny in the distressing and serious situation we are facing.

As for the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) and the previous speaker, I understand why they speak as the champions of civil liberties without giving a thought to the vast majority of Quebecers and other Canadians who willingly submit to inconveniences, searches and even temporary arrests so that we may see the end of this anguish and terror which prevails in Quebec.

An hon. Member: Hear! Hear!

Mr. Gervais: These people are willing to undergo hardships, to forsake some of their liberties partially and temporarily so that may be stopped the activities of

terrorists who want to deprive them of these freedoms and force on them later their totalitarian doctrine, which we reject.

Talking of the freedom of all individuals, Mr. Speaker, it is a lovely philosophy. We heard about that when we were in college. However, what do we hear about Mr. Cross and Mr. Laporte's freedom and about the murder of the latter?

Mr. Lewis: We have the Criminal Code.

Mr. Gervais: We shall come back to that.

What should one think about the innocents who are threatened? I appreciate the fact that hon. members who live in the shadow of the Rockies may find it difficult to read the Quebec newspapers; nevertheless they could come closer to that province, where the crisis is the most obvious at the present time, by reading the newspapers and by consulting with their colleagues here, regardless of their party affiliation to find out what is really happening in our province.

There is much talk about civil liberties but the victims are forgotten. There are many of them at the present time. I think of Cross, Laporte and other innocent people who are threatened. I think of the citizens of Montreal who are afraid even to go to the movies at night. I think of those who have stopped going to night clubs. I think of those who must abstain from attending social or political events of all kinds. That is what is going on in the province of Quebec. Perhaps that in the shadows of the Rockies they are not aware of it right now but I hope that such tragic events never happen there. Today it is FLQ but maybe later on it will be the FLBC—

[*English*]

Mr. Woolliams: Why are you filibustering your own bill?

Mr. Gervais: I am not filibustering my own bill. My hon. friend is often enough on his feet, so I think he should give me an opportunity to speak. We know him very well.

• (9:00 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Children in schools, in CEGEPs, in universities, are threatened by other children who incite them to resort to blackmail, even though their parents make every effort to educate them properly. Here is an example: The hon. member for Papineau (Mr. Ouellet) and myself went to the University of Sherbrooke to explain federalism to the students. By the way, the second issue, first volume, of the *Estrien Rouge,* published in the province of Quebec on April 3, 1970, with a picture of Mao on the front page and sold for 10 cents, contained, as the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) reported previously, the following which I quote:

> The stand taken by those traitors, Ouellet and Gervais, who represent the colonialists, clearly proves that only the power of the people can drive them out of Quebec.

[Mr. Gervais.]

And then, it will be argued that there was not sufficient evidence to proclaim the War Measures Act.

I think that perhaps the time has come to proceed with the study of the bill and to stop rehashing old stories, as we did this afternoon. The aim of this bill is to extend the powers of the Attorneys General or of the Minister of Justice, as we say in the province of Quebec, those powers being delegated to the police forces in order to allow them to work more efficiently.

Those who claim that civil liberties are impaired will not approve, of course, in principle, a special act but taking into account the present context and such a complex situation, I do not think that it is so restrictive.

There is the matter of bail, of arrest, search and seizure without warrant. But, on the other hand, if one refers to the preamble of the bill now under consideration, one can see that if an individual has done nothing wrong, he has nothing to be afraid of.

Some people are acting out of political expediency, such as our friends from the New Democratic Party, who do not really know Quebec—there is not even one in the House who represents a riding from that province—but they could have consulted us. Anyway, the vote was eloquent enough to show them that other members were perhaps more enlightened than they were. In spite of these facts, I suspect they are not aware of the situation and after discussions, telephone conversations with people from other provinces, I submit that these members do not even represent the views of their constituents.

The people of Canada almost unanimously, support action taken by the government since the emergency measures have been in force.

As the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) has pointed out, there might be some abuse in the application of the legislation. That is unfortunate, but in the present circumstances we must apply it, and it is the responsibility of the Attorney General or the Minister of Justice of the province to see that the law is observed and that arbitrary measures are curbed to the greatest possible extent.

Others criticise the government for not having acted soon enough, as the previous speaker said. I should have liked to see how the same people would have reacted had the government taken action, say six months or a year ago. What would have been their attitude, had the government taken action before the kidnappings, before the assassination of Mr. Laporte, before the violent deaths caused by acts of terrorism? Then there would have been a terrible filibuster. The government would have been accused of taking fascist measures, whereas today we must act in that delicate and painful situation we have now.

In Canada we were not prepared to face a situation such as this one. The events followed in rapid succession whereas we were accustomed to live in an orderly way, in peace and in tranquillity. As they say in English: "We were smug, we felt smug." Unfortunately to defend one's liberty it is necessary to accept sacrifices and restrictions

of that liberty. It is in this spirit that the bill is introduced.

As for those who will say that there was no reason for proclaiming the War Measures Act, I answer them by quoting some excerpts from a document submitted to the committee which inquired into the Company of Young Canadians last summer:

[*English*]

Inevitably, Quebec revolutionaries will come to group themselves in a single movement without, however, losing their own identities.

That they fight today in the FLP, the FLQ, the citizen's committees, the MLT, the MIS, the Vallieres-Gagnon committee, and the unions makes little difference. They all participate in the same strategy.

There are not 50 strategies. There are only two: electoral and revolutionary strategy.

Is this not evidence, gentlemen? I will go on.

An hon. Member: We heard that a year ago.

Mr. Gervais: It is time you remembered it. I quote again as follows:

Here in Quebec the fight for the destruction of the capitalist system is inseparable from the struggle for national independence. One will not go far without the other.

Another quotation from the same article reads as follows:

Plan of Action: In the immediate future we must continue and increase the agitation, propaganda and permanent contestation at all levels of society so we can unmask, expose, demystify and weaken the cogwheels of the system which imprisons workers and students in stifling slavery.

Excellent work has already been done in this area; it must continue—

Inevitably this will lead to violence and breaking the law. But it is absolutely normal for a revolutionary to operate outside the law—

The FLQ Manifesto ends this way:

It is easier than denouncing the system, easier than protesting, to make the FLQ a convenient scapegoat for everyone.

But one must remember that it is all Quebec revolutionaries who, through their actions and determination, have brought forth the FLQ.

And the FLQ will endure as long as there are revolutionaries in Quebec who are determined to conquer.

There again, if some hon. members suspect that there is no evidence, I could give them more literature in private.

[*Translation*]

Like the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), I agree that the enforcement of this bill obviously will not kill terrorism once and for all, but it will provide the Minister of Justice of the province of Quebec with an instrument which will enable him and his police forces to carry on their investigations and arrest this pack of criminals.

The mere mention of some crimes in the Criminal Code will not eliminate them but, on the other hand, our police forces are thus empowered to rid our society of criminals.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me say that we must all support this piece of legislation and instead of indulging in sarcasm and being nasty to our police officers, our duty is to offer them whatever co-operation and support we can provide in order that we may once again find this atmosphere which we long for and cherish heartily.

[*English*]

Mr. Douglas A. Hogarth (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Filibuster!

Mr. Hogarth: Mr. Speaker, I realize how anxious hon. members of the House are to get into Committee of the Whole on this bill.

Mr. Woolliams: Is the hon. member trying to justify himself?

An hon. Member: Why does the hon. member not sit down, then?

Mr. Hogarth: I realize that this is a matter of urgency and that we are anxious to complete it.

An hon. Member: Why not sit down, then?

Mr. Hogarth: During the course of this afternoon I heard that the opposition in this House is the conscience of our nation and the conscience of the government.

An hon. Member: The hon. member must be the government's mouthpiece.

Mr. Hogarth: If this feeble group is the conscience of this nation, we are going to go to hell for sure. So far as I am concerned, I have never in all my life seen such waffling and indecision in an opposition.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hogarth: I have never seen such an opposition.

An hon. Member: And how long have you been here?

Mr. Hogarth: It goes one way one day, and another way the next day. You cannot tell which way they are going.

Mr. Dinsdale: Is the hon. member trying to speak as a hatchetman?

Mr. Hogarth: I can tell hon. members that we in the backbenches of this party—

Some hon. Members: Trained seals.

Mr. Hogarth: If we are called trained seals, I do not know what words one could apply to the members of the opposition in this House.

An hon. Member: Be careful, now.

Mr. Hogarth: Here we are in a moment of crisis, and we are abridging civil liberties. It does not matter wheth-

er you abridge them by one day or one year, the traditional and fundamental civil rights of this nation are being abridged. It is either right, or wrong, under the circumstances. It does not matter whether we are doing it under the War Measures Act or the bill before us tonight: the question is, are we right?

• (9:10 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hogarth: Little or no argument can be raised against the proposition that every civil right that we enjoy is subject to the supremacy of Parliament. Parliament has jurisdiction over all civil rights. Acting within the scope of its authority and according to the exigencies of the situation which face the nation, province or municipality at the time, it is the supremacy of Parliament that counts. There is no such thing as an absolute civil right. There is no such thing as the right to liberty that is not subject to the supremacy of Parliament. There is no such thing as the right to security of the person and the right to the enjoyment of property. Any of these rights can be taken away by the due process of law. That is expressly stated in the Bill of Rights. It is something that Canadians should not forget.

The right to equality before the law, protection of the law, freedom of religion, speech, assembly, association and of the press are all subject to abrogation, variation and change by the process of law.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hogarth: The due process of law can mean the passage of a statute such as the one we are discussing today, an order of a court of an appropriate jurisdiction, or a regulation passed pursuant to authority delegated to the Governor in Council by Parliament, such as happened with the War Measures Act.

It has been suggested that the War Measures Act has just been proclaimed. In fact, it was proclaimed in 1914. It has been on the statute books ever since, and now we are merely acting under it. To suggest that we acted with the full force and effect of the act is absolute nonsense. The only right which approaches an absolute civil right is the right to habeas corpus, mandamus, certiorari or the right to prohibition. None of these rights have been abridged by the regulations under the War Measures Act or the bill with which we are now dealing.

Mr. Woolliams: How can you exercise certiorari when there is no charge?

Mr. Hogarth: There will be charges. It is provided in the regulations and the bill before us. We live in changing times, Mr. Speaker. It is time we realized that we live in very troubled times. We can no longer put our heads in the sand. We live in a world where the old values, the status quo and authoritarianism of the past are rapidly being replaced by concepts which have yet to be truly formalized and structured into acceptable political philosophy.

The people in our community today have been emancipated by superior education. They are knowledgeable by virtue of the vast progress that has been made in the field of mass communication. They are conscious as never before of the needless poverty in our country, the decadence and the intolerable bureaucracy with which we are faced at all levels of government. Young people in particular are testing and rejecting many of the concepts which the authoritarians cling to like a young baby clings to a tattered baby blanket. They have had enough. Such testing can by no means be considered to be among only the young people. There are many adults who have seen a little bit of everything, experienced a little bit of everything and seen the slowness of it. We see how long it takes to have the most minor reforms passed in this House. There was a 16-day filibuster on the omnibus bill dealing with abortion. There were 16 days of nothing but talk, the same thing over and over again. The reactionary forces are holding fast; the activists and reformists are anxious to get ahead.

Mr. Peters: The bill was the only abortion.

Mr. Hogarth: I will tell you about that in a moment.

Mr. Peters: I did not ask you that.

Mr. Hogarth: In encouraging dialogue, encouraging young people to get into the political institutions which we represent, and encouraging them to make changes we must have a peaceful transition and reform. In a rebellious world there is no room for violence. We cannot tolerate violence. When a government fails to act, refuses to change and refuses to see the causes of violence in its community, there is every chance the extremists, megalomaniacs and psychopaths will become terrorists. To a large extent, this is what happened in our community today.

This is not the occasion to discuss long-term solutions for what has happened. It is not the occasion to consider what has happened in our universities, among the working people, the unemployed and our ethnic groups such as the Métis who are dissatisfied. Today is not the time to discuss this, but it must be discussed soon. Nor is it a time to dwell on transformation and change of the government. It is not the time to blame, accuse or confront. We all carry, in a sense, a certain amount of the blame. What we must consider today is the legislation before us, its necessity, its provisions and hopeful effect. Regardless of what might have been said about rumours of the takeover of the government of Quebec, in my view there was ample evidence upon which this government and the province of Quebec were entitled to act, not only entitled but obligated to act to preserve social order. I am only surprised that we acted with the restraint with which we did.

Much has been said to the effect that the government had no basis and no ground on which to introduce regulations under the War Measures Act and that there was no evidence of apprehended insurrection. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) has said that we should

have acted earlier and taken effective action. These are two points I would like to discuss. Obviously, before October 16 we did not have a request for assistance from the government of Quebec. The government of the province of Quebec did not write to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) asking for such powers. Hon. members will recall in hearings before the Standing Committee on Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts that this matter was dealt with. There was never a request from the Government of Quebec for assistance.

Does the Leader of the Opposition suggest that the government of Canada should have acted in the absence of such a request? Should we have demonstrated that the government of the province of Quebec had no power to enforce the law in that province? That is contrary to the Constitution. Surely, it was the request of Mr. Bourassa and others, coupled with other evidence, that brought about the invocation of the regulations under the War Measures Act. Should the federal government have refused to act when the Premier of the province of Quebec requested assistance?

Consider the facts which we have heard. I will deal with them very briefly. In the last ten years we have witnessed bombings, we have witnessed riots, obviously organized, in the city of Montreal. There have been crimes of murder extending even to the city of Ottawa, last June. There have been robberies so that these people could gain their financial ends. There have been thefts of dynamite, thefts of weapons.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Hon. members can read today in the *Globe and Mail* about the discovery of a cache of weapons including carbines, machine-guns and a bazooka. Mr. Speaker, these are not for shooting ducks. They were to be used for one purpose only, and that is to destroy the social order. Twenty-three persons are in jail as a result of crimes perpetrated in the name of political power. If we can attribute these acts to the FLQ and its related associations, in these circumstances it would appear to me that we have been modest in our actions.

Consider the evidence which was produced before the Committee on Broadcasting last year. We heard about the infiltration of terrorists into the Company of Young Canadians. We were told by the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Douglas) in that committee that we were not to go on a witch-hunt, that we were confined in our terms of reference to dealing with the CYC. No request was made by the government of Quebec for assistance at that time. We heard from Mr. Saulnier, we heard from Mr. Coté. They were convinced then that there were grounds for apprehending an insurrection; not the next day, but they said it was coming, it was on its way. And they showed us the documentation which had been seized throughout the city of Montreal, obviously designed for distribution throughout the whole of Quebec. Mr. Coté, in evidence before the committee on November 27, 1969—

An hon. Member: Almost a year ago.

Mr. Hogarth: Almost a year ago. There was no request from the province of Quebec for assistance.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hogarth: All right. Should we have invoked the War Measures Act a year ago?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Hogarth: You are right. Consider the documents and the evidence.

An hon. Member: Too late.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. I find it a little difficult to follow what the hon. member is saying. Members of the House should allow him to complete his remarks.

Mr. Hogarth: Mr. Coté was reading from one of the documents which was seized. This is what one of them said:

> The organization of the exploited classes on a vast scale must be brought into effect, when the time comes, with a direct view to popular insurrection which will be characterized by the *armed* occupation of factories, universities, schools, public services and the national territory.

Another document contained the following:

> Since 1963, ever since the explosion of the first FLQ bombs, we have been in that first stage of the revolutionary struggle which will be pursued until agitation becomes widespread and culminates in a general political, social and economic crisis. We are now approaching this crisis very rapidly, and this has been particularly the case in the last six months.

It goes on:

> This is the sort of struggle which is conducted daily, each according to his means, by the FLP, MIS, FLQ et cetera. This many sided action, which pursues the same objectives everywhere, is dominated by propaganda, agitation, ideological training of militants, and the progressive organization at the basic levels, of active cells, whether it be FLP cells, citizens' committees, political action unions, committees, strike committees, clandestine and armed FLQ cells, et cetera.

I do not intend to go through all this evidence tonight, but there is ample documentation here to show that the FLQ did plan an insurrection. Passages in these documents explained how to make Molotov cocktails, how to put ball-bearings beneath the feet of horses in a riot so that the police forces would stumble, how to use military weapons, machine-guns, carbines and the like, how to protect oneself with safety devices against anti-riot equipment. This clearly showed the purport of the FLQ.

It might be said that the committee dealt lightly with this evidence, that its members buried their heads in the sand. But, I repeat, there was no request on the part of the government of Quebec at that time for any action in this field. But the kidnappings of Mr. Cross and Mr. Laporte were obviously the last straw; it was obviously indicative to the government of Quebec, with the totality of its police force engaged in trying to apprehend those who had committed these acts, that the existing measures

governing law enforcement were inadequate. It was obvious that special powers were required, and they decided to act. It could not be said that insurrection was about to take place, because nobody knew. But, certainly, it was properly apprehended in the true sense because all these acts were committed pursuant to the basic manifesto, parts of which I have read out—a manifesto which indicated that at some future date, very soon, an insurrection might take place.

The action of the government, directed to stopping this terror, has been to sweep up all those suspected of any connection with it. I agree that this is an infringement of the civil rights usually enjoyed by Canadians. I do not like it. It required an awful lot of soul-searching to conclude it was necessary. But when one considers the overall picture, the fact that the Bourassa government is a young government, a government which had yet, really, to formulate its policy, it is apparent that the action we took was absolutely necessary and justified in the circumstances. The whole pattern indicates a format of insurrection, and if hon. members opposite cannot see that I suggest to them, with the greatest respect, that they are blind. This bill is quite moderate, considering what it might be.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hogarth: It is fair and it is just. I repeat my statement. A government acting in panic would surely have imposed censorship. The suggestion that there are retroactive provisions in the bill are not well-founded. Any experienced lawyer will confirm this. It is only the circumstances surrounding proof which are given retroactive effect. In the last analysis, the burden of proof remains upon the Crown. The Crown must prove its case beyond reasonable doubt. I should like to hear some of the lawyers in the opposition discuss the question of rebuttable presumption and what happens to the burden of proof. It does not change. Within 90 days a trial date has to be fixed. I am not too sure I would not rather be charged under this bill than under the Criminal Code, because under the Code there is no obligation to fix a date for trial within 90 days.

An hon. Member: What about Lortie?

Mr. Hogarth: If Mr. Lortie was unlawfully picked up, if there was no reason to suspect him, he still has a right to sue for damages. That possibility exists.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hogarth: No criticism of this bill is really possible, considering the exigencies of the situation we face. But having said this, I agree that repressive legislation of any kind can only be of a temporary nature.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Mr. Fairweather: Would the hon. member permit a question?

[Mr. Hogarth.]

Mr. Hogarth: When I am through. We have to find the cause. It is clear to me, as it must be clear to all hon. members, that as long as we encourage dissent, as we do by participatory democracy and the like, we have to be more conscious than ever before of the security of this nation. We must have some introspection at all levels of government in future programs. We must consider changes in the criminal law dealing with group liability, sedition, treason and the like. We must be able to erase the basic structure upon which terrorists rely for their support in riots, and so on. We must consider our traditional concept of civil rights in a changing society and give it very close scrutiny. Greater freedom means greater responsibility. We have to examine civil rights in the light of a changing world.

I am satisfied that we can solve these problems in the future. I agree with the government that now is not the time to introduce such long-range, profound and deep legislation pertaining to civil rights. If we take our time in the sense of studying the question during this session of Parliament, hopefully we can come up with something that will be beneficial to the people of Canada in years to come.

Mr. Fairweather: Would the hon. member now permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. Hogarth: Yes, sir.

Mr. Fairweather: Is the hon. member seriously saying that attendance at a meeting of the FLQ before October 16, 1970, is not an offence; that clause 8 of the bill is not retroactive? If he can assure me of that, it may have some—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I wonder whether it is in order at this point to get into a detailed discussion of this type.

Mr. Fairweather: The hon. member just stated that.

Mr. Speaker: I realize that perhaps the hon. member did give his own interpretation of the clause to which the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) is now referring. I was, unfortunately, not in the chair at the time and am in no position to say whether he did or not. In any event, the hon. member based his question upon a statement made by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Hogarth), who might be allowed to reply. Nevertheless, I suggest there should be no detailed discussion of the individual clauses of the bill.

Mr. Hogarth: As briefly as I can, Mr. Speaker, let me say that clause 4 creates the substantive offences. There is no substantive offence in clause 8, only a presumption dealing with evidence.

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, this evening, as always, I am pleased to follow my bellicose, former municipal council colleague whom I always admire for his volume, his tone and his remarkable dra-

matic ability. I hope that for his dramatic ability he will ultimately be awarded an Oscar, or a suitable reward perhaps in the form of a seat in the cabinet. I ask everybody to note that I have not specified into which cabinet I should like him to resume his seat.

I think we are passing through times of extreme tension. These are times of very high feelings. At this point of the debate I should like to change the tone of our discussion. I hope that what I have to say will not be taken as frivolous in view of the grave circumstances we are facing tonight, but perhaps I may be excused, especially in view of the speech we have just heard from the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Hogarth).

If I may comment briefly on what the hon. member for New Westminster said, may I observe that he spent an extremely large amount of time dealing with the Saulnier testimony last winter before the committee studying the Company of Young Canadians. I rush to point out that in his reply to the statement on motions requesting the House to send this serious issue to the committee, my leader said at the time that this matter was serious enough to place it before, not simply a parliamentary committee but it required a judicial inquiry or royal commission. We objected strongly to the government's action at the time, and I think events have proven that to shunt this particular issue off to a parliamentary committee was merely to invite either a whitewash or witch-hunt. We had neither, Mr. Speaker; we had a washout.

For at least eight months from the time of the hearings very grave things have been happening in this country, and I for one am extremely depressed about our future at this time. I am confused by the statements made by the hon. member for New Westminster and I do not know whether he was speaking in favour of or against his government. He cited the bombings of 1963. He could have gone on to mention the robberies of armouries since that time, as well as the tremendous but necessary security surrounding the visit of the Royal family to Expo'67. It seems to me the hon. member was criticizing his own government for not acting during this period. In fact, they did not act at all until the kidnappings took place.

Perhaps the War Measures Act was a very successful distraction from the many other issues facing the country today, such as unemployment, poverty and pollution. I am not suggesting for a moment that the serious issues at the time of the kidnappings were not extremely grave, but our country abounds with other serious issues and I do not think we should forget them.

I mentioned earlier that I should like to change the tone of this discussion a little, though this is very difficult having heard the last speaker. For some, what I am about to say will be regarded as frivolous, though I hope not because what I have to say I mean deeply. I take refuge in a phrase by a seventeenth century English essayist by the name of Sydney Smith, who some 300 years ago said:

Do not think me foolish because I am facetious, and I'll not think you wise because you are grave.

It seems to me that it would be interesting if we looked at the speech made yesterday by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), not as a verbal presentation but as a musical one, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall assume the role of the music critic or adjudicator who listened to the performance of the Minister of Justice.

Yesterday in this hall the ears of music lovers were affronted by an exceptionally inept rendition of the composition "Variations for French Horn and Backbench Percussion" as performed by the Minister of Justice. This composition is reminiscent of works in the Nixon-Agnew tradition. It began competently enough with what the listeners were led to assume was the main or principal theme. The initial statement to which I listened could be described as *andante tranquillo sostenuto,* but regrettably this lasted but a few bars.

• (9:40 p.m.)

It was quite a pleasant opening theme, I thought, harmonious, lyrical, logical, eminently capable of further development and fascinating interpolation if placed in the proper hands. Our meditations, however, were much too soon shattered by an abrupt change of tempo and mood to *allegro furioso,* followed by an almost endless sequence of deceptive cadences, a monotonous repetition on the three-note motive—N-D-P—rising in pitch and intensity of attack—

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): But no harmony.

Mr. Rose: —until the soloist was creatively drained and his listeners exhausted. The members of the percussion accompaniment in the back rows nevertheless seemed untouched by the stridence and volume and remained enthusiastic to the end, some beating not only their hands but even their heads, each contributing generously to the cacophony.

One critic, a friend of mine, asked the pertinent question as to what might possibly lie behind the performer's excessive preoccupation with the notes N-D-P which had not previously assumed great thematic importance, at least during the introductory section of the piece. Of course, one can only guess about this and a number of possible explanations, and a variety of interpretations remain extant.

The first one is that because of the timing of the concert there were insufficient rehearsal opportunities for the performer to alter his composition; in other words, he could not change his tune because he did not have the time. Therefore, he had to be content with changing his emphasis. Another possibility exists that the soloist just does not know any other tune, or even that he was specifically forbidden by his maestro to change his tune, the maestro of course being convinced that the piece "Variations for French Horn" continued to enjoy its former popularity with those out in radio and TV land.

The third possibility, and perhaps the most impressive reason that special teatment was given to the notes N-D-P is that the Minister of Justice was advised that

many critics have charged that his selection lacked depth, profundity and musical integrity; and that while this harsh melody might be on everyone's lips for the moment, there was no real evidence to conclude that its popularity could prevail for long, in spite of the cleverness of its construction and the elaborate polyphony of its texture, and finally, that it would certainly never stand the test of history as a masterpiece orchestrated, as it was, by the Department of Public Works.

Other critics agree that the whole composition was a badly balanced one from a structural point of view. The pianissimo introduction, though pedestrian, was lulling enough to suit most tastes. Following the introduction, the development section was belaboured, intense and far too long, bearing but little reference to the principal theme. After such an extended development section the coda, naturally, was awaited anxiously by all. When it came, an immense gasp of relief was heard from the audience, undoubtedly because, as in common with all audiences, this one identified with and shared the embarrassment of the soloist. A minor aside really, Mr. Speaker, but apparently the percussion section members were not paying sufficient attention to their scores, because many players tended to proceed with the rythmic ostinato long after it was quite plain to everyone else that the piece had ended.

I would like to turn at this point and give some attention to the technique displayed by the French horn soloist, the Minister of Justice. It was quite evident that yesterday's concert did not rank with his best. While the listeners had little reason to expect virtuosity from him, it saddens me to say that at least they could expect virtue. Perhaps serious music is not the best field for the talents of this young man. With his inborn personal attractiveness and his carefully acquired charm, he might do extremely well in the pop field. Others have abandoned classics for pop with no discredit to them. I mention only two to support my thesis, Xavier Cugat, who was once concert master for the New York Philharmonic, and Lorne Greene, who forsook Shakespeare for "Bonanza."

I think that in discussing technical matters it would only be fair and kindly to point out to the minister that delicate nuances of tone capable of being produced by the French horn are better accomplished by the player inserting just his right hand rather than his whole right wing into the bell of this delicate instrument. Perhaps, though, this extravagant employment of the right wing was a not so subtle appeal to the nostalgia of the good old days when people were offered less dissonance, and a total acceptance of what was musically good prevailed throughout the land.

It must be said, too, that I was extremely disappointed by the way in which the performer handled the relatively simple triple-tongueing passages in the cadenza. Most agree that this particular soloist is superbly equipped for triple-tongueing and has displayed this ability remarkably on numerous previous occasions. Yesterday, alas, was not his day.

[Mr. Rose.]

Typically, however, his reliance on the staccato style remains unimpaired. A series of short, detached bursts followed by deep-furrowed silences—believed to indicate thinking—have been a trademark of the minister's style for some years. Musicologists have theorize that his delivery has developed over many years in a valiant effort to overcome a childhood impediment caused by his efforts to speak clearly without the necessity of removing the silver spoon.

To conclude, let me say that regardless of what field of musical endeavour the soloist might find in the future satisfying and rewarding, it is obvious to me that he has directed far too much of his studies exclusively to the works patronized in aristocratic chambers. It is this critic's view that the soloist would do better to develop a greater acquaintanceship with composers such as Sibelius, Aaron Copland, or even the Beatles who have used as a stimulus for their creativity the melodies reflecting aspirations of little men living in a free society. And above all he must remember that when playing the French horn the best results by far are achieved if one keeps a stiff upper lip at all times.

Some hon. Members: Encore.

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I rise to make one of my shortest speeches in this House, for which many members may be thankful. I rise merely to say that I feel this House is on the verge of committing itself to legislation that is very much against the best interests of this country. I will not go into all the arguments that I raised on October 16 and 17 when we discussed the War Measures Act, but they would apply equally to the legislation that is before us tonight. What we are dealing with is, in effect, just a revised standard version of the War Measures Act regulations. For that reason I have decided to place my vote against these regulations and against this new act.

I am sure that many people will recall that I supported the move of the government on October 18 or 19 to enforce the War Measures Act and its regulations. I did so, not without a great deal of thought and with some uncertainty on my part but basically in good faith, believing that the government had rightly apprehended the situation as it existed in the province of Quebec and was taking what at that time seemed to be a reasonable step. I now believe, 2 1/2 weeks later, that step to have been unwise and one that I can no longer support.

I cannot support this legislation and I certainly cannot support the War Measures Act. I will, as a member of this House, use every opportunity that I have to see it removed as quickly as possible. I think what we have done to the country has been amply proven here in the last few days by the kind of intemperate remarks, most of them irrelevant, and the fact that we have not been given, even to this day, sufficient justification either inside or outside the House to warrant the government asking for and producing the kind of legislation that I feel will, and has, very detrimentally affected this country.

• (9:50 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Turner, Ottawa-Carleton) which was agreed to on the following division:

• (10:00 p.m.)

Division

YEAS

Messrs:

Alexander
Alkenbrack
Allmand
Anderson
Andras
Asselin
Badanai
Baldwin
Barnett
Barrett
Basford
Béchard
Bell
Benson
Blouin
Borrie
Boulanger
Brewin
Broadbent
Brown
Burton
Caccia
Chappell
Coates
Code
Comeau
Corbin
Crouse
Cullen
Cyr
Danforth
Danson
Davis
Deachman
De Bané
Dinsdale
Dionne
Douglas (Assiniboia)
Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands)
Drury
Duquet
Fairweather
Faulkner
Flemming
Forest
Forget
Forrestall
Foster
Francis
Gendron
Gervais
Gilbert
Givens
Gleave
Gray
Grills
Guay (Lévis)
Guilbault
Gundlock
Haidasz
Hales
Harding
Harkness
Hogarth
Hopkins
Howard (Okanagan Boundary)
Howard (Skeena)
Howe
Hymmen
Isabelle
Jerome
Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre)
Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
Laing (Vancouver South)
Lang (Saskatoon-Humboldt)
Langlois
Laniel
Laprise
Leblanc (Laurier)
LeBlanc (Rimouski)
Lefebvre
Legault
Lessard (LaSalle)
Lessard (Lac-Saint-Jean)
Lewis
Macdonald (Rosedale)
MacEachen
MacEwan
MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond)
MacInnis (Mrs.)
Mackasey
Macquarrie
McCleave
McCutcheon
McGrath
McIlraith
McIntosh
McNulty
Mahoney
Major
Marchand (Kamloops-Cariboo)
Mather
Mazankowski
Monteith
Moore
Muir
Noël
Nowlan
Otto
Ouellet
Paproski
Pelletier
Penner
Pepin
Perrault
Peters
Pilon
Portelance
Ricard
Richard
Richardson
Ritchie
Rochon
Rock
Rondeau
Rose
Saltsman
Schumacher
Sharp
Simpson
Skoberg
Smith (Northumberland-Miramichi)
Smith (Saint-Jean)
Southam
Stanfield
Stewart (Marquette)
Stewart (Okanagan-Kootenay)
Tétrault
Thomas (Maisonneuve)
Thomas (Moncton)
Thompson (Red Deer)
Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley)
Trudeau
Trudel
Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)
Wahn
Walker
Watson
Weatherhead
Whicher
Whiting
Woolliams—152.

NAYS

Messrs:

MacDonald (Egmont)—1.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion carried. When shall the said bill be referred to the Committee of the Whole? At the next sitting of the House?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: It being after ten o'clock, this House stands adjourned until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

At 10.27 p.m. the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, November 6, 1970

The House met at 11 a.m.

PRIVILEGE

MR. WAHN—INTENT OF REMARKS MADE AT PUBLIC MEETING

Mr. Ian Wahn (St. Paul's): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. In an interview last night on the program "Encounter", the interviewer may have implied that certain remarks which I made from the floor at a public meeting in Convocation Hall of the University of Toronto last Monday suggested dishonourable motives or illegal conduct on the part of the person or persons named in the interview.

I wish to make it entirely clear that that was not my intent.

At that meeting I did defend, to the best of my ability, the decision of the government in proclaiming the War Measures Act. I reviewed in some detail the situation prevailing at the time that the decision was made, including the statements urging the government of Quebec to accede to the terrorists' demands which, if acceded to, might in my view have led to the breakdown of the civil authority of the elected government of the province of Quebec. I wish to make it entirely clear that I did not accuse or intend to accuse any individual or specific group, other than the FLQ, of dishonourable motives or illegal or dishonourable conduct. If anything I said at what was at that point a somewhat noisy meeting has given that impression, I sincerely regret it and I extend my sincere apologies to all those who may have been affected by my remarks.

Finally, I wish to make it entirely clear that I spoke at the meeting entirely on my own initiative and not at the request of any member of government, and my remarks were not based upon any private information but only upon reports which had been published in the press or referred to in this House.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

POST OFFICE

TABLING OF REPORT ON DEPARMENTAL ROLE

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table copies in both official languages of a report on departmental activities.

[*English*]

FISHERIES

CONSERVATION OF MARINE RESOURCES—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTIONS UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43 I ask the unanimous consent of the House to present a motion in a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

This matter involves the management and conservation of our marine resources on both our Atlantic and Pacific coasts. The depletion of our marine resources by foreign nationals, especially by the Soviet Union, necessitates that Canada assume its responsibility under the articles of the Law of the Sea and initiate an international conference on fish conservation and management.

With the unanimous consent of the House, I would therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath), the following motion:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government must take the initiative in convening an international conference of the fishing nations of the world to discuss the conservation and management of marine resources in the waters adjacent to Canada's territorial seas.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: As the hon. member knows, under Standing Order 43, the unanimous consent of the House is required to proceed with the motion.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimity and therefore the motion cannot be put to the House at this time.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

ATLANTIC PROVINCES—FORECAST OF SEVERE ECONOMIC CRISIS—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43 I ask the unanimous consent of the House—

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Macquarrie: —to present a motion in a matter of urgent and pressing necessity.

The Atlantic Provinces Economic Council yesterday forecast a severe economic crisis this winter in the eastern region of Canada where already the male unemployment rate this year is averaging at least 10 per cent. This

crisis will not be prevented by the government's slight easing of its restrictive economic and fiscal policies. This government must co-operate with the Atlantic provincial governments immediately on crash programs that will be of immediate effect to diminish the force of this crisis.

With the unanimous consent of the House I therefore move, seconded by the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. McCleave), the following motion:

That this House expresses its concern at the effect of the government's economic and fiscal policies upon the Atlantic region where an economic crisis with drastic unemployment is imminent and urges that the government take immediate action to alleviate the effects of this crisis.

• (11:10 a.m.)

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. As the hon. member knows, this motion cannot be put under the terms of Standing Order 43 unless there is unanimous consent.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is no unanimity in the House and the motion cannot be put at this time.

Some hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Baldwin: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think it should be pointed out that two members of the government party said no before the hon. member for Hillsborough had even read his motion.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Peace River knows that is not a point of order. That is debate. I would hope that when motions under Standing Order 43 are proposed to the House there would be no debate and that we would limit our consideration thereof to an inquiry whether or not there is unanimity.

* * *

NEW ZEALAND TRADE AGREEMENT (AMENDMENT) ACT

PROVISION FOR APPROVAL AND COMING INTO FORCE

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (for the Secretary of State for External Affairs) moved the first reading of Bill S-4 (from the Senate) to implement an agreement amending the trade agreement between Canada and New Zealand.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

* * *

LEPROSY ACT

PROVISION FOR REPEAL

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (for the Minister of National Health and Welfare) moved the first reading of Bill S-7 (from the Senate), to repeal the Leprosy Act.

Motion agreed to and bill read the first time.

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

MEASURES TO ALLEVIATE WINTER UNEMPLOYMENT CRISIS FORECAST BY ATLANTIC PROVINCES ECONOMIC COUNCIL

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Prime Minister whether, in view of the warning of APEC that the Atlantic provinces face crisis conditions of unemployment this winter, he proposes to adopt any new measures, or whether he considers APEC to be exaggerating inasmuch as he suggested yesterday we could have no assurance that Donald MacDonald was telling the truth?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, without agreeing with the insinuation the hon. member made about APEC not telling the truth, I might say that the government has been taking a series of measures which will have the effect of alleviating that situation. As the House remembers, in the March budget we announced that the government's cash requirements would undergo a swing of about three-quarters of a billion dollars from the previous year. This certainly is a new posture which is meant to help the unemployment situation. Last June it was announced that outlays to the provinces would increase by some $300 million to cover accelerated transfer and so on, and later it was announced that equalization payments to the provinces were to be increased by $50 million. The House knows that the student summer employment program, launched by the government, added another $73 million to current expenditures. Then, an additional $100 million was announced a month or two ago for moderate income housing. Also, in the throne speech debate the Minister of Finance announced plans for new expenditures of $60 million. All these measures, of course, add up to a serious expenditure by the government to meet these unemployment situations.

On the monetary side there has been an easing of restraints, and the money supply in private hands has increased at a seasonally adjusted annual rate averaging 12.1 per cent. I think it should be obvious to any impartial observer, Mr. Speaker, that the government is doing a great many things indeed in terms of money, money supply and fiscal measures to meet this serious unemployment situation in Canada.

Mr. Stanfield: I thank the right hon. gentleman for his review of what has taken place. However, any impartial observer would agree that it has not taken us very far forward. In view of what the Prime Minister stated, is it the position of the government that it is now doing all it reasonably can to reduce anticipated winter unemployment, that while the government may have made a mistake and gone much too far in slowing down the economy there is nothing further it can do to relieve this approaching crisis?

Mr. Speaker: It appears that the question of the Leader of the Opposition is somewhat argumentative in tone,

and I wonder whether it should be accepted as a supplementary question. However, the matter is important and the Prime Minister may wish to reply.

[*Translation*]

UNEMPLOYMENT—PAYMENT OF COST BY GOVERNMENT IF RATE EXCEEDS FOUR PER CENT

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Prime Minister.

Will the government implement this winter the policies outlined in the white paper on unemployment insurance, that is, will it assume the whole cost of unemployment if the latter exceeds the 4 per cent rate by 1 per cent?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member is aware, this proposal as included in the white paper is before the House at the present time and the government has announced its intention to introduce legislation during the present session following consideration of the white paper.

[*English*]

SPECIAL WINTER WORKS PROGRAM TO LESSEN UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. David Lewis (York South): As the Prime Minister knows, there is always a time lag between the kind of policies to which he has referred and their effect on the employment situation. Is the government giving consideration to some special works this winter in areas of particularly sharp unemployment, such as building works or other projects of that sort to lessen unemployment in those areas?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the member is correct that with some of these measures there are time lags which are fairly substantial, but in others the time lags are much shorter. They have already had substantial effect. For instance, the actions of the government in the area of housing have given the very surprising and welcome result that seasonally adjusted starts rose to an annual rate of 270,000 units in this last month. That is 70,000 units above the annual rate of 200,000 units which is the average that the government has been looking for.

Mr. Lewis: In view of the fact that everyone is agreed that there will be a much higher rate of unemployment this winter—I appreciate the seasonally adjusted figure but that does not help those who are unemployed—particularly in Quebec and the Atlantic provinces, and in view of the fact that there will be a critical situation from various points of view, including that to which we have been giving attention in the last two or three weeks, can a program be introduced this winter to accelerate job creating work in those areas?

Mr. Trudeau: All these actions I have recited, beginning with the swing of three-quarters of a billion dollars which was announced last March, are obviously going to take effect this winter and have been taking effect.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Will the Prime Minister consider delegating to one of his more responsible ministers the task of making a statement on motions to explain why these measures have been such a dismal flop?

INTERIM MEASURE TO INCREASE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS

Mr. David Lewis (York South): May I ask the Prime Minister a further supplementary since I do not think the Minister of Labour is due to be here? It follows upon the question asked by the hon. member for Shefford. I realize that the white paper on unemployment insurance is now before a committee, but in view of the heavy unemployment which is expected this winter is the government considering introducing a special measure or an interim measure to increase unemployment benefits to meet this situation, whether on a 4 per cent basis or on any other basis?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, but if the House wishes to co-operate and get this white paper considered and the legislation introduced early, we will be very happy.

ATLANTIC PROVINCES—APPLICATION OF SELECTIVE FISCAL AND MONETARY POLICIES

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): My supplementary question is directed to the Minister of Finance. Does the government intend to announce the selective fiscal and monetary policies which the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council says are immediately required?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): The government has already announced these policies. I should also point out that this government and the previous Liberal government put some teeth into the development of the Atlantic region allocating money for regional development.

An hon. Member: False teeth.

Mr. Stanfield: One further question to avoid any misunderstanding. Is it the position of the government that it has taken all measures which could reasonably be taken with regard to unemployment this coming winter and that it does not propose to take any further new measures of substance?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I do not know whether the hon. gentleman is suggesting that we should take no further measures—

An hon. Member: Oh, come on!

Mr. Trudeau: —but I recited a few moments ago a series of measures which have been taken from month to month. Of course I would not say no further measures will be taken. They will be taken if they are needed and if we have the money to implement them.

Inquiries of the Ministry

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON RECOMMENDATIONS BY COUNCIL ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Would the Prime Minister discuss with the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion the third report of the Canadian Council on Rural Development, which I gather was made available to the minister in July and which has now been made public, recommending firm measures which the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion should take to alleviate the rural poverty that stretches across this country from coast to coast? I appreciate that the Prime Minister cannot comment on it, but could the minister, who has had this report in his hands since July, come into the House early next week and tell us what he intends to do about the strong recommendations made by this independent body?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Obviously the hon. member is making a speech. If he wants to ask a question of the minister, he will have the opportunity to do so next week.

Mr. Nowlan: I appreciate that the minister will be here, but because of the importance of the subject, the clear and comprehensive nature of this report, and the importance of this whole problem as it affects Canadians, both employed and unemployed, I had hoped the Prime Minister would give an undertaking to discuss this matter with his colleague so that a statement could be made by the minister concerned.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond.

Mr. Nowlan: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister rose as you rose—

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will agree, of course, that when the Speaker rises he has the floor.

Mr. Nowlan: I would be the first to agree with Your Honour, but the fact is you were looking toward the ebullient member for Cape Breton-East Richmond—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I was looking both ways, but I am recognizing the hon. member for Cape Breton-East Richmond.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): A supplementary question to the Prime Minister following the question asked by my hon. friend from Peace River in which he indicated that programs in the Atlantic provinces had flopped. Would the Prime Minister agree that this has come about because of the lack of administrative ability on the part of Mr. Blackmore in Cape Breton and Mr. Addison in New Brunswick?

Mr. Trudeau: No, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order please.

[Mr. Trudeau.]

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL SECURITY

QUEBEC—DELAY IN LAYING CHARGES OF SEDITION

Mr. Réal Caouette (Témiscamingue): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister.

As several charges were laid yesterday against some suspects under the Criminal Code provisions on sedition, could the Prime Minister tell us why the charges were not laid before since the presumed offices go back as far as January 1, 1968?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am obviously unable to answer this question. The accused are now before the courts. The reason why the charges were not laid sooner is a matter that is naturally relevant to the administration of justice which comes under provincial jurisdiction.

[*English*]

REPORTED REDUCTION IN RCMP PERSONNEL ENGAGED IN SEARCH FOR KIDNAPPERS AND MURDERERS

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, in order to clear up some confusion that I felt the Solicitor General left yesterday, and in view of the fact that there appears to be some new evidence with reference to Mr. Cross, could I ask the Solicitor General whether any RCMP officers have been withdrawn from Quebec of late and, if so, who made that decision?

Mr. Speaker: Order. My understanding is that this question was asked and answered. However, perhaps the minister might like to clarify the situation further.

Hon. G. J. McIlraith (Solicitor General): Mr. Speaker, I am very glad of the opportunity to confirm the answer that I gave two days ago to that question. No RCMP have been withdrawn from Quebec province or from the Cross-Laporte case.

* * *

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

BANKS ISLAND OIL EXPLORATION—AGREEMENTS BETWEEN GOVERNMENT OR COMPANIES AND ESKIMOS

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and arises from a question I asked him on October 13 in regard to oil exploration on Banks Island and agreements between the government and the oil companies and the government and the Eskimos. On October 21 he tabled copies of the agreements between the government and the oil companies. May I ask the minister whether the fact that he tabled these agreements means that there are no agreements between the government and the Eskimos or the oil companies and the Eskimos?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, there has been no agreement signed with the Eskimos. We discussed the conditions set forth for the company involved with the Eskimos' legal adviser who seemed to find them satisfactory. Seismographic work has begun, the Eskimos are accompanying the groups involved and all seems to be going well. At no time have the Eskimos requested the companies to interrupt their work and everything seems to be running smoothly just now, which proves that the agreement between the three parties was adequate.

[*English*]

Mr. Barnett: Does that mean that in the minister's view the Eskimo people on Banks Island have no property rights in that area?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, the lands located inside the Territories are the property of Her Majesty the Queen, and it was on behalf of the government and of the Queen that we signed an agreement with the company.

[*English*]

GENERAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE NORTH—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT AND REFERENCE OF CERTAIN REPORTS TO COMMITTEE

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, as a preface to my supplementary may I compliment the minister on the speech he made in Edmonton, and I do so quite sincerely.

In light of the views the minister expressed there in regard to bringing economic, political, ecological and social development in the north into harmony, may I ask the minister whether or not he would consider making a statement on motions in regard to the government's intentions in this regard, and possibly referring to a committee the report of the Mackenzie Delta group which investigated the very serious conditions there, as well as the report of the committee which is investigating conditions in the Peace-Athabasca Delta?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I hope that the chairman of the committee will look into the hon. member's suggestion and if this matter is studied by the Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development, I would gladly appear before that committee and explain in detail the government's policy on the two issues raised by the hon. member.

[*English*]

RESERVATION OF LAND FOR ESKIMOS

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): In view of the minister's answer that all the land in the north and the territories belongs to the Crown in the name of Her Majesty the Queen, and in view of the fact that development is now taking place in the north and people from other parts of Canada are moving in, may I ask the minister whether any thought will be given to reserving a certain amount of land for the Eskimo people?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, this question is very complex. We consider that all the land in the North belongs to the Crown and, in any event, we have taken the necessary steps in order that the land required by the Eskimos and Indians will be available for their usual activities.

* * *

TAXATION

WHITE PAPER ON REFORM—CAMPAIGN AGAINST CAPITAL GAINS TAX

Mr. Pierre De Bané (Matane): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Finance.

I wonder whether he had time to consider the point I made a month ago about the campaign which the Quebec Association of Private Broadcasters, in co-operation with the provincial Chamber of Commerce, had launched against taxation of capital gains, a measure which evidently would turn out to the advantage of the underprivileged classes. Would it be possible for the latter to be allowed free broadcast periods to start their own campaign?

Mr. Speaker: Apparently the hon. member is taking this opportunity to launch his own campaign. I would suggest that he allow the Minister of Finance a chance to answer his question.

[*English*]

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I am informed that free time public service radio broadcasts during October over various Quebec radio stations, including CKBL, did oppose a capital gains tax for Canada. While there is no regulation requiring it, there is a well established principle that a station broadcasting these messages must ensure that any person or group wishing to express differing views be given an opportunity to do so free of charge and in an equitable manner. Should the application of this principle give rise to any difficulty, the interested parties may communicate with the CRTC to clarify any misunderstanding and state their point of view.

* * *

TRANSPORT

FEDERAL-PROVINCIAL COMMITTEE ON ATLANTIC PROVINCES TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS—APPOINTMENT OF NEW FEDERAL NOMINEE

Mr. Charles H. Thomas (Moncton): I have a question for the Minister of Transport. Now that the winds of

change are blowing in the Atlantic provinces, would the minister contribute his share by advising the House if a successor to Dr. McClure as the federal nominee and chairman of the federal-provincial committee studying Atlantic transportation problems has been named? If so, can the minister now announce the name of the nominee?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): I am afraid I cannot give the name because I am not sure whether the gentleman has been appointed as of today. There have been consultations with the provinces concerned to obtain their agreement, but I can assure the hon. member that the appointment will be announced within a very short time.

Mr. Thomas (Moncton): When the minister is pursuing this course of action, would he also use his good offices to persuade the committee to resume the study of the premiers' report and the twelfth report of the standing committee with a view to making some early recommendations for a new transportation policy for the Atlantic region?

Mr. Jamieson: I do not think we need to wait for the appointment of that gentleman to do that. Work has been going on steadily during the summer months and since the report was received. As the hon. member knows, portions of it have already been implemented, including recently a reduction of the full 25 per cent in truck rates in and out of the two island provinces.

* * *

TRADE

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA—PROMOTION OF CANADIAN WOOD PRODUCTS

Mr. Barry Mather (Surrey): I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Having in mind, on the one hand, the unemployment situation in British Columbia and, on the other hand, our improved trade relations with China, will the minister undertake to encourage his department to develop the trade potential for Canadian wood products, including plywood, in the Chinese market?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): We will do that, Mr. Speaker. We will leave no stone unturned when it comes to developing trade opportunities with China.

ITEMS INVOLVED IN BRITISH REVERVATION CONCERNING APPLICATION OF EEC COMMON TARIFF

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, may I complete the answer I gave yesterday on the subject of the 12 industrial materials for which the British feel that application of the common EEC external tariff would result in an excessive increase in costs for their domestic industry. Nine of these items are of interest to Canada. They are: phosphorus, silicon carbide, plywood, wood pulp, newsprint, ferro-silicon, aluminum, lead and zinc. The three remaining items are: alumina, ferro-chrome and wattle extract—I have no idea what that is. Lumber is not included in the list of sensitive items, although I said yesterday it might be, since the common external tariff of the EEC is already free of duty on rough, sawn lumber.

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA—COMPOSITION OF PERMANENT CANADIAN MISSION

Mr. William Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand): I would like to ask the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce whether he is sending a permanent trade mission to China and whether, when that mission is assembled, he will consider including a member of the Tobacco Producers' Marketing Board?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): The Secretary of State for External Affairs announced on October 13 what the plan was with respect to our representation in the Peoples' Republic of China. I think it was said at the time that the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce would send two trade commissioners to Peking. There is no intention at this time to hire people from any one of the specialized industries in Canada for the purpose of special representation.

* * *

[*Translation*]

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I want to put a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Is he aware that his special assistant, the former member for Champlain, who is paid $13,000 a year plus a certain amount for his expenses, is presently in the motel La Provence at Thetford Mines where he is organizing the election campaign of the Liberal candidate in Frontenac?

Mr. Speaker: Order. This question is not in order.

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: The minister on a question of privilege.

Mr. Chrétien: It is true that Mr. Matte is working in my office. He is on leave right now and I understand very well that the Ralliement créditiste members are afraid of losing the Frontenac constituency within ten days.

Mr. Speaker: The question of privilege is out of order as well as the question of the hon. member for Shefford.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Témiscamingue on a question of privilege also.

Mr. Caouette: Mr. Speaker, I must say to the minister as well as to his private secretary that they have been blundering in the Frontenac constituency.

* * *

[*English*]

FINANCE

ISSUING OF UNSOLICITED CREDIT CARDS BY BANKS—SUGGESTED REPEGGING OF CANADIAN DOLLAR

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance. A few days ago I asked the minister about the rights and privileges of the commercial banks in sending out gratuitous Chargex cards which create a liability on those receiving them. I wonder whether the minister is in a position to answer this question, and at the same time could he give the House any indication if, when, and at what amount he intends to repeg the Canadian dollar?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member may ask only one question at a time. He might indicate now which one he would like the minister to answer.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Speaker, I did ask only one new question. The other question I asked the other day, and I felt that perhaps Your Honour might permit both.

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): I looked into the question raised on October 27 and I find that the situation is as follows: First, as the banks issuing Chargex cards extend this operation into additional places in Canada, these cards will not be mailed to the public until the bank concerned has been advised that the card is wanted. Second, the banks issuing these cards have not held anyone legally responsible for the improper use of a credit card which was mailed but not received by the proper person.

My reply to the second question is no.

* * *

AIR TRANSPORT

NEGOTIATIONS WITH PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex): I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Transport to seek some information which I think would be of interest to all members of the House. In view of the new status of our relations with the Republic of China and the apparent opportunity for a tremendous expansion of our air transport to that country, can the minister state whether the necessary negotiations will be initiated and pursued by the government or whether this will be left to the air carriers subject to ratification by the government?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): The procedures for negotiations toward a bilateral air agreement with any country are well laid down. These negotiations are carried on between countries rather than between airlines, although naturally there is an input by the airlines because of their direct interest. At the moment there are no bilateral negotiations under way with the government of China, but presumably if there were to be any they would follow the establishment of proper recognition in both capitals.

INSTALLATION OF RADIOS AND HOMER BEACON DEVICES ON PRIVATE COMMERCIAL PLANES

Mr. Mark W. Rose (Fraser Valley West): My question to the Minister of Transport relates to the helicopter pilot who was lost for 30 days and miraculously found in the Baker Lake area north of Saskatchewan. In view of the fact that thousands of man-hours and thousands of dollars are spent annually by the Department of National Defence on search and rescue operations, is the minister considering the institution of regulations requiring radios and homer beacon devices to be installed on all private commercial planes?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are. I have answered this question in various forms over the last year or so. The real difficulty is in getting general agreement as to the technical standards for such equipment. If it can be shown that these are useful, the department and the government would be quite prepared to require them, certainly in those cases where there is danger of loss of an aircraft in a remote area. The difficulty is that at the moment there is no such assurance of proper standards and we would not want, for example, to require their installation and perhaps give people a false sense of security which, indeed, the equipment now available might not be able to provide.

Mr. Rose: Mr. Speaker, would the minister be kind enough to tell the House what steps are being taken by his department or other agencies to validate the usefulness of such equipment?

Mr. Speaker: Order. I would think such information should be given the House by way of a statement on motions. With respect, I suggest it should not be done at this time.

* * *

NATIONAL PARKS

POLICY RESPECTING PERPETUAL LEASES

Mr. P. M. Mahoney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address this question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Is the minister in a position to inform the House as to government policy with respect to perpetually renewable leases in light of the Supreme Court judgment in the Walker case and, further, what action is being taken with regard to applications for assignment or renewal of such leases?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I already have been asked this question by the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) and I am pleased to answer it.

In answering the question of the hon. member I would like to say that all the requests for renewal or assignment of perpetually renewable leases under consideration now are in process of settlement. I approve and I will continue to approve all requests for renewal or transfer unless there is clear evidence that I have to refuse in the public interest.

It is nevertheless my duty to stress that we do not have given up definitively the idea of eliminating perpetual leases gradually. Our policy regarding lease renting and other matters involving the interests of persons living or doing business in our national parks is the subject of—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I must interrupt the minister and remind him that such a lengthy reply should normally be made by way of a statement on motions.

[*English*]

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, may I say that we are prepared to agree to the minister reverting to motions. When there is such an obvious rehearsed arrangement, I think that should be the proper procedure.

Mr. Mahoney: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What is the government prepared to do to reimburse the 750-odd leaseholders who over the past 10 to 12 years have been obliged to surrender perpetually renewable leases they held and accept 42-year leases in order to secure the minister's consent to transfers or renewals?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chrétien: Mr. Speaker, we have not examined this aspect of the problem, and though we cannot give an answer now, we are studying the matter.

[*English*]

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I have raised this question in the House on many occasions. In light of the fact that a number of people, 700-odd or at least a great portion of them, were told they could not transfer to a second party unless they gave up their equity and rights, will the minister now consider restoring the rights that were denied these people by duress?

Mr. Chrétien: I should like to say to the hon. member that this policy was established in 1958 by the previous administration.

Mr. Woolliams: That is hogwash.

Mr. Dinsdale: On a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker, may I say that the policy established in 1958 was a moratorium on any further perpetual leaseholds. There was no interference with existing perpetual leaseholds.

[Mr. Mahoney.]

NATIONAL SECURITY

KIDNAPPING OF JAMES CROSS—INFORMATION AS TO WHEREABOUTS FOLLOWING OFFER OF REWARD

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Prime Minister. Since the announcement of a reward, has the Prime Minister any information to give the House concerning the whereabouts of British Trade Commissioner, James Cross?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, I have none, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

POST OFFICE

DISCOVERY OF MISSING MAIL BAGS

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister without Portfolio from Longueuil, based on the fascinating document he has just tabled, concerning the rediscovery of 140 mail bags which have been misplaced since Holy Thursday, March 26. Can he advise whether his department has reason to believe that other mail bags are still missing and that there is hope of reclaiming them?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I was very upset by this report from some of my officials that 140 bags of mail had been found in two trucks that had been in storage since last March. That is why I did not wish to conceal any of the facts and that I made them known as soon as possible.

Therefore, I tabled the report this morning and I informed the press. We intend to carry out a thorough investigation and to take any action required against the persons responsible for this negligence.

I wanted to reveal all the facts as soon as possible. There is no excuse for this sort of thing, Mr. Speaker, especially when the post office is trying very hard to improve its services.

* * *

[*English*]

FINANCE

LOWERING OF INTEREST RATES BY INSTITUTIONS OTHER THAN BANKS

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Finance this question. Following his successful consultations with the chartered banks as the result of which they did reduce their interest rates, has he had consultations with lending institutions other than the chartered banks to see whether they might also conform with the general trend established by the chartered banks?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): No, Mr. Speaker, but I have noted that in some instances there has been some reduction by other financial institutions.

* * *

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY

REFUSAL TO COME UNDER PENSION BENEFITS STANDARDS ACT—GOVERNMENT ACTION

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, I also have a question for the Minister of Finance. In view of the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway maintains that it does not come under the provisions of the Pension Benefits Standards Act in so far as its pension plan is concerned, would the minister give some indication to the House of what action is being taken against the Canadian Pacific Railway in regard to its refusal to come under the requirements of the Act?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, may I take that question as notice in order to get detailed information.

* * *

NATIONAL PARKS

PROVISION OF POLAR BEAR REFUGE SOUTH OF CHURCHILL

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Can the minister say whether any discussions have taken place between the federal government and the government of Manitoba in relation to the establishment of a national park or a provincial game preserve in the Polar Bear denning area south of Churchill in order to improve the chance of survival of these animals?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I do not know if there were discussions in that respect. I am aware that federal wildlife service officers are now looking into that situation in order to maintain this very important sanctuary for the reproduction of polar bears. I therefore take the hon. member's suggestion as notice and I shall see if there is any possibility of reaching an agreement with the Manitoba government in that connection.

* * *

[*English*]

GRAIN

PRODUCTION AND RECEIPTS POLICY—STATUS OF PAYMENTS UNDER TEMPORARY WHEAT RESERVES ACT

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the minister in charge

of the Wheat Board arising out of the tabling of the proposed grains policy last week. In light of the proposal to discontinue government payments under the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act, can the minister say whether it is the intention of the government to redirect such funds into other areas within the grain industry or is this proposal primarily an austerity move at the expense of the western farmer?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): It is clearly not an austerity move, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member had read the totality of the proposal he would have seen there is an indication of government support in the stabilization fund and also in the market development fund in addition to the three-year program for diverting further acreage to forage.

Mr. Mazankowski: With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, there is no assurance of a corresponding amount being paid into the stabilization fund. Since $655 million has been paid in lieu of storage charges since 1956, can the minister give any indication whether a corresponding amount will be channelled into funds to promote and provide a stronger grain industry in western Canada?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the exact figure which will be involved will, of course, have to wait for the further development of the details of the program. But it certainly is envisaged that a significant contribution will be made, and if the plan had been in effect over the period of the Temporary Wheat Reserves Act perhaps a little more money would have been involved than under that Act. Naturally I would hesitate to be too precise about figures while I am still urging further discussions with the producers about various aspects of the plan, including a maximum limit on grain deliveries by each producer which should be included.

* * *

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

PUBLIC AFFAIRS PROGRAMS—PROVISION OF EQUAL TIME FOR DIFFERING POINTS OF VIEW

Mr. Norman A. Cafik (Ontario): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Finance which is really supplementary to the question raised by the hon. member for Matane regarding equal time privileges. Does this same principle apply to public affairs programs on the CBC and other media, which so often spread messages of disunity and anarchy, in order to allow the rest of us to present a more healthy point of view?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I have to defer to the Secretary of State for an answer to that question.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*Translation*]

MANPOWER

QUEBEC—RETRAINING GRANTS TO NURSING STUDENTS

Mr. Gilbert Rondeau (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, I wish to put a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration.

Can the minister inform the House of the progress of the discussions between the Department of Manpower of Canada and officials of the adult education service of the Department of Education of the province of Quebec with regard to the retraining allowances which have been promised to male and female nurses who have been waiting for an answer since September?

[*English*]

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I will have to take as notice the question of where the specific discussions referred to by the hon. member are. I should say, of course, that there are programs by both governments in this area, with the federal government not being involved in regard to certain of the nurses training programs to which I think the hon. member referred in a question some weeks ago.

* * *

HOUSING

ACCEPTABILITY OF MOBILE HOMES UNDER NHA REGULATIONS—CONTINUATION OF SPECIAL EXPERIMENTAL FUND

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the minister in charge of housing. Prior to rising for the summer recess we had some discussion about the acceptability of mobile homes by CMHC under the NHA regulations, and the minister indicated he was looking into this matter. Has he come to any firm conclusion yet in this regard?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, we did initiate a study of this concept in order to assess fully the potential of this technique as a cost saving project. We have one or two pilot projects under way—I believe one in London, Ontario—where we are assessing the infrastructure necessary for mobile home use, and I am optimistic about the possibility of bringing certain types of mobile homes under the banner of the National Housing Act. However, one of the requirements for this is municipal acceptance regarding the provision of the necessary sewage, water and other service components of the infrastructure that must go along with it.

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the minister's remarks and I do hope that at the earliest opportunity as soon as this study is completed he will make a statement on motions indicating to the House just what the situation is. In view of the relative success of the $200 million special fund which he implemented, is it his intention to carry this matter through in next year's budget also, in order that we can acquire the necessary innovations and new techniques for housing?

Mr. Andras: Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the hon. member for his kind words about the program, and it would be my intention to ask for some reasonably similar form of program authority to carry on this excellent approach in the 1971 season.

* * *

POST OFFICE

WHITE PAPER ON DEPARTMENTAL REORGANIZATION

Mr. Rod Thomson (Battleford-Kindersley): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister without Portfolio in charge of the Post Office. When will the minister be tabling the white paper on Post Office reorganization promised by the previous Postmaster General?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the question.

Mr. Thomson: When will the minister be tabling the white paper on Post Office reorganization promised by the previous Postmaster General?

Mr. Côté (Longueuil): In due time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PUBLIC ORDER (TEMPORARY MEASURES) ACT, 1970

PROVISION OF EMERGENCY POWERS FOR PRESERVATION OF PUBLIC ORDER

The House in committee on Bill C-181, to provide temporary emergency powers for the Preservation of Public Order in Canada—Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)—Mr. Honey in the Chair.

On clause—*Definitions.*

The Chairman: Shall clause 2 carry?

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise—

Mr. Woolliams: Could I just raise a point of order to start—

The Chairman: Order. Would the hon. member resume his seat, please?

Mr. Woolliams: I was wondering—

The Chairman: Order, please. Is the hon. member rising on a point of order?

Mr. Woolliams: On a point of order.

The Chairman: The hon. member for Calgary North.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that we are moving into committee of the whole House, a procedure we do not use very often, could we have some clarification and direction from the Chair? I appreciate that in the committee of the whole a member may speak for 20 minutes at a time. It would shorten our proceedings if we could reach agreement on our method of proceeding. Members of this party, and myself in particular, will lay what amendments we have in mind before the committee, so that we may set them out en bloc. I was wondering could we speak in a general way, a practice that we followed in the past, which I think would save time?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, we agree with that. I have already received the courtesy from the hon. member for Greenwood of an indication of what amendments he intends to put. I, myself, intend to propose a clarifying amendment to clause 7. I think it would be very useful for the committee if we were to introduce the amendments at this stage and allow everybody to consider them over the lunch hour. That might be, as the hon. member for Calgary North suggested, quite an expeditious way to handle them. It is good to get back in committee of the whole, something we have not had for some time.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Chairman, I am sure we will all be prepared to agree to this proposal if it means that during the discussion on clause 2 members who are speaking, for themselves or for their parties, will be permitted to indicate the amendments they are going to move when we get to the other clauses.

I believe that we have to observe the rule that we do not actually move the amendments on the specific clauses until we get to those clauses. What the hon. member for Calgary North is requesting is latitude on clause 2, and particularly for that latitude to include the right to indicate amendments to be moved later. We would agree with that, but I trust it is understood that hon. members are not required at this point to indicate what their amendments might be.

The Chairman: Is the hon. member for St. John's East rising on this point of order?

Mr. McGrath: No, on another point of order.

The Chairman: As I understand hon. members who have spoken on this point of order, spokesmen for the parties in what we might call their initial speeches on clause 2 would indicate, or may indicate if they wish to do so, the amendments which their particular group wish to advance. They will read them but they will not put them in the formal sense. They will read them in the sense that they will make the House knowledgeable of the particular amendments they will be moving. Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise a point of order at this stage of our proceedings. It has to do with a question I directed to the Solicitor General regarding the bill that is now before the committee. On Friday, October 30, I asked the Solicitor General, in his capacity as acting Minister of Justice, as recorded at page 740 of *Hansard*:

> Have the provincial Attorneys General been shown a draft copy of the government's proposed legislation to replace the War Measures Act? If so, can the Acting Minister of Justice tell the House when Parliament will also be granted this privilege?

The Solicitor General replied:

> Mr. Speaker, the Attorneys General of the provinces have not been shown any such draft bill.

In today's issue of the *Globe and Mail* there is a report concerning the Attorney General of Ontario, which reads in part, and I am quoting:

> • (12:00 noon)
>
> Arthur Wishart said the provincial government made "strong representations almost immediately" after receiving the first draft of the bill, intended as a long term replacement for the War Measures Act.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, I might point out that the Attorney General of Newfoundland, a week ago yesterday, also made a public statement to the effect that he had received a draft copy of the bill. In the light of this statement of the Attorney General of Ontario I wonder whether the Solicitor General might want to correct the record.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to correct the record. There was no draft bill in that sense circulated to Attorneys General across the country. There was a discussion draft of the general tenor of what the federal government had in mind. After those discussions, and indeed after discussions with the Leader of the Opposition and after receiving communications from the other two parties and after discussion with members of my own caucus, the bill was then drafted.

The only draft bill, and the only bill for which I take responsibility, is the one before the House. It is true that we indicated in general terms the options we had in mind, and those options were in the form of papers which were left with the various Attorneys General.

Mr. Alexander: Mr. Chairman, if I may I will say on that point of order—

The Chairman: Is the hon. member rising on the same point of order?

Mr. Alexander: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Referring to that same article, I notice that the Attorney General for the province of Ontario has indicated that we could follow the Criminal Code regarding matters of sedition and treason, but he questioned the propriety of this new bill before the House. I wonder if the minister could advise whether he has any other information of similar tone from other Attorneys General throughout the country?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I will want to have further communication with the Attorney General for Ontario because that position really was not indicated to us. We received general approval for what we had in mind from the provinces all across the country.

The Chairman: Is the hon. member for Calgary North rising on that same point of order?

Mr. Woolliams: No.

The Chairman: Shall clause 2 carry?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I will try to put our position clearly as to what amendments we will be moving.

First of all, because there seemed to be some confusion at the beginning, I should like to ask what the position of the government is as far as this bill is concerned. There seemed to be an impression left that when the Prime Minister spoke on October 16 he promised a special bill.

I just want to clarify the position of the official opposition. This impression affected the official opposition yesterday because if the record is consulted—and I may digress for a few moments—it will be seen that, outside of one short statement properly made by the hon. member for Egmont in reference to how he intended to vote, we had one speaker while the Liberals put up five or six speakers during the debate on second reading of the bill.

An hon. Member: A government filibuster.

Mr. Woolliams: It seemed to me they were filibustering their own bill because we were then dealing with the principle of the bill, and they all voted for it. Maybe they were conscience stricken, Mr. Chairman, and had to explain why they were supporting the Prime Minister. So, there was delay yesterday, in spite of the fact the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice had indicated there was some urgency to get this bill through and thus get rid of the War Measures Act because it was so all encompassing. I was rather surprised to have to sit through a long debate whilst the government hurled reproaches and recriminations at the NDP because they took a different position. I will say that where everybody thinks alike there is no thinking at all, and that is apparently what the government wants.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: A letter arrived on my desk this morning containing this statement: "Be thankful of the opinions of others; there are three sides to every question." Well, maybe that answers that.

Now, I want to go to where the Prime Minister stood when the War Measures Act was brought in at four o'clock in the morning. I want to emphasize again that when we met in Parliament on October 16, we met when this law was in effect. We were not debating the law, we were debating then the question of whether or not the government should receive the confidence of Parliament or the confidence of the Canadian people through Parliament, because the law had been brought in at four o'clock in the morning. A law that was not in effect when we went to bed became effective at four o'clock in the morning. This was what the Prime Minister said:

> The government recognizes that the authority contained in the act is much broader than is required in the present situation, notwithstanding the seriousness of the events. For that reason, the regulations which were adopted permit the exercise of only a limited number of the powers available under the act.

I pause there. He reminded the House that they were dealing with the administration of justice as far as the War Measures Act was concerned. At that stage they apparently did not intend to use any of the other sweeping powers which would have dealt with economic factors in Canada. I say that when the War Measures Act was proclaimed by the government, in fact the whole constitution *de facto* and *de jure* was set aside. The Prime Minister continued:

> Nevertheless, I wish to make it clear today that the government regards the use of the War Measures Act as only an interim and, in the sense mentioned above, somewhat unsatisfactory measure.

That is, in the original proclamation that set out the time limit on the operation of the War Measures Act. At no place in the debate and no place in the Prime Minister's statement—and let us get this straight—did he ever promise to bring in a bill such as the one we are debating today in committee. That is why the Leader of the Official Opposition in the debate on second reading said that this government needed some leadership on this bill. Where did that suggestion come from? The opposition gave that leadership to the government.

I should like to return to page 196 of *Hansard*, Mr. Chairman. I have read what the Prime Minister said. He talked about an interim measure and that meant the War Measures Act was only going to last for a short time. This is what our leader said as recorded at page 196:

> I assert that, rather than coming here this morning and seeking the approval of the House for a measure for which the government must accept the responsibility for having taken, the government should have concentrated on bringing before the House a bill—

Meaning a temporary bill such as the one we have now. The leadership that this suggestion gave—and the government capitulated—came from this side of the House and, to be fair, I mean all the opposition parties took that position.

An hon. Member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Woolliams: If you would only listen for a few moments. I listened very attentively to your filibuster yesterday and I wish the hon. member would give me the same privilege today.

I should now like to read from page 239 of *Hansard*. At that stage the Minister of Justice was in the House and I said:

This would contain the powers they felt they needed to cope with the situation. I ask the Minister of Justice whether he will stand in his place and say that the government intends to bring in a bill which will give them the powers they feel they need to deal with this crisis, and that this bill will supplant the regulations passed early this morning. Is that the government's policy?

I put that question to the Minister of Justice, Mr. Chairman, but he would not answer. Why? The Minister of Justice was concerned, if not frightened, that he might overstep the instructions given by the Prime Minister.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: That is why the Minister of Justice would not answer the question at that time, so this bill was necessary, and I would like to re-emphasize this, after the government capitulated their position. Indeed, they did capitulate their position to bring in the bill in question.

An hon. Member: Oh, go on, you are just stick handling.

Mr. Woolliams: Well, I don't know about that, Mr. Chairman, but when I hear these people talk about stick handling I must say that a lot of them are so slippery they would do very well on ice.

Now, I want to read on:

Does silence indicate it will be? Of course it does not. This Order in Council is the law, and it will be the law...

• (12:10 p.m.)

It will be the law unless it is changed by a bill. If the Minister of Justice, who was speaking for the government, had said that in place of the War Measures Act the government would bring in a bill such as we are considering, and said "Yes" to our inquiries in that regard, that would have shortened the debate because that was the position we took. We voted as we did on the question of the War Measures Act because we understood certain promises had been made. After the deals had been made with our house leaders we said, "In view of your undertaking, we will support you." Now, we are debating the bill in question.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: I have outlined what our position is. And what did the Liberals do in the debate yesterday? They embarked on a filibuster in which we heard many reproaches and recriminations aimed at the NDP. It was a political debate, and not the sort of debate you would expect in a time of crisis when it is necessary to take extraordinary measures such as these.

Mr. Baldwin: It was not even a good filibuster.

Mr. Woolliams: I do not know whether or not it was the Minister of Justice who stimulated that debate on the government side of the House. At any rate, he could not get government supporters to keep silent so that we could bring this matter before the committee.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Mahoney: Nobody tries to silence us on this side.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, what, therefore, is our main amendment?

An hon. Member: Ah!

Mr. Woolliams: I want now to deal with a number of amendments.

An hon. Member: Wonderful.

An hon. Member: Let us get on with it.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, our position is that we go along with the principle of the bill, but that there are certain mechanical aspects we are concerned about. One of those pertains to review. I want to deal with this for a few moments, because this bill speaks of the same kinds of regulations as were brought in under the War Measures Act. May I point out how the War Measures Act regulations were enforced during the last war. I have before me the Defence of Canada Regulations which were in force between 1939 and 1942. You will find that even in the time of emergency, when the War Measures Act was in force, there was provision for a judicial review. I wish to read briefly from page 36 of the Defence of Canada Regulations. Subsection 26(1) reads:

Any enemy alien who has been interned under the provisions of this Part, may within thirty days of such internment, appeal against such internment to the nearest person designated by the Minister of Justice for the purpose of hearing such appeals, hereinafter referred to as 'the Tribunal.'

That was standard procedure. I continue:

(2) A written notice of appeal signed by the appellant, shall be filed with the Tribunal by the person having the custody of such appellant, who shall transmit a copy thereof to the Registrar General of Enemy Aliens.

It is clear that a tribunal was set up, of which the trial judge was the chairman. Since the tribunal was overburdened with work, it was empowered to set up subboards headed by county court judges. What took place at that time? The special judicial board was set up and it had so many hundreds of cases to review that it was necessary to set up subboards presided over by county court judges. According to information that I finally obtained after checking with the Public Archives History Section, the Department of Justice, and with a friend of mine who formerly was a distinguished member of the RCMP but who is now retired, there were approximately between 1,800 and 1,900 detainees who applied for release; and more than 95 per cent of these were released after their applications were heard.

What I am saying is this: this bill would preserve some of the law contained in the War Measures Act regulations. It is to provide for temporary emergency powers for the preservation of public order. But there may be abuses, as I have said previously, as other members have said, and as my leader has said. Once the law is passed it will not be the Minister of Justice who will administer it;

it will not be the attorneys general of the various provinces. There will be 10,000 policemen who will interpret this law as they see fit. Under those circumstances, there are bound to be abuses.

Mr. Baldwin: Also the armed forces.

Mr. Woolliams: As the hon. member for Peace River says, we ought to include the armed forces. There are bound to be some abuses. Our amendments would seek to deal with these and other problems to which I shall refer. If a proper review board could be set up, there could be safeguards. We have already seen that about 438 people have been arrested; a great many have been released. Now, a few are being charged. Those few who are being charged, after having been detained incommunicado for a long period of time without the right to counsel, are being charged with crimes under the Criminal Code. I say that is proof that what is really wrong is that this government would not act for two years; nor would the Liberal government of the province of Quebec take its responsibilities. If these governments had shouldered their full responsibilities, these extraordinary remedies being asked for today might not have been necessary. It would not be necessary for the government to implement these extraordinary powers at this time.

So, I say that the first function is to set up a review board. That is what we suggest. We are, therefore, proposing that Bill C-181 be amended by inserting therein, next after clause 14, on page 9 thereof, the following:

15. (1) The Governor-in-Council, as soon as possible after the coming into force of this Act, shall appoint a person holding judicial office under Her Majesty in right of Canada, who shall be called the 'Administrator', and who shall inquire into and report to Parliament from time to time upon the administration of this Act and of the Public Order Regulations, 1970.

What we are suggesting is that a superior court judge in the province of Quebec be appointed as an administrator to administer these reviews. If he were to find that the board can not handle the number of cases coming before it, he could set up subboards, as was done during the war, so that people charged would be able to have their reviews heard. Then, if there were abuses under the act—we have already heard about abuses, and I will not name names because they have already been mentioned in the debate—those abuses could be corrected by way of application to these boards. Under the bill, even if people are charged they can be held for 90 days.

We also propose:

(2) The Administrator shall have the powers of a commissioner appointed under the Inquiries Act and shall continue as Administrator for such period after the expiration of this Act, whether by effluxion of time or by proclamation, as the case may be, as is necessary for the carrying out of his duties under this Act.

Subclause (3) would be as follows:

(3) The Administrator shall have power to review and confirm, vary or revoke a certificate filed by an Attorney General of a province under subsection (1) of section 7 or an order made by an Attorney General under subsection (2) of section 9, and to make an order for fixing a date for trial.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

Surely, whatever regulations our jurisprudence may deal with, there will be abuses. There must be abuses. Already we know from those people who have been released that mistakes have been made. Perhaps many more mistakes have been made than we are aware of because people who have been detained for a long time may be afraid to speak out now in view of the powers the government has at present. Therefore, we say that in an application before the board a date for trial should be fixed, so that justice may be done. That, to me, is the essence of a just society. What I have read constitutes our main amendment in that regard.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I wish to say something about clause 8. Actually, I wish to deal with several amendments. If clause 8 is to remain as it is, and if the minister takes an adamant position and refuses to accept amendments to this bill, I suggest that he is in for a lengthy debate. Let us face the facts. This is Friday. As this bill has to go through the other place, it cannot be proclaimed until next week. This is not like other occasions when bills are sent to a standing committee and, therefore, I hope the minister will take a charitable and sympathetic position. We are sincere when presenting our amendments. We feel they are for the good of Canada, the Canadian people and the administration of justice.

• (12:20 p.m.)

I now wish to deal with clause 8 which reads as follows:

8. In any prosecution for an offence under this Act, evidence that any person, either before or after the coming into force of this Act,

(a) participated in or was present at a number of meetings of the unlawful association or of any branch, committee or members thereof,

(b) spoke publicly in advocacy for the unlawful association or

(c) communicated statements on behalf of or as a representative or professed representative of the unlawful association,

is, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, proof that he is a member of the unlawful association.

I have not checked this, but I think I am correct in stating that for all crimes under the Criminal Code, with the exception of murder and possibly a few others, there are statutory limitations. These regulations create a new offence. It is illegal to belong to the FLQ or an unlawful association. I do not think it is confined to the FLQ. I will have something more to say about that. Carrying it to the extreme for purposes of argument, if I had attended a meeting or meetings of the FLQ in 1926 I could be charged with an offence because there is no statutory limitation. Once there is evidence, such as some letter or signature on a register when I walked into a hall, I then may be charged. That evidence having been presented, I must go on the stand. I know what the argument of the Minister of Justice will be. He is going to say that it is a matter of evidence only. However, there must be no

mistake that this is an offence and that provision may apply retroactively. The clause reads:

8. In any prosecution for an offence under this Act, evidence that any person, either before—

That probably refers to before four o'clock in the morning on that particular Friday or after this act came into force. The section then sets out what the offender might have done. The onus is then on the accused.

The Chairman: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but I must advise the House that his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

The Chairman: Is there unanimous consent that the hon. member continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Woolliams: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I think this will shorten the debate. I have quite a lot to say concerning our position on this bill.

Returning to clause 8, except for the Income Tax Act and a few other acts that put the onus of proof on the accused, this is the only bill that is contrary to any jurisprudence in our system of justice. If someone signs a register that such-and-such a person attended a meeting or meetings, that person must go on the stand to make a denial. Not only is this contrary to the jurisprudence of our system, but it is not a rule of evidence. Allegorically, it may be regarded as a rule of evidence, but basically it is substantive law and no one can get around that. I wish to emphasize what the clause states:

8. In any prosecution for an offence under this Act, evidence that any person, either before or after the coming into force of this Act,—

After subsections (a), (b) and (c), the clause reads:

—is, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, proof that he is a member of the unlawful association.

That is substantive law according to the rules of evidence. If we analyse that part of the bill, it will be seen that if there is no change we will need a review board because there have been, and will be abuses. As I stated earlier, the worst cannot be remedied with an evil. I now wish to deal with another part of this bill.

The preamble is very beautiful. It lays a beautiful bed for what is to come. It reads:

Whereas the Parliament of Canada continues to affirm that men and institutions—remain free only when freedom is founded upon respect for moral and spiritual values and the rule of law;—

When you read this bill, that does not mean anything. It is straight declaration. As I stated at a meeting, it is like handing someone a sucker. After you eat the candy, all you are left with is a stick. The preamble is like the candy. The preamble continues:

And whereas the public order in Canada continues to be endangered by elements—

It then states what is happening. The next paragraph reads:

And whereas the Parliament of Canada, following approval by the House of Commons of Canada of the measures taken by His Excellency the Governor General in Council pursuant to the War Measures Act to deal with the state of apprehended insurrection in the Province of Quebec—

I am sorry that the hon. member for Calgary South is not here. Throughout the election campaign he talked about a two-nation policy. At that time I did not know what he meant, but I know now. This policy was brought in by the Grits. There is one law for Quebec and one for the rest of Canada. I ask the Minister of Justice to think about this. The minister has attended law school and has written a book about the interpretation of statutes. This means very little in this debate, but it means a lot before a court. As the minister knows, the preamble cannot be used for the interpretation of sections. It can only be used as a guide. Some cases do go that far. If the minister has any question about that I will give him the authorities, but I do not intend to cite the interpretations given by Mr. Driedger, Q.C. and Mr. Maxwell. The preamble of this bill cannot be used in interpreting the substantive law contained in the section. This is why clause 3 must be looked at very carefully.

I now wish to deal with clause 4 on page 3 of the bill which reads in part:

4. A person who
(c) communicates statements on behalf of or as a representative or professed representative of the unlawful association,—

Basically, the government is trying to say that the only association is the FLQ. I question that. Any association that recommends, promotes, advocates crime or uses violence in order to gain political advantage is an illegal association. Basically, under the Criminal Code, that is criminal conspiracy. The minister must answer our questions when dealing with the clauses. I ask, what does the bill mean when it refers to: "communicates statements on behalf of"? Does it mean that the personnel of those radio stations which carried the communiqués of the FLQ with regard to the kidnappings, the tragic murder of Mr. Laporte and the still unknown whereabouts of Mr. Cross, are liable to five years imprisonment? Surely, here is a question which must be answered. There is another clause which is almost on all fours with the example I have given. Both need to be looked at carefully. The precise meaning of clause 4(c)—"communicates statements on behalf of"—must be fully explained by the minister. Does this mean that a radio station which carries a communiqué will be committing an offence? The same applies to similar words used on page five of the bill. I pause for a moment—

• (12:30 p.m.)

Mr. Anderson: Get your notes in order.

Mr. Woolliams: I don't know what the hon. member means by that. I know the Minister of Justice would be sympathetic; if I were in his position, I would certainly need to have my notes written out. In my own case, I have made careful notes. I do not know why the hon. member wants to be so illiterate and so ignorant today, when we are dealing with a subject of such importance.

Mr. Anderson: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. We listened with great interest to the hon. member's allega-

tions of fillibuster when members on this side rose to speak yesterday.

Mr. Woolliams: That is not a point of order or a question of privilege. Why doesn't the hon. member sit down?

The Chairman: Would the hon. member resume his seat, please? The hon. member for Esquimalt-Saanich rose on a point of order. I did not have the opportunity, before the hon. member for Calgary North rose, to determine whether or not he was in order.

Mr. Anderson: The point I wished to raise was this: all hon. members here suffered some insults in the course of the hon. member's speech but agreed to an extension of his time, despite the fact that last night he accused us of filibustering. My interjection was strictly directed to getting this debate carried forward in an orderly manner, as he himself evidently approves. So, I suggested he should get his notes in order.

The Chairman: The hon. member for Calgary North.

Mr. Woolliams: I do not intend to listen to that kind of nonsense. As far as I am concerned, my notes are in order. The Minister of Justice will be sympathetic in this regard. I wrote them myself; I do not have a staff behind me and I probably was up this morning long before the hon. member was out of bed preparing my speech and carrying out the research needed.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: The hon. member can laugh and giggle. It means nothing to him. He will vote with the government no matter what they do.

Let me get back to the question of the general principle of the bill.

An hon. Member: The debate on that is over.

Mr. Woolliams: I take the position that generally, with one exception, this bill does not create any new crimes. It is true that membership of the FLQ is outlawed and that the procedure in our courts is reversed in the measure before us, but I still maintain that the criminal law of Canada contains all the power the government needed. All the government had to do was to stop playing politics and be pragmatists for right rather than pragmatists for opportunism, and administer the law, because they already possessed sufficient power under the Criminal Code.

What are some of these powers? Well, there is power to deal with criminal conspiracy. Criminal conspiracy means entering into an unlawful agreement for an unlawful purpose, or even a lawful agreement for an unlawful purpose. The bill before us spells out that the FLQ is an unlawful association. The clause reads:

> The group of persons or association known as Le Front de Libération du Québec and any successor group or successor association of the said Le Front de Libération du Québec, or any group of persons or association that advocates the use of force or the commission of crime as a means of or as an aid in accomplishing the same or substantially the same governmental change within Canada as that advocated by the said Le Front de Libération du Québec, is declared to be an unlawful association.

Mr. Chairman, that association, basically, whatever its motivation and purpose, is already within the scope of the Criminal Code. The persons who recommended, permitted or defended violence of any kind or, who, in fact, committed violence, could have been charged with criminal conspiracy. Then, there is the crime of sedition. We find, now, that people are being charged with sedition. When a crowd gets out of hand, provision is made for the use of the riot act from which certain consequences follows. Criminal conspiracy, sedition, counselling to commit an offence—all these offences are covered by the Code.

Let me get down to describing what the new bill really does. Apart from making certain that the FLQ is an unlawful association, it gives added powers to the police. I am not being critical of that at the moment, nor do I believe members of other opposition parties are critical in this regard, bearing in mind the emergency which prevails. It gives the police power to detain people without bringing charges, to interrogate them, to hold them incommunicado, to hold them without counsel. What is the purpose behind this? Normally, when a person is arrested, a charge is laid. Many times, before an accused gets the advice of counsel, he makes a statement to the police. He is generally warned, but a warning is really not one of the ingredients which go to determining whether or not such a statement is admissible at trial, subject to certain other rules which I shall not attempt to discuss at the moment. But the arrested person is generally warned and often he makes a statement. If, in the course of that statement, he incriminates himself and the court agrees that the statement was made voluntarily, the statement is admissible as evidence before a judge without jury or a judge with a jury.

Under the terms of this bill no charge need be laid immediately. The normal rights of an accused person are set aside. What really happens when a person, particularly someone who has never been in detention before, is held incommunicado for a number of days? The police have really got him in a sweat box. Along comes a police officer who asks: What information have you to give? If a person does not know when he is likely to get out of goal and there is no limitation on the time during which he can be held, what happens? He starts to tell stories.

I am not being critical in this regard, but that is the real power which this bill confers. Safeguards must be set up. We know that many people have been detained already under the War Measures Act which the bill now before us is to replace, interrogated and then released; their families did not know where they were. An independent body should be set up to minimize the possibility of this extraordinary measure being misused, bearing in mind the unusual powers which it entrusts to the police force. What the bill really means is that any door in Canada can be kicked open by the police and a man can be taken from his family, or, for that matter, the whole family can be taken away. This is why a review board is needed. This is why amendments to the mech-

anism of this bill are so necessary. But, I repeat, we went along with the bill in principle.

Now, I turn to a theme which has been mentioned by every member of my party who has spoken; it has been dealt with by spokesmen for the New Democratic Party and by spokesmen for the Creditistes, also. You cannot prevent revolution by a bill of this kind or by the War Measures Act. If I might be personal for a moment, I want to tell two stories. Every two or three years they sent Lenin and Stalin in chains to Siberia because they were disturbing the peace, advocating violence and so on. Then, under that particular government of the day they were released, but in another two years back to Siberia they went in chains.

• (12:40 p.m.)

The point I want to make is that sending Lenin and Stalin and even Trotsky away did not stop the revolution. That is why I interrupted the Minister of Labour when I mentioned there was 10 per cent unemployment and he said I was a millionaire.

An hon. Member: Do you deny that?

Mr. Woolliams: Yes, I do, but I do not want to get off the track. I want to tell another story. I am sure my hon. friends in the New Democratic Party will appreciate this story because it is in their favour. Hon. members opposite may think this is funny, but it is not funny at all, because the same thing is now taking place in Quebec. In 1930, the bottom fell out of everything in western Canada. There were farmers in Saskatchewan who received 16 cents in total, after deduction of freight, for 1,000 pounds of beef shipped from Rosetown to Winnipeg. The price of wheat dropped to 19 cents a bushel. Machinery on the farms was repossessed. I went through that experience.

Then one day Mr. Coldwell, former leader of the C.C.F., spoke at a place called Valley Centre which has a population of around 100. About 5,000 people turned out to hear him, and I was there as a young boy, along with my father. He made a great speech. I had always thought that Mr. Coldwell was a near conservative socialist, but when it came to dealing with grievances at that time he spoke with that kind of responsibility that we would expect the leader of any party to speak with, whether or not we agreed with what he said.

His words excited, and even incited to violence, because either at a nomination meeting or shortly thereafter when he was running for my home town constituency of Rosetown-Biggar, a murder was committed. This murder was committed in the heat of a political argument by a man who was respected by the community. He was found guilty of manslaughter and served time. However, this did not change people's feelings. There was a Liberal government in the province of Saskatchewan at that time, what we called the Gardiner machine. We now have the Trudeau machine. In 1944 the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands, to his credit, turned out the Gardiner machine and became premier of the province of Saskatchewan.

The point I want to drive home is this, that until government improves the social and economic conditions of the people of the province of Quebec and other provinces in Canada, the revolution will go on. All the acts and the powers of the law will not stop that revolution. Nor will they stop change. Nor will they quiet people who suffer grievances. Having been raised in this sort of sad environment, I could use some very intemperate language today, particularly with regard to the powers contained in the bill. However, I am not unsympathetic to the fact that the government, and the Minister of Justice in particular because of the position he holds, realized that there was a crisis in the province of Quebec.

The strange thing is that outside of one case I have read about—though the government may have additional information that we should have in this regard—there have been no FLQ members charged under the act; the others have been charged under the Code. I should like to know what the Minister of Justice, the Solicitor General, who is filled with words, and the Prime Minister have been doing for the last two years when they had evidence before them. The answer is that they were procrastinating. They were doing nothing. They started the fire, and now having put wood on the fire they cannot put the fire out. This is why we are standing in our places today debating extraordinary measures.

May I end with this. Revolution will not end with this bill. There has been talk about millionaires, though I am not going to get personal here. I would say to the cabinet that some were born in riches, some had a rich education and some have lived a rich life. I make a special plea to the Minister of Justice to consider seriously some of our amendments. Because if the government fails us now, it fails not only the province of Quebec and the people of Canada, but also the role of the opposition.

Somebody has said that we are the conscience of the government. At times like this, it is our job to take what may even be unpopular positions. For example, what the hon. member for Egmont did was unpopular, but I am sure one thing he did not lack was courage to vote as he did, whether his judgment will be proven to be right or wrong. This is why I ask the minister to give us a chance to suggest to him and his officers amendments to the bill. Particularly, give people the right to a review. Do not suppress or silence them. Do not hold people without giving them the opportunity to state their grievances.

We have all read in the morning papers what happened when people who were detained came before a court of justice. They were frustrated and vehement because they had been held incommunicado without the right of expression. Without the right of expression, you have oppression. This is why we feel a review board should be established. We want to be given the chance, intelligently and to the best of our ability, to suggest the kind of law that should be passed. We for our part will support the government and show that kind of responsibility that a government should expect from the members of this party and other parties.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, I should like to take the opportunity of re-echoing the plea just made by the hon. member for extremely serious consideration on the part of the Minister of Justice and his government of the amendments that we are going to propose. I believe all members of the House are uneasy about this particular bill, but we have almost unanimously agreed that some measures are necessary to deal with the disorder created in the province of Quebec by the FLQ. Although we have acknowledged that necessity, we say that it is of the utmost importance that the steps taken to deal with disorder are not such as would unnecessarily deprive Canadian citizens of their fundamental rights and civil liberties.

The series of amendments that we have proposed is designed to remove vague and dangerous words from the bill; to remove principles that are not in accordance with the ordinary, recognized rules of justice. Our whole aim is to improve, make more workable and adequate what is done, not taking away from the effectiveness of this bill but taking away from it certain features that we think are dangerous to the liberty of Canadians. We have seven or eight amendments—not very many in number because this is not a long bill—which will be introduced by different members of my party. I will leave it to them, as they introduce these special amendments, to explain them in detail. However, it might be useful for me to make a rather brief summary of the amendments to be proposed.

• (12:50 p.m.)

We propose an amendment to clause 6 of the bill which deals with the responsibility of an owner of a building or premises to permit meetings of the unlawful association. We say it is important to take out some of the vague words about assemblages of persons so that this clause will only deal with the owner who encourages meetings of the illegal organization, and so that it cannot be applied, owing to the vagueness of the wording employed, to, perhaps, a gathering together in classrooms or universities or other places which are not meetings of the association but at which perhaps someone in a theoretical way advocates some of the doctrines of the unlawful association.

The second amendment deals with the question of bail as it appears in clause 7 of the bill. As I think I mentioned yesterday, we propose that the granting of bail be handed back where it belongs, that is to the judiciary of this country. We do not think there is any need to distrust the judiciary. They will be advised by counsel representing the law enforcement officers of the province concerned. However, they will have a final right to say that they are not content with a mere general statement from the Attorney General that everybody should be held without bail. They will have the right to say: "We want to know why you are holding a person and depriving him of his liberty pending a hearing which may be postponed for a considerable period of time." We also think that subclause (2) of clause 7 should be amended, that holding a person for 90 days before letting him appear to have a date fixed for trial is much too long. We propose that it be changed to 30 days.

The next amendment is to clause 8, and is of crucial importance. I particularly invite the attention of the Minister of Justice to this amendment. This is the clause that creates the retroactive application of the penal provisions of this bill. It is not itself a penal provision, it deals only with the evidence. However, by making the provision retroactive as to evidence so that acts permitted before the passing of this measure, acts which at that time were perfectly legal, can be taken as evidence upon which a conviction is made, is in effect to give retroactive effect to the bill. I will speak later with more detail on this, but I say that all across Canada, in the press and in the comments of informed people, there has been an urgent plea that this be not done. This retroactive legislation, which runs against the principles of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, is offensive to those who say that a person who commits an act not defined as a crime cannot have criminal intent, and surely criminal intent is basic to criminal responsibility.

Mr. Hogarth: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member permit a question to clarify what he is saying? Let us say we took clause 8 out of the bill. Is it his view that no evidence of having attended any meeting of the FLQ or of speaking publicly in advocacy of what the FLQ stands for, none of these things that took place prior to October 16 would be admissible as evidence to show that on that date the prisoner was a member of the FLQ?

Mr. Brewin: I am not saying any such thing. What I am saying is that there should not be a presumption of guilt, which is included in clause 8, by reason of something which, when it was done, was perfectly innocent. If there are acts which take place after October 16, and light can be thrown on this by previous associations, that may be perfectly all right.

Mr. Hogarth: That is all that this clause does, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: Order, please. I think the hon. member for New Westminster has asked his question. I believe more progress would be made if the hon. member for Greenwood continued uninterrupted.

Mr. Brewin: I will certainly deal with this question in detail when we come to this clause. All I am saying now is that this clause, which provides that evidence that a person either before or after the coming into force of this act participated in a meeting, and so on, shall be in the absence of any evidence, proof that a person is a member of the unlawful association, is an offence against basic principles and should be taken out of the act. That is our amendment to clause 8.

We then propose that clause 12 be amended by striking out the exception to the Canadian Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights provides that no person who has been arrested

shall be deprived of the right to bail. I do not have the precise wording in front of me, but that is in the Bill of Rights. The effect of clause 12 is to incorporate the provisions of the Bill of Rights in this act—and naturally we welcome that—with the exception of paragraph (f) of clause 2 dealing with bail. The provision in paragraph (f) is that no law of Canada shall be construed or applied so as to deprive a person charged with a criminal offence of the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty, and so on, or of the right to reasonable bail without just cause. We believe that that constitutional guarantee should be maintained because it is important, and that "without just cause" is a matter that can be properly reviewed by the courts. The removal of that paragraph from clause 12, plus the operation of clause 7 to which I have already referred, will have the effect of depriving a person of the right to go to a court ultimately and say: "I am being detained without the reasonable opportunity of obtaining bail". We think that should be granted. May I call it one o'clock, Mr. Chairman?

The Chairman: It being one o'clock, I do now leave the Chair to resume at two o'clock this afternoon.

The Committee took recess at 1 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The Committee resumed at 2 p.m.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Greenwood on clause 2 of Bill C-181.

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, before the committee adjourned for lunch, I was summarizing the amendments which different members of this party propose to move. I had reached the point of our last but one amendment which proposes that the Minister of Justice appoint a supervisory commission of three persons, not employees of the federal authority, of any provincial government or any police force, with the authority to interview persons arrested under this bill to assure they are treated according to the law, have had access to counsel, do not continue to be detained without adequate ground and have been given opportunity to be contacted by their families. It is proposed that the commission be given an opportunity to publish its findings as frequently as deemed necessary.

It would seem to me that the events of the last few days or weeks have clearly demonstrated the need for such a commission. It is all very well to say that the Bill of Rights gives certain rights, but unless there exists adequate machinery to see that these rights can be exercised then they may not be exercised. The appointment by the Minister of Justice of such a commission composed of people of the nature of special ombudsmen to deal with this particular situation which arises out of these emergency acts, and out of these perhaps necessary interferences with normal procedure, is a very important matter. I know the minister may possibly say that this can be done by voluntary organizations. Of course, voluntary organizations can help, but they would not have the authority of a commission appointed under the direction of this Parliament, requiring that it perform this very necessary function. I believe the hon. member for York South proposes to introduce this amendment. I have no doubt he will have more to say about it at that time.

The last amendment we have on our list at the moment is an amendment to clause 15 of the bill. This would give the right to Parliament, through a motion by 10 of its members, to pray that the operation of this act be terminated and would provide that the motion would be heard at the first convenient opportunity. This amendment is in accordance with the provision now in the War Measures Act, and introduced by the Canadian Bill or Rights in 1960. It proposes the very same power for Parliament to discuss whether the time has come to end an emergency measure. It may never have to be exercised. Under clause 15, as it is presently drawn, the government by proclamation, and both houses of Parliament by joint resolution, can call for the ending of the application of the emergency measure.

• (2:10 p.m.)

I think it is important that Parliament itself be given the machinery to review these things. The authorities that are conferred here, affecting the rights of the subject, are matters that are particularly the concern of Parliament. I suggest this amendment would be a reassertion of the authority and responsibility of Parliament as to the duration or expiry of the emergency provisions of these measures which affect the liberties of Canadians.

I am going to conclude my remarks more or less in the same way as I spoke to the minister when opening my remarks. I believe that Parliament is very much on trial here, and that if the minister can see fit not only to consider seriously the amendments that are proposed but to indicate that he accedes to some of them, he will do a lot to vindicate the parliamentary process. I am not asking him to approve of something without merit or that, in his view, endangers some of the measures proposed in the bill. It would be ridiculous to ask him to do that. But I am asking him to lean over on the side of freedom, freedom of Canadians, when he comes to consider these proposals made by a responsible opposition. If he can do that, if he can see fit to accept some or all of the amendments proposed, he will be doing a lot not only to vindicate the processes of Parliament but to re-assure the Canadian people that Parliament is still in control of these things. It is not the fiat of government which alone must be used to deal with a crisis such as we face, but it is Parliament itself, the representatives of the people, whose voices are taken into account in this Parliament.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Chairman, clause 1 of Bill C-181 affords us an opportunity of making general remarks on the substance of the bill before proceeding to the examination of each clause.

Judging by the almost unanimous vote that was given last night, I believe all hon. members are aware of the importance of this bill that provides for measures to replace the War Measures Act.

The object of this bill is to prohibit any revolutionary activity on the part of the FLQ, especially in Quebec.

I agree with the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), that this bill will not remove the remote or real causes of a revolutionary movement in Canada and particularly in Quebec.

Should this bill work out, and we hope it will, it could curb the activities of the revolutionaries by enabling us to punish them. But if Parliament does not, now or in the future, take the economic steps that would be necessary to remove the underlying causes of such activities, we shall not be able to check the revolutionaries in spite of Bill C-181 and of all the good will shown by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner).

Mr. Chairman, at the opening of each sitting, you say a prayer from which I quote the following words: Give us our daily bread. Now if the present Minister of Justice and the governments that have administered this country since Confederation had put those words into practice, we would not have to pass a bill to check the revolutionaries or outlaw revolutionary ideas in Canada.

Of course, the revolutionaries of today perhaps are not looking for their daily bread only. In fact, they have some economic or political goal to achieve. However, I believe that the majority of them have been putting up with economic conditions which, normally, should not exist in Canada and which we should seriously consider removing in the future.

I was amused on reading the speech delivered last night by the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier). He attacked those who have always supported the goverment with respect to this bill, as well as those who, as do the members of our party, realize that order and justice must be respected. I find it strange that he would not blame those who have political interests to safeguard, for we know that the disappearance of the FLQ people from Quebec might be prejudicial to some political parties which have promoted, up to now, if not revolution for the sake of democracy, at least theories which could lead to the establishment of a socialist and totalitarian state.

• (2:20 p.m.)

Some right-minded and honest government members do not approve the position of the Secretary of State who is responsible for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and who has been acting quite irresponsibly in the House for a number of years. This is a very important Crown corporation: it controls the thoughts and information of Canada. When we express grievances to him in the House he acts in an irresponsible manner and answers: I shall inquire. I do not know. I shall make an investigation. I shall tell the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation about it.

We realize that for many years, the CBC information policy has revolved around infiltration and revolutionary

ideas. Indeed, terrorist activities in Canada are unfortunately highlighted every day. Furthermore, great attention is given in programs to the speeches of those who create the political atmosphere of our country.

If indeed the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) intends to complete the clean up that he has undertaken, he should first of all consider the minister responsible for the CBC.

Mr. Speaker, we must create a favourable economic climate so that this bill does not have to remain in force for too long a time. We have felt, in this House, from the day when we have been made aware of the existence of revolutionary groups in Quebec, that a democratically elected Parliament could not give in to blackmail from some minorities. As far as we, Créditistes, are concerned, we have been challenging the present system for the past 30 or 35 years. In our opinion, reforms are needed and changes are necessary. We have offered some solutions and have not become impatient. We hope that through the democratic election process the present government and the Créditiste government which will succeed it will be able to change the present system without resorting to revolutionary methods. And this is the reason why we accept the bill introduced by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner), so as to safeguard the freedom of the majority.

Some might holler about the liberty of those who will be inconvenienced by the judicial process, who will be questioned and searched, who will have to spend a few days in jail, but I am convinced that the number of people so affected will be small as compared with the rest of the Canadian people who want to continue living in peace.

As a matter of fact, we cannot ask that, in the name of the freedom of the few, the legislation be insufficiently precise and severe. We must safeguard the majority. We have been elected for that purpose.

I have some recommendations to make with regard to the amendments we have submitted to the Minister of Justice. We deplore the fact, contrary to hon. members of a certain party sitting at my right, that the bill is still too lenient towards revolutionaries and anarchists.

This is why we will bring in some amendments. As for clause 4(g), we suggest that it be replaced by the following:

> A person who advocates, promotes or engages in the use of force or the commission of crime as a means of or as an aid in accomplishing the same or substantially the same governmental change within Canada as that advocated by the unlawful association,
>
> is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to life imprisonment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment tends to replace clause 4(a) of the bill now under study.

The punishment provided in the bill is "not exceeding five years". The amendment extends also the scope of the bill.

Indeed, clause 4 (*a*), is thus drafted:

> Is guilty of an indictable offence a person who a) is or professes to be a member of the unlawful association...

We maintain that not only "being a member of the unlawful association" is indictable under the law but also "the use of force, the commission of various crimes or the recourse to the commission of crimes".

Therefore, clause 4 would be replaced by Section 4A and Section 4B would be added. It would then read as follows:

Is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to be sentenced to death or to life imprisonment a person who uses force or violence for the purpose of kidnapping, keeping in seclusion, mutilating, torturing or injuring with the intent to bring about death, one or more persons, as a means of or as an aid in establishing the same government change within Canada as that advocated by the illegal association.

Some hon. members or the Minister of Justice might answer that the Criminal Code already provides for that. It does not! This amendment makes the people responsible for kidnapping and other crimes liable to be sentenced to death. According to the Criminal Code there is no more capital punishment, except for the murder of prison guards and other persons.

This amendment calls for the return to capital punishment for political crimes. In other words, kidnapping, torture, mutilation or murder, when committed for the purpose of bringing about in Canada a change such as was advocated by the FLQ, are crimes calling for the death penalty. Kidnapping, torture or murder committed in other circumstances are not punishable by death.

If our amendment were adopted, clause 5 would become clause (5) and clause 5(b) would read as follows:

A person who, knowing or having reasonable cause to believe that another person or other persons are guilty of an offence under Section 4(a), gives that other person any assistance with intent thereby to prevent, hinder or interfere with the apprehension, trial or punishment of that person for that offence, is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding fourteen years.

Mr. Chairman, our amendments are mainly aimed at making the law more comprehensive. In fact, we all know that a five-year term of imprisonment is often reduced to 20, 24 or 25 months. These sentences are too light in view of the crimes we have enumerated and which are not mentioned in the bill. I am alluding to the crimes committed by the FLQ in the Cross-Laporte case.

In the case of political murder, capital punishment should be applied. At the moment, such criminals are liable to life imprisonment.

The Criminal Code provides for capital punishment in the case of the murder of a prison guard, a peace officer or a policeman. In my opinion, in the case of political murder such as that of Pierre Laporte, hon. members, and particularly the Ralliement Créditiste members, are right when they want to re-establish capital punishment, since who can say today who will be the next politician to be killed? Life imprisonment is too lenient a sentence for political murder.

When reading the revolutionaries' manifestos, including that of the FLQ, it is obvious that the first two steps towards revolution have already been made and that the third one will be the selective murder of politicians. This is the reason why I find it urgent to vote for the re-establishment of capital punishment for political murders like those we unfortunately witnessed recently and which we did not expect.

Because we were warned by the revolutionaries and the anarchists, we cannot plead ignorance and say there is no danger, that we need not restore in our statutes the death penalty for political murders.

Mr. Chairman, I know we will deal again during the debate, with each of these sections, in an effort to have our amendments accepted; to my mind, the bill is still not clear nor specific enough, and especially not severe enough in the light of past events and future threats.

Let us not be so naïve as to think that the danger is past, because the police forces, the army, the R.C.M.P. have performed a formidable task in the last month or so; as to think the bill need not be more severe.

I feel the government is trying to please too much certain friends who, unfortunately, I know, were former friends of the Secretary of State and whose activities were more or less questionable in the past.

Mr. Chairman, we have writings that are not new, that were published throughout Quebec, that warned us of the events we know and those that could happen. Those people will not let go for they have pledged themselves to a revolutionary ideal and if the law is too complacent towards them, all the more problems will crop up.

Even if the law were stricter, as we suggested, if the government does not take concrete steps from the economic standpoint and does not stop setting up royal commissions to delay by three, four or five years the solution of problems, all along handsomely rewarding some persons to study problems of which we are already aware, the Canadian people and unfortunately, young anarchists, will become impatient again and will arouse the population, and this will create events like those which we have recently known in Canada, particularly in the province of Quebec.

• (2:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Hogarth: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Shefford has suggested that members of this House and, certainly, the people of Canada should not be so naïve as to believe that this bill will wipe out the FLQ in its entirety or terrorism in the province of Quebec and elsewhere. I suggest that he should not be so naïve as to think that capital punishment will be of aid in any way because, for every one of the FLQ who is hanged, the FLQ will make sure that three or four members of this government or of the government of Quebec will be assassinated.

Mr. McCleave: How does the hon. member know that? Who told him?

Mr. Hogarth: I draw to his attention section 47 of the Criminal Code which provides for capital punishment for

certain offences. That section is not confined to the sort of homicide the hon. member mentioned.

May I speak generally about the suggested amendments brought forward by the hon. member for Calgary North, the hon. member for Greenwood and the hon. member for Shefford. I cannot see in this legislation a retroactivity provision in the true, legal sense; there is nothing that one could consider in law as retroactive legislation. That is to say, the provision in question does not create an offence that antedates the proclamation of the regulations under the War Measures Act. It appears that some hon. members have argued that if clause 8, the presumption section, were removed, we should thereby remove that element of retroactivity which is said to exist in the bill. This just does not stand up to scrutiny at all. If my hon. friends are concerned about retroactivity in its broadest sense in the bill, the only solution available to them is to attempt to bring in a clause providing that no evidence of any activity prior to October 16 can be admitted to prove membership in the FLQ.

What will happen is this, you see, if you remove clause 8 and if there are no presumptions: A man will be charged that on or about October 16, 1970, he was unlawfully a member of the FLQ. That will be the indictment. To prove that indictment, the Crown certainly cannot show any activity on the part of the accused after that date, because he would have been in jail after October 16. The Crown would naturally have to rely on the very things that are set out in clause 8; that is to say, it would have to rely on prior activity and any other evidence of that type it could obtain. It would have to show that the accused attended meetings, and that he participated in some way in FLQ activities; there would need to be shown enough evidence, circumstantial or otherwise, from which a conclusion could be drawn that the accused was, on October 16, a member of the FLQ.

All that clause 8 does is this: in the absence of evidence to the contrary, it entitles the judge to conclude that the accused was a member of the FLQ. Certainly, I doubt very much if we will ever be able to hand any judge a registered list of FLQ members. That a man was a member of the FLQ can only be inferred on the basis of circumstantial evidence, and therefore clause 8 is no more than an aid to proof. The burden of proof in this bill remains on the Crown. It must prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt. Those of us who have participated in the criminal courts know very well that the presumptions put forward in clause 8 are not unusual. The unique part of this bill is this: under clause 4, a person who on October 16 was a member of the FLQ is guilty of an offence. Being a member on October 15 does not make him guilty of an offence; that is the unique part of it. It is his activities prior to October 16 that will prove his guilt as of that date.

I suggest that if hon. members are concerned about retroactivity, and think that the bill is bad because of that, they should never, never have supported this bill in principle. I say that, because when you take out clause 8, the alleged retroactivity will still be there.

[Mr. Hogarth.]

The hon. member for Calgary North suggested that there be set up a board of review. Let us just take a look at that suggestion.

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please. Will the hon. member resume his seat. It is the impression of the Chair that at this stage we are getting away from clause 2. I thought there was some kind of agreement whereby we could allow representatives of the different parties to list possible amendments and speak generally on the different clauses of the bill; however, it is still my impression that if at this stage we are to let hon. members enter into a detailed discussion on these clauses or the possible amendments, we shall repeat at a later stage what has been said. I should like to hear the opinions of those hon. members who were involved in the agreement this morning, so that I can make up my own mind and decide how far the Chair can permit hon. members to go into a detailed discussion.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Chairman, may I speak on that matter, because I participated in what led up to the suggestion made by the hon. member for Calgary North. As I understood it, hon. members would be free to give notice at this stage of amendments they intended to produce, so that everything would be before the Chair and before the other parties of the House, and that we should embark on the sort of discussion we used to embark on under clause 1 in committee of the whole. In other words, we agreed that there would be a rather general discussion, with the hope—and this would be more than a hope, because we think it will be realized—that the remarks to be made in the debate on later stages of the bill would be more specifically tied down. I think those two suggestions were the basis of the general consensus of the committee when the hon. member for Calgary North proposed them this morning.

• (2:40 p.m.)

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I agree with that, Mr. Chairman. I know that under the new rules there is a practice of the committee to bypass clause 1, which used to be the general clause, and deal with clause 2 in order to preclude wide debate, reserving that until the last when clause 1 is called. My understanding of this morning's general consensus of the committee was to allow rather wide play for those hon. members intending to present amendments, and for those members who want to make some general statement they were unable to make on second reading, in order to allow the bill to be dealt with by the committee. That leeway having been properly given to members opposite, I think perhaps the Chair might want to look a little kindly upon members on this side of the chamber who want to address themselves in a general way.

Mr. Lewis: I am not attempting to curtail anyone, Mr. Chairman, but I wish to point out that there is a difference between a general statement and what the hon. member for New Westminster was doing, dealing with

the amendments that have been mentioned and which will be presented again later.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): That is all very well, Mr. Chairman, but in presenting an over-view of the amendments, the hon. member for Calgary North, the hon. member for Greenwood and the hon. member for Shefford, did not only give a view of the amendments, they argued them pretty widely. I think the Chair might be fair to both sides.

Mr. Deputy Chairman: Of course the Chair will try to be as lenient as possible, but I must caution hon. members not to go into the details of clauses or possible amendments, otherwise we might need to revert to second reading and deal with the whole bill.

Mr. Hogarth: If the hon. member for York South prefers, I will deal with the situation on the Prairies in the 30's, as was done by the hon. member for Calgary North this morning, relating stories about the dust and depression. I prefer to stick to the suggestions made this morning regarding amendments to this bill.

A rather attractive suggestion was made that there should be a citizens' board of review to investigate the imprisonment of various people arrested under this bill. I do not see how an accused is being deprived of the right of habeas corpus. We have fixed 90 days as the longest period of time for which an accused can be imprisoned without having a date fixed for his trial. I do not understand how such a board of review would serve any cogent purpose. After all, it is a general principle of criminal law.

Why should persons who cannot raise bail or persons charged with crimes such as homicide, where bail is rarely granted, have a board of review? Why should we go out on a special limb for these people, although admittedly the Attorney General can deprive them of bail? If that is to be the case, why not have a board of review to deal with every person who is charged with a serious offence? The hon. member for Greenwood suggests that bail should be the responsibility of the judiciary. The protection under section 7(2) with respect to fixing a date for trial will resolve that. My understanding of that section is that once a date for trial has been set, there could not be an adjournment because it would be by statute.

Mr. Woolliams: That is ridiculous.

Mr. Hogarth: I beg your pardon, but the ordinary provisions in the Criminal Code, which are in the regulations under the War Measures Act, have not been included in this bill. If an accused asked for an adjournment after the trial was set, the judge would have to ask the Crown to produce.

The hon. member for Shefford suggested that instead of five years' imprisonment, the penalty should be life. With the greatest of respect, I feel that would be very tragic for a young, hot-headed, political minded person who found himself involved in the FLQ, although he had never participated to any extent in violence. Even though he had attended many meetings and, as some young students do, advocated getting involved, I think it would be rather tragic for that person to be imprisoned for the rest of his natural life.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Rondeau: Mr. Chairman, I think that the hon. member has not understood the amendment, for we do not want to change the five year penalty for subclauses (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f). We agree on the way to press those charges and with the penalty, to which we would like however to substitute a penalty of life imprisonment, for the considerations we have made. Therefore, as it is plain the amendment, in subclause (g)—

[*English*]

Mr. Hogarth: I thank the hon. member for the correction. He wants life imprisonment for political kidnapping, or is that the death penalty?

Mr. Rondeau: You read the amendment.

Mr. Hogarth: I apologize if I misquoted the hon. member. In any event, I do not think that the drastic measures that he has suggested should be necessary under these circumstances.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Chairman, usually on Friday afternoons the exercise in which his House engages is not always enlightening or entertaining, but on this gray November day we are dealing with an exceedingly important issue. It is good to see the cabinet represented by some of its most distinguished ornaments. We are also graced with people gazing down from the heights of Olympia. I think it is a credit to Parliament that on this occasion we are able to gather in this way to discuss this particular issue.

I have a great deal of respect for the hon. member for Shefford. He is very sincere. He is from the province of Quebec where this problem is concentrated. I respect his views and judgment. He speaks from the heart. However, his proposals indicate that a great many Canadians, including some in this chamber, have not grasped the nature of the phenomena which has recently appeared in political life, not only in Canada but in the United States and other parts of the world. The solutions proposed by the hon. member for Shefford, and to some extent proposed by the government, might well have had their place in the world of yesterday, but not in the world of today. Increasingly large numbers of young people have become disillusioned with the democratic process and the opportunity to achieve those types of reform for society which are so sadly needed.

I am not going to deal with the problems that face this country which were so eloquently dealt with by the leader of my party; by the right hon. member for Prince Albert, the hon. member for Calgary North and members

of the New Democratic Party. They also dealt with the problems which face the province of Quebec, the absolute need to deal with causes as well as with effect. I wonder about the Prime Minister. I hope that he is not too intellectually caught up with this problem, and involved in it, in the sense that he does not see the forest for the trees. Apparently, from the answers he gave during the question period today and yesterday, a great need lies with him to change his views as to what needs to be done to remove the causes which have brought upon us much of the difficulty which has involved this House in days of discussion during the last two or three weeks. I shall not say any more about that aspect, because it has been dealt with before.

• (2:50 p.m.)

We have seen this phenomenon over and over again in the United States and elsewhere. We have said to ourselves often that Canadian society could never have evolved in its bosom this violence, these attempts to change the processes of society and reintroduce by force social reforms which have not been brought about in other ways. When it happened here, the reaction of the Canadian people and, to some extent, of the Canadian government, was illuminating. It was a reaction of fear, of anger, of determination to stamp out these acts of violence and terrorism. I think it was an emotional outburst which took the Canadian people out of their accustomed phlegm and into a view of the situation which does not permit calm and rational judgment. This is one reason I am glad to see the subject debated here.

I give credit to the Minister of Justice and to the leader of the House for acceptance of the proposal that the matter be debated in this Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): On a point of order; it was our proposal.

Mr. Baldwin: That is what I said. I gave you credit.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): For accepting your proposal.

Mr. Baldwin: If the Minister of Justice is going to approach this legislation in the light of his interpretation of what I have said, then God help all those who try to bring amendments before the House.

This phenomenon is something which is completely new, and it involves the continued alienation of young people completely disillusioned with society as we have understood it, completely prepared to opt out of democratic processes which far too often fail to bring about the results which are needed but which are essential if any society is to work out government by consensus. It is in the rejection of this philosophy by increasing numbers of young people that we face such a grave threat today. Fortunately, at the present time most of the disillusioned young people have restricted their confrontations to reasonably peaceful means. This involves violence in words, confrontation in the streets and confrontation at meetings.

It gets hectic, it gets hot, but by far the greatest number have not yet adopted the view that terrorism, savagery and brutality, if exercised on various parts of the social anatomy of the country, will result in the changes they desire. So, when we come to deal with this phenomenon we have to make certain that we do not drive the young people, the disillusioned and the disaffected, those who can justly say they suffer deprivation under our social system, into the arms of those who advocate violence and who practice violence as a means of bringing about quickly the reforms that they demand.

If the history of the world teaches us anything, and this was made very clear by my hon. friend from Calgary North in his address this afternoon, it is that civilization is but a thin crust over the volcano of revolution and anarchy. To work out a proper balance, to contain that volcano, but not, in our effort to contain it, to pierce a hole through the crust and let through the forces of anarchy and violence within, is the task which faces the government. I give them my sympathy. It is not an easy problem; not one in which they are helped by precedents, because most governments in the past have not had to face it.

I sympathize with the government in the difficulties they have faced during the last few weeks, and realize how difficult are the decisions they have been called upon to make. I, personally, have not attempted to make matters more difficult for them by my conduct either here in the House or outside it, but I do suggest that in their approach to this problem there are two main tasks which need to be undertaken. The first is rapidly and firmly to stamp out violence, savagery and brutality as a means of government. But they must be careful not to do so in such a way as would drive more and more young people and others into becoming recruits for those who promote and practice savagery. Just a few weeks ago a group of the Weathermen in the United States, young white militants who are dedicated to savagery, brutality and violence in their way, as are many of the Black Panthers, were involved in a bank robbery in Boston, or were alleged to have been so involved, resulting in the brutal killing of a watchman and the theft of $90,000. Several of the young people concerned were brilliant university students who had recently been engaged in the advocacy of a greater measure of university reform. What is it that caused them to go over the brink? What caused them to change from being people who thought there were peaceful means of settling problems into becoming advocates of the sort of violence we saw in this country recently?

I am inclined to agree with what the Prime Minister and others have said. We have not seen the end of this situation. It might be suppressed now, but there will be outbursts all over the country in due course as more and more people become involved in this means of settling disputes. It is an object lesson for us in this House to ensure that the procedures available to us will permit greater opportunities to ventilate and solve in an honest, objective way, the problems facing society. I was encouraged to see the results of the elections in the United States. I think they were evidence of the sound,

common sense of the American people as a whole. Here, faced with two alternatives, the American people rejected the extremism proposed on the right, an extremism which has to some extent been evident in proposals made in this House, and rejected also the views of those who thought there should be a freedom given to the extreme left to determine all problems by the use of violence. I think this was an example of an electorate showing more common sense than is suspected, sometimes, by the government or by members of this House generally.

• (3:00 p.m.)

I wish, now, to make one or two statements of our position in relation to this bill. In view of what the Minister of Justice has said, I will direct them to him. Our position, which has been consistent throughout, is this. On Friday, October 16, we as a group stated that we saw a number of things which were wrong in the way in which the War Measures Act was introduced as well as with the act itself. The day previously I had spoken in the House and said that there was another alternative, and during the course of debate we put forward that alternative. I had an opportunity to meet with the House Leader for the government and I am very happy to say that his views in this regard were the same as mine. He said, representing the views of the government, that there was an alternative so that we could approve the proclamation. It is that alternative that has brought us to the point we have arrived at today, namely, the opportunity to legislate.

When we are dealing with problems of this kind it is much better to expose and to ventilate the issue publicly in this House than to deal with it secretly by Order in Council. I know it has been argued on the government side that it was necessary to have the opportunity to make this great sweep at four or five o'clock in the morning and to pick up the suspects, but I do not think the facts bear this out. When we examine the record of the arrests, the releases, the charges laid and the names of the people who were charged, it is quite obvious that in most cases the people who were picked up and charged were not affected in one way by the proclamation made under the War Measures Act, and were picked up without any difficulty.

It was a well known fact both in Montreal and in this city that the government was toying with these two alternatives: first, invoking the War Measures Act and, second, introducing legislation. It was a very difficult decision to make, and I recognize that. I was not privy to the secrets of the Privy Council, and I am glad I was not. My suspicion is that the government was on the horns of a dilemma. Knowing the calibre of the members of the Privy Council, many members of the cabinet did not want to impose the War Measures Act but felt there were other means of achieving what was required. On the other hand, there were those who felt something should be done. There was a feeling among the people of the country that something had to be done; the people wanted some kind of action, some display of movement. There was also another, overpowering reason, which was that the authorities in Quebec obviously required additional assistance and manpower for the purpose of pursuing their investigations in an attempt to solve the crimes, capture the kidnappers and obtain the release of the two people involved. I accept these as valid reasons for taking some action.

There is no doubt that at that time the receipt of the letter written by the 10 or 11 people in the province of Quebec tipped the scales in favour of imposing the War Measures Act. I know this has all been gone into to some extent, but as I see it the government of Quebec was in difficulty. The surge in public opinion, which might have been led by these 10 or 11 people, might have brought such pressure to bear on the government of Quebec that they would have found it difficult to resist, and might indeed have caused the collapse of that government. I do not subscribe to the absurd suggestion that there was a plot to overthrow the government; I think that is nonsense. But the government of Quebec might have been put in grave difficulty. So I think the first two reasons for taking some action are valid ones. The third reason is not valid.

I suspect that all future governments of Canada will have cause to rue the day when there was what appeared to be an intrusion into the affairs of a provincial government in this particular way. I am not saying that something did not need to be done; I am saying that the other method I suggested is the proper one. If a request had been made by the government for a debate of two or three hours, we would have met that request immediately. We were facing a crisis, one that could only be dealt with if the House met and acting hopefully, in unanimity agreed to invest the government with powers in excess of what it then had to meet the particular situation. Although I cannot speak for my hon. friends of the New Democratic Party, I should like to think that if a reasonable request had been made for some specific powers to meet the current problems, they also would have agreed to have a short debate so that these powers could have been given to the government.

Mr. Brewin: We said that.

Mr. Baldwin: I am glad to hear from my hon. friend that they did say that. That was where the mistake was made, a mistake that many in this country, I am afraid, will live to regret.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

The Deputy Chairman: Does the committee give the hon. member unanimous consent to complete his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Chairman, I will not take advantage of the good nature of the committee and I shall conclude very shortly. I do not know how the government will

answer the people of Canada or what the people of Canada will have to say, but I am convinced that when the history of this period is written and the developments that will spring out of this situation are recorded, the Prime Minister and the government will have a great deal to answer for.

Finally, had this intermediate course to which I have referred been taken and the government had been given these powers, the government would still have been able to act promptly, exercising the strength it required to deal with the problem. It was not a national problem. This has been said over and over again, but let us not deceive ourselves: it was not a national problem. Anybody who reads the War Measures Act would be convinced that the basis on which the act was originally brought into the House and passed lay in issues involving war, invasion, insurrection or apprehended insurrection—conditions going to the heart of the survival of our system of government and society in Canada.

I am reinforced in that view by the European Convention on Human Rights, which is a fascinating and interesting document written by nations of Europe, whom we often affect to despise, gathered together to pass a number of motions in respect of which, I might add, there have been a number of charges. For example, just a short while ago the government of Greece was charged in respect of certain abuses that had been perpetrated on its citizens under the dictatorial government now in power in that country. I refer to article 15 of the convention, which I think indicates the sense in which the War Measures Act was intended to be used. Article 15 commences:

> In time of war or other public emergency threatening the life of the nation any High Contracting Party may take measures derogating from its obligations under this convention—

I say this should have been done in this case, and I am convinced that had it been done it would have been a great deal more beneficial for the country.

• (3:10 p.m.)

We are now prepared to support this bill. We think we can improve it. I hope that the Minister of Justice will listen to the more moderate side of his character—and he has a very reasonable and moderate side—and will accept some of the changes proposed by the hon. member for Calgary North. I do not want to go into detail and against your implied injunction, Mr. Chairman, but when we give these particular and strong powers to any government, whether it is done in this form or in the form of the right to act and govern by Order in Council, we must always retain some means of accounting. What the hon. member for Calgary North suggested is a very reasonable and moderate step by which this can be done.

I therefore hope that the Minister of Justice, when he goes to his retreat over the weekend, will take with him the amendments of the hon. member for Calgary North and those brought forward by my friends from the NDP and will not reject them all out of hand. I have a feeling that as he sits here and faces us today, he has rejected them. I hope I am wrong and that he will correct me when I sit down and say he is not rejecting them out of hand and will, in fact, be considering some of them over the weekend.

[Mr. Baldwin.]

[*Translation*]

Mr. De Bané: If I am right, Mr. Chairman, we have been asked to give a general impression of the remarks and amendments we want to propose.

As far as subclause 2 is concerned I will probably introduce an amendment to restrict the definition of peace officer because, as you know, according to the Criminal Code, a peace officer can only arrest without a warrant a person who, in his belief, has committed a crime, not an infraction.

According to the Criminal Code a peace officer is not only police, but also the mayor, the warden, the sheriff, the justice of the peace, the deputy warden, the instructor, the gaoler, the civil servant, the pilot... So, as according to the bill we are studying those people may act on mere suspicion, I believe that we should limit the number of persons empowered to enforce the present measure to those who depend on a hierarchical authority, and exclude people who may act at their own discretion, because there is no claim possible against them.

As to clause 3, I think it is in apparent contradiction with the statement of the government that the bill is directed against the FLQ restrictively, or to its successors. The clause goes on to say that it applies also to any association that advocates the use of force or the commission of crimes in Canada. And I think that to hold that this bill would apply only in Quebec and not in other provinces is to misread what are the same or similar goals as those of the FLQ.

The goals of the FLQ indeed are not only to achieve the independence of the province of Quebec through the use of force, but also to use force in order to deal with any social malaise, be it the rehiring of G. Lapalme Inc. employees or any other cause. Then I do not think the government is justified in stating that the bill now before us is aimed exclusively at the FLQ or its successors. It should equally be directed against any other group in Canada which has recourse to similar methods.

Concerning clause 4, I feel that the press release of the Department of Justice, to the effect that the legislation prohibits the communication of statements in favor of subversive movements, is much better than the present wording which says "communicates statements on behalf of. ." All the more since clause 8 says that if a person has communicated statements before October 16, he is presumed at the very most to be a member of the association.

Now, if there are organisations or individuals which did communicate statements "on behalf", all the information media in Canada are concerned.

Then, I think that in clause 4, the following should be added: "without legitimate grounds the onus of which lies upon the said person".

Of course, it can be argued that these words are not absolutely essential but since the bill is, in my view, an exceptional piece of legislation, we must include those words which are required to avert any ambiguity. Indeed, on October 16, we placed our confidence in the province of Quebec to uphold the rights of prisoners to legal counsel. But they procastinated for two weeks. We had to wait for the provincial bar association, the federal government and the judicial body to issue statements in this regard before the government of Quebec recognized that the regulations proclaimed under the War Measures Act did not infringe upon a right enshrined in the Bill of Rights.

I believe we should take good account of this experience and include in the bill before us the words "A person who, without legitimate grounds the onus of which lies upon the said person".

To my mind, clause 5 should be amended so as to maintain the existing privilege in favour of the spouse. You will recall that the Criminal Code says: section 5 deals with complicity after the fact. The Criminal Code makes exception for the spouse who helps her husband to escape. And I do not think we have the right to cancel this provision of the Criminal Code which is centuries old.

In clause 6 there are, I believe, two different concepts. Lines up to 20 prohibit meetings of FLQ cells, and the second part prohibits meetings by other groups for a very definite purpose and not only meetings per se.

Clause 7 as it stands now I believe is unacceptable, and I would also draw the attention of the minister to a legal error in clause 7 (2) of the bill. Under the bill, and particularly under clause 7(3) as well as under the amendment introduced today, it is impossible to issue an order to a judge of the superior court of criminal jurisdiction in the province of Quebec because in our country it is absolutely unthinkable for a judge of the appeal court, Crown side, to set the date of trial—and as I was saying, it is impossible to give orders to a judge of the court of the sessions of the peace other than by mandamus or in resorting to control power.

Section 8 requires clarification and some remarks on section 9, paragraphs (2 and (3) would be in order.

In respect to sections 10 and 11, concerning search, I wish all the rights recognized in the Criminal Code to the owner of the seized belongings were safeguarded. There is even no provision for an official entry to be made of the seized items as a matter of record.

Concerning section 12, I submit that interference of politics in the judiciary seems an unfortunate way of settling the problem. I shall have other solutions to suggest.

Finally, I would suggest to the minister that the logical order of the sections following section 6 should be as follows. After section 6 should come the basic sections 10 and 11 on search, then section 9(1), concerning arrest without warrant, and afterwards, sections 9(2) and (3), concerning appearance before the court. Following that should come section 7, dealing with detention, and section 7(2) regarding directions for expediting trial, and lastly, section 8, concerning the rule of evidence.

These are roughly the remarks I intend to make. Besides, I shall suggest amendments to improve the French wording of the bill.

Mr. Ricard: Mr. Chairman, the crisis we are now going through and are trying to deal with goes beyond political considerations, and I believe we should strive to find solutions without playing politics with such a serious question.

It is in that spirit, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to make a few remarks, for it is not my intention to keep the House very long.

Mr. Chairman, when the war measures were put forward by the government, this party put all its confidence in the government and we all supported the government's efforts to strike at the root of evil.

My Quebec colleagues and I had warned our party that regardless of the position it would take in this regard, we felt duty bound to vote for the War Measures Act. We did so because we believed without question what the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) had told us. We did not want to question his word and acted accordingly.

Bill C-181 is now before us. I do not wish to discuss the sections of that bill. Thank God, there are enough lawyers to do so and I do not believe I should venture in such a complex field. I shall leave it to the disciples of Themis to make the best legislation possible out of the bill now before the House.

Mr. Chairman, it is understood that this bill is imperfect. Having been conceived by human beings, the contrary would be astonishing. Still we must make every possible effort to make it more explicit so as to meet the needs which concern us at this time.

It is therefore, Mr. Chairman, in the common interest of the Canadian people and especially of the people of the province of Quebec, that the government pay special attention to the suggestions made by the members of the opposition.

I should like to insist on this: the amendments proposed by the members of the Ralliement créditiste, the New Democratic Party or the Conservative Party have but one goal—to make the act as efficient as possible.

On various occasions, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has also held the opposition responsible for applying the war measures. Time and time again he said that we had given complete support to the government and that, because of this, we had to accept our responsibilities.

If it is true, Mr. Chairman, that we have assumed some responsibility by approving the implementation of war measures, it follows that the government should go half way and show a disposition to accept amendments which, I say it again, are as generous and as well intentioned as possible.

In introducing those amendments, we do not seek any political aim or capital. We are seeking only the common welfare of the population. So I would like to make a special appeal to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) so he will take into serious consideration the amendments presented to him.

Knowing what those on the government side may be thinking, it is clear that they do not have—any more than we do for that matter—the monopoly on science. Now, I think that they should give appropriate consideration to the amendment presented by my colleague from Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) as well as to those introduced by other parties.

I could yet say many things in that respect. For instance, I could say that, having heard certain speeches by certain members of the government, including the hon. members for New Westminster (Mr. Hogarth), for Sherbrooke (Mr. Gervais) and for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand), according to whom the danger of revolution was hanging over the province of Quebec, I could say that if it is true that the government knew all the aspects of the situation which existed in the province of Quebec, one can only wonder why they did not act before.

It will be said, as the hon. Minister for Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) is probably going to say, that it was necessary to wait for the province of Quebec to ask the assistance of the federal government. I wonder how long the federal government, aware of the danger and of the various aspects of this situation, would have waited before taking the necessary measures.

It is the duty of any government to see that the security of its citizens is maintained in all occasions. I would ask my hon. friends opposite to stop making such statements because, by doing so, they confirm that we are right when we urge the government to reveal to the population all available and relevant facts so that we can judge their value ourselves.

Mr. Chairman, I would conclude my remarks by asking once more the Minister of Justice to accept the amendments proposed to him since they only have one purpose: facilitating the elimination of the present crisis.

• (3:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Chairman, like a number of other members in this House yesterday, I voted for the bill before us with a considerable degree of hesitation. The bill before us is intended to deal with a matter which is unique in the history of our country. Never before have Canadians really had to deal with terroristic politics. For the first time, in a very serious and fundamental way, we face the problem of dealing with the conflicting objectives of freedom and orderliness, that is to say, conflicting at times but conflicting certainly when there is a terroristic group in society.

[Mr. Ricard.]

• (3:30 p.m.)

The FLQ have been active in Canada for at least eight years. They have committed murder. They have committed acts of bombing. They have caused the derailment of trains. They have committed a number of other acts highly objectionable in any civilized, democratic society. Therefore, there is no question in anyone's mind that such a group and, such politics must be dealt with in a very serious and concentrated way. This kind of activity in recent weeks culminated in two kidnappings, one murder and the intimidation of government.

During this time the federal government declared that there was an apprehended insurrection in the country. It was the judgment of at least 16 members of this House that this was not the case. It is our view that there is indeed a serious malaise in the political culture of Canada. There have, indeed, been reprehensible and serious kidnappings, but there was not an apprehended insurrection. Therefore, we voted against a measure which proclaimed that there was such an insurrection. And we found, in terms of the regulations that came with that proclamation, that there were taken away from Canadians basic liberties acquired over hundreds of years of history. We did not believe this was necessary to deal with what was admittedly a very serious situation.

I am not going to go over the whole ground as to whether or not the government was right in what it did. As I say, a number of us believed it was wrong. History will be the judge of that. But I think what we have to face today, and what this bill proposes to face, is the question: What do we do now? It is not what do we do now in terms of welfare legislation, regional development programs or providing linguistic justice, all of which remedies are indeed necessary to deal with the very serious problems of French Canada and Quebec, but: What do we do in terms of the Criminal Code? That is really what is at issue.

What do we say is to be criminal activity? What can be done to deal with the very serious problems associated with Quebec, in terms of criminal law? In the law books of this country we have laws pertaining to sedition, conspiracy, intimidation and kidnapping. If you look at this bill with care, you will find there are no changes at all made there. The government, instead of arguing that some improvement must be made in these areas to deal with terroristic politics, has said, "Really what we need to do is, first of all, ban the FLQ." That is one central, specific part of the bill. Further, the government proposes to extend the powers of arrest, detention and search.

In the view of a number of hon. members, certainly in the view of a number of members of this party, whether or not we support this measure on third reading will be determined by the flexibility of the government and its willingness to accept reasonable amendments. It is our view that we must deal with terroristic politics and, therefore, that we must make some changes in the criminal law. But the frame of reference for us is the broad one of how we deal with criminal politics, on the one hand, and preserve freedom on the other. It is our view

that no limitation on Canadian freedom—none whatsoever—is justified beyond that which is necessary to deal with the politics of the FLQ.

Let us begin by asking what are the existing powers of arrest, detention and search. The first point that can be made is that a man in Canada can only be arrested if he has or is about to commit a criminal offence. Secondly, such a man must be taken before a justice of the peace and be charged within 24 hours. Thirdly, police in this country at present can conduct a search only with a warrant, and there must be reasonable and probable grounds for conducting such a search. What does the new legislation propose? There are a number of changes, but in my view the most important and most basic to this question are, first, an extension of the powers of arrest and detention, second, an extension of the powers of search and, third, clause 8 which is the provision of *ex post facto* law. These are serious changes in the fundamental rights of Canadians acquired over hundreds of years of our history, and they are not to be discussed or dismissed lightly. The question we must answer is: Should we make the changes in these three areas to deal with the FLQ?

As I mentioned earlier, one thing has been decided. In the bill we have in effect declared that the FLQ is an illegal, violent conspiracy. The bill makes its kind of politics illegal. Therefore, the other changes in basic law as they affect our Canadian rights, changes concerning arrest, detention and search, must be intended to do one of two things—on the one hand, to prevent crime by the FLQ or associated bodies or, on the other, to catch those involved in a crime that was committed in the past.

The question then is: Do we need the extension of powers in these areas to deal with this situation? I put it to the Minister of Justice, not as a rhetorical but as a genuine question: If we now assume that there is no state of insurrection, that there is no impending riot in the immediately foreseeable future, but there is a terroristic group with which we must deal in a serious way, could this not be done merely by extending the present powers of search? If we consider what is involved in the present powers of search, in my view all that is required is to extend those powers. At present, as the Minister of Justice well knows, before you can search a Canadian's home there must be a warrant and there must be reasonable and probable grounds for searching it. The bill provides for an extension of these grounds, and in my view perhaps that is all we need at this time, if the grounds could be further changed from reasonable and probable to mere suspicion.

• (3:40 p.m.)

Let us accept the time period for this bill, until the end of April. If it were declared that during this period whole areas of Montreal, some other city, another part of the province or, indeed, any other part of Canada needed to be systematically searched, this could be done under the proposal I make of extending the powers of search and no warrant would be needed. Then when a search was made, instead of arresting people and bringing them in without laying charges and keeping them in jail for long periods of time, no such arrest could be made unless there were evidence of past criminal activity or intended criminal activity. In other words, the existing provision of the Criminal Code would have to be used. If we are really interested in preserving freedom in Canada, particularly in Quebec because that is where this activity is located, this is the kind of provision—the first step, if you like; the first, minimal erosion of our freedoms—that we should be considering. It is up to the government to prove that something else is required.

I assert that there is no insurrection now, and the government has acknowledged that by the title of this bill for the preservation of public order. If it has reasonable grounds for believing that before the end of April a riot is going to take place, a kidnapping or any other kind of criminal activity by the FLQ, a successor body or a body sympathetic to the FLQ, it could move through these extended powers of search. What would be the advantages of taking this much more limited approach, Mr. Chairman? Obviously, the first is that the existing freedoms would remain unchanged, with the exception of the power of search. Secondly, a well equipped, dedicated and hardworking police force, in my view, would be able to deal quickly with FLQ actions or intended actions. Finally, and this is really an elaboration of the first point, such limited kind of change in our law would enable us to maintain a basically free society and yet deal with the kind of malaise that we all wish to exorcise.

I would like the Minister of Justice to depart from the kind of partisan politics in which he indulged the other day and address himself, at some point in the debate, to the very serious question as to whether or not there is a need to extend governmental power beyond that which I am proposing.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Chairman, I want to make clear at the outset that I support the measure before us, just as I supported the invocation of the regulations under the War Measures Act, for the simple reason that had we not acted this Parliament would have fallen into utter disrepute with right-thinking Canadians.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. McCleave: So, Mr. Chairman, I justify our action in that sense. We have to take critical action to meet a critical situation, one on which the public conscience demanded action. I shall never look back at myself in that respect and wonder why I voted as I did, and as I will no doubt vote in the next few days. Nonetheless, in what I say this afternoon I shall pose the question of whether the government could have taken a better course than the one it has followed. A better course would have been to follow the sensible suggestions that have been made, not only in recent weeks but for some time. Had the government taken that action, I suggest we would not now be engaged in this debate.

May I present a sort of philosophical postscript to all this, Mr. Chairman, before I get into the meat and potatoes of my argument. I look at the people involved, the inner-circle of the government, the people before the courts in Quebec, the people being hunted, the people whose names are in the news at the very heart of today's tragic drama in Canada, and it reminds me of Victor Hugo's "Les Miserables". In that novel, all the great characters came together in the last few chapters, arrayed on one side or other of barricades erected in the streets of Paris. Some were on one side of the barricade when they could have been expected to be on the other. Such is the kaleidoscopic way of change in which lives are moulded in our times.

Much has been made of the way in which this legislation was initiated. I think the answer is clearly to be found in statements made by the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition early in this story, on October 16. The Prime Minister's position would not have led to legislation being considered here today because, as he said then as reported at page 194 of *Hansard:*

> Following the passage of enough time to give the government the necessary experience to assess the type of statute which may be required in these circumstances, it is my firm intention to discuss with the leaders of the opposition parties the desirability of introducing legislation of a less comprehensive nature.

But there the Prime Minister is referring to what has still to be produced, the long-term measure. I think that is a fair reading of everything the right hon. gentleman had to say on that page. A few minutes later, the Leader of the Official Opposition said, as reported at page 196 of *Hansard*:

> Nevertheless, I urge that the government instead of seeking the approval of the House for the measure it has already taken, the invoking of the War Measures Act, should heed what is said in the House today and should at the earliest possible date bring in a bill with much more restricted powers, many more safeguards with regard to review, and of a much more limited duration.

Mr. Chairman, that is the legislation we are considering today. When we talk about the conscience of Parliament, this shows that the leadership has indeed come from Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition. It seems strange that we should be discussing a situation in which so far approximately nine out of every ten people arrested should not have been. In normal times, those of us familiar with the background of English common law would quote the old saying that it is better that ten guilty men should go free than that one innocent man should be punished. That is the philosophy that guides us in more sober and less dramatic times.

There are those of us on this side of the House particularly, and I imagine there are those on the other side of the House too, who are concerned that there is such a large number of arrests. Under the arbitrary provisions of the War Measures Act, people can suddenly be arrested and deprived of their liberty in the middle of the night. After several days they may be released. This is an abuse, and it is to prevent abuses that we on the opposition are suggesting certain amendments to the Minister of Justice. We shall be fighting for the adoption of these amendments next week when we resume consideration of this bill.

• (3:50 p.m.)

I join in the eloquent pleas made by others to the Minister of Justice. He should pay due regard to what we are trying to do. We are not trying to discombobulate him. We are not trying to embarrass him in any way. We are trying to satisfy the feelings of Canadians and make sure that, as far as possible, criminal elements shall be dealt with in a just way. There are many in this House who fought against the horror that our planet experienced only three decades ago, a horror in which the jackboot rang on cobblestoned streets in the middle of the night and in which people disappeared, some never to reappear. Some went to the gas ovens; others reappeared as impoverished refugees if they were lucky enough to escape.

We ask: Why cannot that happen here if we have arbitrary action on such a scale and when so many errors have been committed? One can only assume that our government, which is supposed to be civilized and to represent our civilization, harboured no effective forethought for dealing with this emergency. All this while these Maoists, Marxists and other extreme leftists in the province of Quebec have been preaching their doctrines. They are economic doctrines, but these people are smart enough to use the political wagon of separatism in furthering their idea. They have been around for some time.

Last night on television the Prime Minister used two words. I will not mention them now; I will merely ask: To whom do those two words the Prime Minister uttered apply? For years the members of the Conservative party have asked for a royal commission to look into the causes of crime in Canada. Our large cities, and Montreal in particular—the city which is bearing the brunt of these awful times—have been faced with the problem of the Mafia. Latterly, Montreal has been faced with the problem of terrorism. The combination of the Mafia and terrorism has been more than the police force of that city could handle without outside help. That outside help has now been provided.

This situation is not new. For seven years we have asked for this royal commission. The present Prime Minister, as well as preceding prime ministers, when asked about this matter just shrugged it off. No action was taken. How would you describe a person who makes that sort of decision? One year ago Mr. Saulnier of the city of Montreal, who knew of the terrible problem that city's police forces were facing, who knew that those men were literally being driven beyond endurance in their fight against terrorism and the war against the Mafia, requested of the government a royal commission to look into certain matters pertaining to his city. That very sensible request on the part of the most important public servant to serve outside the federal and public services of Canada was not acceded to. What was the response to that request? It was a shrug. I ask: How would one characterize a person who makes that sort of response?

Let us consider the statement made in this House on the day before it was decided to send forces into Montreal early on the morning. How would one characterize a person who makes such statements? What sort of adjectives could one apply to that sort of person? What would one call a man who proclaims himself as an apostle of instant action, yet does nothing? Good God, Mr. Chairman, this government has waited for years and years before acting; the crisis piles up and now it asks us to give our approbation and blessing for what it has done. The government will gain approval, because steps must be taken. But we will not trust the government to administer these measures efficiently, because innocent people may be dragged in. After all, that is why we are fighting as best we can, to bring safeguards into the legislation that is before the House.

Sir, I meant to leave to the end of my remarks the adjectives that the Prime Minister of this country used when speaking on television last night. He tried to suggest that the words would apply to what others would do in this situation and that they do not apply to himself. Considering the way in which he dealt with the request for the appointment of a royal commission, and the way he acted in certain matters a couple of years ago, the adjective that should apply to him, that he said should apply to others, is "wishy-washy".

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Chairman: Order, please. It being four o'clock, it is my duty to rise, report progress and request leave to sit again at the next sitting of the House.

Progress reported.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. It being four o'clock, the House will proceed to consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper, namely, Notices of Motions.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

UNITED NATIONS—MORE EFFECTIVE ROLE IN PREVENTING MILITARY AGGRESSION, ETC.

Mr. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should take initiatives for United Nations reform to make that institution a more effective instrument for the prevention of military aggression, for the settlement of international disputes, and to promote co-operation, peace and prosperity in particular, to:

1. provide that the decisions of the Security Council be enforceable;

2. provide that the unused provisions of the charter be activated;

3. provide that the International Court of Justice be empowered to interpret the United Nations charter;

4. provide for universality of membership;

5. provide for the establishment of global authorities related to the United Nations to deal with serious global problems

such as the environment, population, development of seabed resources, and economic and social stability;

6. provide for a United Nations stand-by peace force.

He said: Mr. Speaker, on October 24 this year the peoples of the world commemorated the twenty-fifth anniversary of the ratification of the United Nations charter. On that occasion many of us suggested that we should not at that time merely celebrate that anniversary in the sense of commemorating the setting-up of the United Nations but, rather, that we should take steps to reform the United Nations, to correct its failings and to make it a much more effective organization.

During the previous session I had the honour to sponsor a private member's motion in this House asking for the reform of the United Nations charter. That motion was debated in the House on February 9, 1970. Since the debate on that motion several speeches have been made which have given me great encouragement. One of the those was made in New York by U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations. The second speech was also made by U Thant, here in Ottawa during August when he was addressing the Conference of World Federalists. As a result of various remarks and the speeches of the Secretary General of the United Nations, I have brought forward the motion we are discussing. It sets out six points. These six points are the same as those put forward by the Secretary General of the United Nations.

• (4:00 p.m.)

When I put forward my resolution last year, many people participated in the debate. They said that my proposals were unrealistic and unacceptable. The six points which I am now putting forward are the same as those put forward by the Secretary General, a man who has served the United Nations since its inception, and as Secretary General for many years. He put forward these proposals because he thinks the United Nations needs reform and that these proposals will help bring it into the seventies to do the job it must do.

These six proposals are as follows: First, the decisions of the Security Council must be enforceable; second, the unused provisions of the charter should be activated; third, the International Court of Justice must be empowered to interpret the United Nations charter; fourth, steps should be taken toward universality of membership; fifth, there should be established under the United Nations, global authorities to deal with serious world problems such as environment, population control, development of the seabed resources, and economic and social stability; sixth, the United Nations should have a stand-by peace force.

I refer to some of the remarks made by the Secretary General in a speech in Ottawa. He said as follows:

In a very important sense, the United Nations is in a transitional stage. Effective and sensible world approaches to world problems are urgently required. The United Nations, for the reasons mentioned, has not yet been charged with that full responsibility of adequate authority to discharge it. But the United Nations has to be the active and vital process within which world policies are made or changed, within which agreement and consensus must be reached on major issues among member states, and where agreed decisions must be carried out

on behalf of the world community. That process is only embryonic, in comparison with the needs, but we know that it must be fully developed...

I recently said that strengthening the United Nations should be not just a desire but an obsession... I would like to summarize very briefly the immediate steps I see as indispensable.

He then deals with the six points which read as follows:

First and foremost, the decisions of the United Nations, particularly of the Security Council, must be enforceable.

Second, unused provisions of the charter, which can add greatly to international peace and security, should be activated.

He then refers to subsidiary bodies for fact-finding and conciliation, as follows:

Third, the International Court of Justice must be empowered to interpret the United Nations charter. Our goal should be the acceptance by all member states without exception of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all international legal disputes.

Fourth, I have mentioned earlier that I consider the idea of the universality of the United Nations the priority item of this year's agenda for world affairs.

Since U Thant delivered that speech, Canada has established diplomatic relations with China. This matter will soon come before the United Nations for a vote to determine whether the People's Republic of China should be admitted to the seat now held by Taiwan. If we are to properly act upon the request of the Secretary General which would make the United Nations a universal body, Canada should support this admission to the United Nations on a full basis. This is what our government said they would do, but we do not yet know in which way they will support it or whether they will vote in favour of the matter being a serious question.

The fifth proposal the Secretary General made to the delegates in Ottawa is as follows:

Fifth, I have urgently recommended that global authorities related to the United Nations be established to deal with serious global problems.

He then dealt with the threat to our environment and the need for an international agency to deal with world pollution and conservation problems. He said:

It is my sincere hope that the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, which is to meet in Stockholm in 1972 on the invitation of the government of Sweden, will take the first steps toward the establishment of such an agency.

As hon. members know, the Deputy Secretary General, who will head the world conference on environmental problems, is a Canadian, Mr. Maurice Strong. He is the former head of the Canadian International Development Agency. We wish him luck in his new task. I hope the Canadian government will fully support him and the conference in the work to be done.

The Secretary General, referring to resources of the seabed, said:

—I hope that steps will swiftly be taken to establish the proposed international regime to administer the resources of the seabed, generally recognized as "the common heritage of mankind".

Sixth, the United Nations urgently needs a standby force a recommendation I made to the General Assembly some years ago. Progress in the Committee of 35 may be encouraging, but we have a long way to go before such a force becomes an actuality. In my view, a ready, trained, standby force is a prerequisite for effective maintenance of international peace and security.

These are the six points that U Thant feels are necessary to reform the United Nations in its twenty-fifth anniversary year. Why is change needed? As I attempted to point out last year, the United Nations was formed following World War II. There was great hope that it would be the proper institution to handle problems of international conflict and to deal with the terrible problems of war such as confronted the world from 1939 to 1945. Unfortunately, that has not been the case. Although there have been no world wars since World War II, there have been 48 major and minor wars. There has hardly been an occasion since 1945 when there has not been some type of war going on somewhere in the world. Even though they have not been atomic wars, the people who die as a result of them are dying just as cruelly and with as much terror as in a war on a world scale. The only difference is that in a world war, more people die.

We should take preventive measures before there is another world war. We should not wait until we are involved in another world conflict before thinking seriously about these matters. The present situation is almost one of world anarchy. In the past week we have been discussing the need for systems of order in this country and laws to deal with terror and criminals. We see this need within our national boundaries but we have not reached the point where we have effective institutions to deal with anarchy, terror and war between nations or on a world level.

The United Nations must be elevated to a higher level so that it can properly negotiate settlements with effectiveness when world disputes arise. One of the greatest threats to world peace at the present time is the situation in the Middle East. There have been temporary ceasefires, but unless we deal with the cause of that war it could be the spark that would once again develop into a world conflict. As I say, we should not wait until these things take place but we should act now, while we have time, to strengthen our world institutions, our world court and our United Nations so these things cannot happen.

• (4:10 p.m.)

I do not suggest that the United Nations has been a failure over the last 25 years. I think that if the United Nations had not been in existence, the world would be in a much worse state. The United Nations, even as it stands, is valuable, but it is not yet adequate. However, because I do not want to leave the impression that the United Nations has failed in all areas, I would point out that it has been a very real success especially with respect to the specialized agencies, the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization and ECOSOC with respect to economic and social questions.

It has also been a very real success in the area of decolonization. Many countries in Asia and Africa have been released from colonial status and have been set up as fully independent states which are today members of

the United Nations. Great progress has been made in this field since 1945. There have also been successes in connection with peacekeeping, especially in Kashmir, Cyprus and the Congo and, for ten years, in the Middle East. I would hope that these minor successes in some areas would bring home to us the great successes we could achieve if we improved and reformed the United Nations so that in other areas it could act more effectively and with teeth.

It is for this reason I have brought this motion before the House in the twenty-fifth anniversary year of the organization, in the hope that the House will approve it. This is not a private member's bill; it is merely a resolution which I am putting to the House. It would be a set of goals to which hon. members could subscribe, goals which we in this country should try to reach. I understand that not all of these six items can be put into effect immediately if we approve this resolution. Even if all the nations of the world approve these points, these things could not be done this year. But if we start by accepting and approving these goals, it means the first step has been taken. We have to set goals for ourselves so that we can work out means of achieving them.

I earnestly ask the House and the government to accept these goals. A year ago when I made a suggestion like this, people thought it was too idealistic, but now these things are being said by the Secretary General of the United Nations and by many other people in the world. I hope we can go forward and make the twenty-fifth anniversary year of the United Nations a year when we do not merely raise flags and say a few nice words in favour of the United Nations, but one in which we look at the past, examine the shortcomings of the institution and take steps to correct them.

Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal): Mr. Speaker, the trouble with the hon. member's resolution is that it covers such a wide field that it is difficult in the hour in which we are permitted to discuss world affairs, rather than domestic affairs, to give precise consideration to any one of the six items he mentions. I say this not in any way to be critical but merely as a warning that the remarks I intend to make may not be as incisive as they should be.

James Reston, surely one of the most thoughtful commentators of our age, in an August birthday message to the United Nations which appeared in the New York *Times* of August 12, said the soldiers had been dominating world events for the past few years but that the diplomats were now stirring again. The diplomats have always been in the awkward position of seeking to anticipate the future, and they are now beginning to think they can at least talk about the world beyond the present wars.

Whenever I become discouraged at the futility of some of the debates which go on in the General Assembly, I console myself by thinking that at least some of the issues are being discussed and that discussion is better than violence. I propose to discuss briefly two or three of the issues in this speech in support of the hon. member's resolution. One of the issues that I think the hon. member is right in asking us to reflect upon concerns the essential need for universality of membership in the United Nations. Usually, when discussions on this subject take place we think, quite understandably I suppose, of the substitution of the government of the People's Republic of China for the Nationalist Government of China. I, with others, believe that this is inevitable and that the sooner it takes place, the better. But there are other parts of the world which remain outside membership.

I do not intend to go into the merits, but if we are frank about this question of universality, we have to consider a formula to provide for the "split" countries, the Koreas, the Viet Nams, north and south, and the two Germanys. I also believe, though I have got into trouble at times for saying so, that there are many people, particular in Africa, particularly in countries like Rhodesia and the Republic of South Africa, Angola and Mozambique who, because of the authoritarian nature of the regimes under which they are forced to exist and the obscenity of apartheid and other measures which frustrate, to use a somewhat eloquent phrase, the flowering of their citizenship, are not in any meaningful sense represented at the United Nations. So when we talk of universality, let us be very clear that there are still a large number of people in the world who have not yet been able to enjoy the membership we seek for them.

The peace force proposal can be discussed briefly. I hope hon. members will agree, modestly. The idea of a peace force is not a new one but its usefulness has been underlined, I am sure, by the report of the subcommittee of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence which reported some months ago. I trust the report was the subject of urgent consideration by the government on this very point. In other words, we have a somewhat up-to-date and, if I may say so, thoughtful, well documented report of a subcommittee of a Standing Committee of the House of Commons which provides all the information and forward thrust that I think we will get at this stage for the usefulness of a peace force.

• (4:20 p.m.)

The last point I want to make, since I am sure other hon. members will want to indicate their support for this resolution, relates to the large item that is covered in paragraph 5 of the resolution before the House. I refer to United Nations authority to deal with serious global problems such as the environment, population, development of seabed resources, and economic and social stability. I think so much is encompassed in this paragraph that it rather diffuses the proper emphasis that must be placed on one or two other items.

Surely the world has had all the warning it needs by now of the serious danger that man is doing to his environment and the very precious balance that it is our obligation to keep. In some parts of the world we know that this balance has been drastically upset. Indeed, in some areas there is doubt whether there is in fact remedial action that can be taken to save the dead seas,

not of biblical times but of the present day. Having said that, I welcome the proposal in regard to the Stockholm conference on pollution. My only reservation is that it takes mankind so long to get around to organizing these conferences; and this one will not meet, I think, until 1972.

The second item in paragraph 5 has to do with population. I think here we must be realistic too. While it should never be part of the policy of the government of Canada to impose birth control methods on peoples of other cultures and other countries, nevertheless we should not resist making available, hopefully under UN auspices, both funds and technology to meet the situation so that we will not be faced with another encroachment upon the quality of life, as it were—a world where there are in fact too many people. I do not suppose that I will be around in the year 2000, but I am satisfied that I do not want to be if the world does contain the 7 billion people that present population projections indicate.

When people talk of the great open spaces of the world and say that all we have to do is to fill these spaces with people, they cease to get to the central issue. If the people of the earth are put into these now empty spaces, what type of lives will they live? I think there are techniques that man in his wisdom has evolved to find answers to what could be a very terrible disaster. I hope there will be set up, I do not like the word "commissioner" but certainly somebody in the United Nations responsible for dealing with the problems that man faces because of a rapidly escalating population.

The last issue I want to speak about very briefly is the technology man now possesses to exploit the last unexploited part of the earth, the seabed. Here I hope man does not fall into the trap that he fell into during the great escapades of exploitation in the last few centuries which have culminated, I think, in the quite irresponsible exploitation of the last 100 years. This is an area where man, if he is to exploit, must exploit together. Man has to exploit, remembering that these resources do not belong to any one country but belong, surely, to all men. He has to remember that because this country, for example, has been blessed, through an accident of geography, with a large coastline—I believe the largest coastline in the world—there are other people in landlocked areas and in undeveloped parts of the world who, surely, have rights equal to those which belong to all men—those resources which are on the ocean floor, the seabed and below the seabed.

Therefore, I think it is essential that some regime be set up to deal with the techniques, with all of the "terrible engines", if I may call them that, of exploitation which could be unleashed unless all man's wisdom and generosity is used to harness them for the benefit of all men. Without this regime we shall be in for serious trouble.

I am sure all hon. members are delighted to note that some forward steps have been taken. It is peculiar that when technology demands that man find a solution that is apart from ideology, man is often able to do this. I for one think that the curse of this and other ages has been the ideological dogmas that influence men to take certain positions. When man can separate himself from ideology and deal with what I might call the real problems, he usually succeeds in finding an accommodation.

I cite just one or two examples of this. I am advised that one of the most useful initiatives that has been taken in this regard is the North Pacific convention on halibut. The four or five countries of various political stripes that harvest the seas have something in common: they need to be assured of a constant supply of resources from the sea. This is why such a convention is essential to them. It does not really matter whether a man is a citizen of the U.S.S.R., Japan, Canada or the United States, or whether he is a Liberal, Progressive Conservative, Republican or what have you; the resources of the sea must be conserved. This is the impetus that has made such a convention possible.

I think this sort of action to protect the seabed is essential, and I must say I look forward to debates in the UN to evolve regimes for exploitation purposes—or for harvesting, if that is a better word—for the benefit of everybody on this earth. This matter is urgent because if man exploits without regulation, he will pollute. It is urgent because it is essential to co-ordinate research and to supervise the exploitation. It is urgent because unless we have a regime under international auspices, surely we will have only licensed entrepreneurs who have only national ambitions—and this I think would be tragic. I warned the House that the very general nature and the very wide number of issues covered by the resolution that we are discussing today means that members do not have the opportunity that they might perhaps like to have to hone and sharpen their comments. Therefore, I am making this apology for being somewhat general.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson said—I am paraphrasing his words—that the United Nations was in danger of sinking on a point of order. The Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp), in his speech to the UN General Assembly last year, warned the UN about the proliferation of reports and of paper. I think that we, too, might take warning from these words. I hope that a committee of United Nations will deal very seriously with the problems raised by the Secretary of State for External Affairs.

I think it is a very happy fact that this year the distinguished President of the United Nations is a very wise and knowledgeable gentleman, Mr. Eric Hambro, who does not put up with some of the niceties of the lateness and proliferation of committees' reports and, if I may say so, of the nonsense encountered in diplomatic forms that unhappily have scarred an otherwise rather good record of the UN.

The last thing I wish to say on this subject is that when some of us think of the 25 years of the UN and are

frustrated about its thrust and its effectiveness, we should remember, as the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand) reminded us, of the tremendous work of the specialized agencies. If there had been no UN, it is doubtful that the World Health Organization, the Food and Agricultural Organization, UNESCO, the specialized agencies dealing with international development, and so on, could ever have reached their present degree of helpfulness to man.

Therefore, when we get upset about sterile debates—as we often do when we listen, for instance, to the old debate on China coming up again—we should take encouragement from the specialized agencies and their work and remember, as the hon. member said, what might have happened if the UN itself had not been established 25 years ago. Someone reminded us that our world is too small for anything but truth and too dangerous for anything but brotherhood. I suggest that this is the birthday greeting that should be very much part of our thoughts when we think of the 25 years of the United Nations.

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I share the difficulty of the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather) in that I, too, find the subject so broad as to encompass the whole future history of mankind. It is a motion that rather lends itself to generalities. Nevertheless, I too want to say that the motion before us is both forward-looking and, in my view, realistic and it has our enthusiastic support.

I think it was the late President Kennedy who said that in the nuclear world, peace is the rational end of rational man. It sometimes seems to me that it should be our first preoccupation, although it is often our last. In the type of age in which we live, survival depends upon an orderly world, an orderly world in turn depends upon some system of world law or order and this depends upon the evolution of a world community. It is trite to say that technology has made the world into a neighbourhood, but it is a neighbourhood in which there are immense areas of poverty and immense gaps in race, where there is instability and threat of instability.

We are threatened, not only with the possibility of a nuclear war but, as the hon. member who preceded me said, by the threat of environmental pollution and population explosion. These are matters that can only be dealt with effectively on an international scale; therefore, the primary object of our policy in the international field—perhaps our total policy—should be the strengthening of the UN and its member organizations. This is at least the first and the only effort that is now available to us to create the world community of which I have spoken.

There are many people responsible for diplomacy in the day-to-day conduct of foreign affairs who are, naturally, preoccupied with these day-to-day problems and sometimes have a feeling of cynicism and despair toward the United Nations. I do not blame them. There is sometimes in the UN debates a sense of futility, as has already been mentioned. I suggest that in the longer term point of view there is no reason for this sense of hopelessness.

There has been a forward marching of mankind toward a more effectively organized society, and there has been evidence that within this universe the spirit of creative evolution does produce the changes that are necessary. What is the Canadian contribution to this evolution? I would mention, as the hon. member for Fundy-Royal has done, the Canadian contribution to peacekeeping and to the available permanent peacekeeping forces. Canada is in a unique position to contribute in this way. We have the expertise, we are not a great power, we have the experience and we also have a degree of security from immediate aggression because of our position on the North American continent which frees us for a major effort in peacekeeping. I hope this fact will never be forgotten or disregarded because of the difficulties inevitably inherent in the development of new international institutions.

The task of the UN has only begun after 25 years. I express my gratitude to the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand) who produced this motion and set these goals before us. It is easy for us to become immersed in the regional and local problems that now face us. Part of our task, however, is to look at the picture as a whole. I therefore thank the hon. member for putting these goals before us. We must not forget them.

I join the hon. member for Fundy-Royal in stressing the importance of the universality of the UN, to which reference was made by the Secretary General of the UN when he brought forward the propositions embodied in this motion and said that these things should be done now. Canada, having recognized the Peoples' Republic of China, should now urge not only the admission of China to the UN but the admission of other nations which through wars and difficulties in the past have been excluded from this world body. I hope Canada will take a clear initiative in that field.

I noticed that in the speech made by the Secretary General of the UN, U Thant, he said that to strengthen the United Nations should not be just a desire, but an obsession. I hope that many Canadians will take his words seriously and that the strength of the UN will be the centre of their policy in international affairs, one of their main purposes. That is one reason I was disappointed in the policy statement of the government respecting international affairs, namely, that it seemed to me to overlook the centrality of the development of the world community through a strengthened UN.

• (4:40 p.m.)

Mr. Speaker, this resolution has so far been supported by spokesmen for three parties—I cannot speak for the other party in the House—who have expressed their approval of the resolution which I believe embodies suggestions put forward recently by the Secretary General of the United Nations. I wonder why, instead of the resolution being talked out—which would seem to be the

usual procedure during this hour—we could not pass it. I think this would be a healthy and useful exercise and one that would show the direction in which all members of this House, regardless of party, wish our Parliament to move.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Maurice Foster (Algoma): Mr. Speaker, the motion before the House this afternoon, proposed by the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand) is most fitting because it deals with the United Nations and initiatives which the government should take in reforming that body. This motion is being debated a few days after the UN completed a quarter-century of existence. With reference to the twenty-fifth anniversary of the United Nations, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said:

> Over the past 25 years disillusionment and failure has not been a stranger to the UN but there has been as well substantial progress in efforts to achieve peace, justice and progress—the theme chosen by the United Nations for its anniversary year.

He also paid tribute to Canada's efforts in these words:

> I am proud of the efforts that Canada and Canadians have made in support of the United Nations in the past. We have made a substantial contribution to its peace-keeping efforts, the gains that it has made in economic and social progress, its achievements in the field of human rights.

The twenty-fifth anniversary of the UN, which was celebrated on October 24, was more of a time of stock-taking than a time for celebration. The motion of the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce suggests many areas of responsibility which could well be reformed. I believe that many of these reforms are necessary and desirable. However, when we consider the problems of governing within a single nation, we realize the difficulties of bringing together a world assembly like the UN. The wonder is that it functions at all when one considers the immense complexity of national positions represented there and the diverse objectives of its members. In many ways it has been a success. Consider its membership. Now, 126 countries are members, whereas in 1945 there were only 51 countries. This is a move toward one of the objectives of the hon. member's motion, that is, universality of membership.

In its role as peacekeeper, the UN has provided a diplomatic meeting ground for conflicting nations where their disputes can be aired under the bright lights of world public opinion. This is probably the greatest value of the UN in world peacekeeping. Because of the development of instant world communication and international interdependence, every country now is concerned with its international image. The UN provides, also, a forum for other countries to use their prestige and influence on countries in conflict with one another to "cool" the situation. Usually this involves the two super powers, the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R., using their influence on the conflicting nations. However, sometimes it works in reverse when the superpowers are in conflict. Then their positions in a dispute are held up to the scrutiny of world public opinion.

It is important to note how much emphasis the two superpowers place upon gaining world support for their actions. If this were the only value of the UN, to provide a world forum to air conflicts between nations, it would be well worth while. Consider some of the conflicts which have been handled in its 25 years' history. Nearly every one of these confrontations would have had far worse results without the influence of the United Nations.

First, the Berlin blockade was settled at an earlier stage than would have otherwise been possible. Second, the six-day war, in 1967, in the Middle East was stopped much sooner by a public airing at the UN. Third, it has hastened the transition to independence of virtually the whole of Africa south of the Sahara, and much of Asia as well. In other countries the break-up of colonial empires has resulted in far more bloodshed than in these. Only in the Congo did the transition to independence threaten to trigger great power conflict. But if there have been many successes, there has also been some decline in the authority and influence of the UN. President Nixon appointed a commission last July to propose recommendations on the course of future United States policy toward the world body. The report said that the UN is becoming increasingly incapable of dealing with issues facing the world.

The report went on to say that the failure of member nations to make the world body the paramount means for maintaining international peace and security, and its misuses into becoming an ineffective debating society and a propaganda platform, has caused the United Nations to fall short of the world's hopes. The governments of too many nations have either given lip service to the principles of the UN charter or have interpreted them for petty advantages and narrow self-interest.

The report indicated four major areas in which imaginative initiatives could revitalize the world body and make US participation more effective. First, strengthening of the UN peacekeeping machinery and improving conciliation procedures, which is particularly important in light of the Middle East situation. Second, reforming UN institutions to reduce inefficient procedures of the General Assembly, eliminate red tape, apply the rule of relevance to debate and improve the personnel selection for the secretariat. Third, developing international policies, regulations and machinery to make the United Nations capable of dealing with the worldwide effects of environmental changes brought about by accelerated scientific and technological developments. Fourth, strengthening international law and co-operation to deal with drug abuse and the hijacking of commercial airplanes, which the report described as the two current, critical problems of modern society.

Needless to say, agreement on reform of the machinery for settling international disputes will be slow and difficult, but should be pursued just the same. The right of veto by one of the permanent members of the Security Council has immobilized this body. I think this should be changed so that a single member cannot frustrate the will of the minority of representatives on the Security

Council. The overriding influence of the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. creates a balancing-act situation in many disputes, with the free world countries lining up against the Communist world countries.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has recommended universality of membership in the United Nations. Doubtless, this would include Communist China which has 700 million people. There can be little doubt that China will eventually be seated in the United Nations. Canada has extended diplomatic recognition this year, the second country to do so in the western hemisphere. We should also support her membership in the world body. Then this government, which represents such a large percentage of the world's population, will be subject to the same responsibility as other members of the United Nations. There can be little doubt that this will further complicate the negotiation of international disputes at the United Nations. However, the Chinese influence will be direct, with the other superpowers, and will not be felt through intermediaries and through other voices outside the United Nations.

• (4:50 p.m.)

Another area of increasing concern is the method of financing the United Nations. The Secretary General, U Thant, said recently:

> The UN's financial situation is worse than ever before and steadily deteriorating. Certain governments continue to withhold contributions . . . The amounts owed by slow payers continue to rise. At certain times this year the United Nations did not have enough funds to meet salary payments earned by the UN staff.

It is interesting to note in passing that the world's military budget last year came to $185 billion, foreign aid throughout the world came to $8 billion, while the budget for the UN and its agencies came to less than $200 million.

I have mentioned some of the problem areas of the UN, but there are many activities which have been notable successes, and new areas of responsibility in which I think this organization can give leadership. The hon. member's motion has outlined these. The social and economic programs of the UN have been the most successful in the past. Millions of people in underdeveloped countries have benefited from these programs. Perhaps if these programs are expanded on and developed, and the disparity between the rich and the poor nations of the world decreased, there will be fewer international disputes to be settled in the Security Council.

I am optimistic that the UN can be a positive force in influencing international control over pollution and the preservation of the environment. In 1972 a conference is to be held in Sweden to deal with this very problem. Other problems of the future, like airplane hijacking, control of development of the seabed and world population control are especially appropriate for the UN to deal with because their effects cut across national boundaries. The history of this organization leads me to believe that the UN can do a great deal in coping with these problems.

My feelings about the future of the UN, Mr. Speaker, are similar to those in a statement made by the former Prime Minister and Member of Parliament for Algoma East, Right Hon. Lester B. Pearson, who recently said:

> The United Nations has now survived 25 years of international tension and cold war. With all its faults, but also with its achievements, it remains the indispensible international institution.

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, this is so vast a subject and we have so little time, but I of course agree that we must look toward a more effective instrument when we look upon the United Nations. The motion as set out might be realistically described as something of an overexpectation, and yet we do tend to grasp beyond our reach; and that is the inner part of wisdom down through the ages.

Speaking on the question of universality, the countries which are out are those which are divided, and their problems are not those that seem to be susceptible to United Nations resolution. Would we gain much if it should eventuate that the People's Republic of China should become a member of the United Nations, and at the same time the Nationalist Chinese be sent out into limbo? This would not be a contribution toward universality, and I hope something is being done by the Canadian government—which has been so active in working toward diplomatic recognition of Red China, something with which I do not disagree—to find a way whereby the Taiwan regime may find its place in the diplomatic community, and certainly in the United Nations. This is my comment on the question of universality.

With reference to peace forces, it is terribly important as the years go by, for instance in Cyprus, that we move away from the military or paramilitary aspect of the question and turn more to the realm of mediation and conciliation. I wonder, too, with respect to some of the organizations already activated—for example, the UNWRA meetings year after year after year, voting sums of money to the Palestine refugees but year after year after year the problem becoming more acute and painful—whether new approaches should be taken. As well as thinking of activating new areas, we must energize ourselves more in those areas which are already technically active.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marcel Prud'homme (Saint-Denis): Mr. Speaker, all hon. members naturally have the right to express opinions on this important notice of motion put forward but the hon. member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce (Mr. Allmand).

The hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) took 12 to 14 minutes to express his views. However, at the end of his speech, he said that all other members should remain silent and approve the member's resolution.

As for any initiative to be taken regarding the United Nations, it is important to remember how fragile the organization is.

I do not share the pessimism of such as believe the United Nations headquarters to be merely a place where speeches are made. The United Nations have a role, if only that of giving politicians of the world an opportunity to meet on neutral ground. When undertaking initiatives, one should always make sure they have a chance of succeeding. If they are not welcome, they will not achieve universality, as the hon. member for Hillsborough (Mr. Macquarrie) mentioned. In fact, unwelcome initiatives could result in withdrawal of some member of the organization, which would almost immediately lead to an uninterrupted chain of withdrawals. This would undermine the very basis of the United Nations principle of universality.

For initiatives to be taken, they must be welcomed. This reminds me of a latin dictum: *si vis mittere, mitte grantum,* which could be translated into English as follows: If you dispatch messengers, be sure they are acceptable.

[*English*]

If you ever send ambassadors, make sure they will be acceptable; that they will be welcome.

[*Translation*]

I suggest initiatives of that kind—

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hour provided for the consideration of private members' business has now expired.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. Baldwin: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, no cabinet minister being in the House I have to address my question to the two parliamentary secretaries who together might make up one cabinet minister. It was originally contemplated that we might be progressing in the expectation that the government would have facilitated the passage of the bill we were debating earlier today.

This not having happened, there is now some doubt in our minds about what we will be doing on Monday. As a result of discussion which the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and I had with the Minister of Justice, we in this party are assuming, unless there is notice to the contrary, that we will continue the debate on the bill which was before us prior to private members' hour. I thought I should make that as a public statement on behalf of our party.

There is no minister present. I understand the cabinet is sitting. One of the parliamentary secretaries might like to make a statement on the development which took place earlier. Barring that, I limit my comments to saying that we expect to be debating Bill C-181 next Monday.

Mr. Mahoney: Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member's assumption is correct and that is what is intended.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That is our understanding, too.

At five o'clock the House adjourned, without question put, pursuant to Standing Order.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Monday, November 9, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

WATER RESOURCES

ASSISTANCE FOR CONSERVATION PROJECTS—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. W. M. Howe (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43 I ask the unanimous consent of the House to propose a motion in the following case of urgent and pressing necessity. I refer to the situation that has developed in western Ontario, particularly along the Grand River, since the repeal of the Canada Water Conservation Assistance Act which provided federal and provincial assistance to municipalities wishing to carry out conservation projects so necessary for pollution control, projects which would assist municipalities faced with mounting unemployment and welfare costs.

Therefore, with consent, I intend to move that the Canada Water Act, 1970 be amended by the addition of a formula for assistance to municipalities similar to that incorporated in the Canada Water Conservation Assistance Act and that the House refer this matter to the Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works for consideration and report.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the motion proposed by the hon. member for Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo. The motion may be put to the House only if there is unanimous agreement.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Under Standing Order 43 there must be unanimity. Is there unanimity?

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: I regret to advise the hon. member that the motion cannot be put at this time.

* * *

EXPORT DEVELOPMENT ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING AUTHORIZED CAPITAL, BORROWING, LIABILITY UNDER CONTRACTS OF INSURANCE

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-184, to amend the Export Development Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

• (2:10 p.m.)

CROP INSURANCE ACT

AMENDMENT TO INCREASE EXTENDED COVERAGE

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-185, to amend the Crop Insurance Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

PROVISION FOR CAPITAL EXPENDITURES, GUARANTEEING OF SECURITIES

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (for the Minister of Finance) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-186, to authorize the provision of moneys to meet certain capital expenditures of the Canadian National Railways System and Air Canada for the period from the 1st day of January, 1970, to the 30th day of June, 1971, and to authorize the guarantee by Her Majesty of certain securities to be issued by the Canadian National Railway Company and certain debentures to be issued by Air Canada.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

YUKON MINERALS ACT

ADMINISTRATION, ACQUISITION AND RECORDING OF CLAIMS, ETC.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (for the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-187, respecting minerals in the Yukon Territory.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

MERCHANT SEAMEN COMPENSATION ACT

AMENDMENTS RESPECTING PROTECTION, COMPENSATION, PAYMENTS TO WIDOWS AND DEPENDENT CHILDREN

On the order: Introduction of Bills:

November 5, 1970—The Minister of Transport—Bill intituled: "An Act to amend the Merchant Seamen Compensation Act and to amend an Act to amend the Merchant Seamen Compensation Act".

Questions

Mr. MacEachen: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, this bill ought to stand in the name of the Minister of Labour rather than the Minister of Transport. I ask that that correction be made.

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-188, to amend the Merchant Seamen Compensation Act and to amend an Act to amend the Merchant Seamen Compensation Act.

Motion agreed to, bill read the first time and ordered to be printed.

* * *

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS

REFERENCE TO STANDING COMMITTEE OF REPORT, "PARTICIPATION BY TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIERS IN PUBLIC DATA-PROCESSING"

On the order: Government notices of motions:

November 6, 1970—The President of the Privy Council: That the report entitled "Participation by Telecommunications Carriers in Public Data-Processing", laid before the House June 15, 1970, be referred to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to section 2 of Standing Order 21 this government notice of motion stands transferred to and ordered for consideration under government orders at the next sitting of the House.

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

AIR CANADA—NUMBER OF PLANES ON ORDER

Question No. 15—**Mr. Skoberg:**

What airplanes does Air Canada now have on order or on a reserve basis?

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport):

Type	Number on order	Number of options	Number of line positions	Delivery dates
Boeing 747	3			Spring 1971
Lockheed L-1011	6			Spring 1972
"	3			Spring 1973
"	1			Spring 1974
"		5		Spring 1974
"		4		Spring 1975
Concorde SST			4	Approx. 1976
Boeing 2707 SST			6	Approx. Spring 1980

[Mr. MacEachen.]

*STE. SCHOLASTIQUE AIRPORT—PROPOSED ANNUAL EXPENDITURE

Question No. 16—**Mr. Kaplan:**

Has the government estimated its proposed expenditure on the Ste-Scholastique airport on an annual basis and, if so, what is the proposed expenditure for each year from and including 1970 for which such projection has been made?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the latest forecast of net expenditures, completed in the spring of this year for inclusion in the five-year plan for Ste-Scholastique, is as follows: 1970, $54,681,000; 1971, $89,912,000; 1972, $97,022,000; 1973, $79,815,000; 1974, $10,813,000; 1975, $12,406,000.

[*English*]

COST OF LIFT PROGRAM

Question No. 31—**Mr. Mather:**

What, in dollars, to date has been the cost of the Lift program?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): As at October 15, 1970, $27,878,298.51.

RICHARD MORANDINI

Question No. 34—**Mr. Paproski:**

1. Is Richard Morandini a Canadian citizen?

2. Is the government investigating the disappearance in Italy of the said Richard Morandini of Toronto?

3. Was he seized or compelled by the Italian military authorities to undergo military callup and, if so, has the Canadian Government launched a protest in strong terms to the Italian Government protesting this treatment of a citizen of a NATO ally?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Department of the Secretary of State and the Department of the Secretary of State for External Affairs as follows: 1. There is no record of one Richard Morandini having applied for citizenship or having applied for a certificate to show that he is a Canadian.

2. No.

3. The check which has been made of Citizenship, Passport and Immigration records has disclosed no record of anyone named Richard Morandini and the Canadian Embassy in Rome, which has received no approach either directly from him or on his behalf, has no knowledge of him.

INDIAN CONSULTATION AND NEGOTIATION SECTION PERSONNEL

Question No. 85—**Mr. Howard (Skeena):**

Who are the staff members of the Indian Consultation and Negotiation Section of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development and, in each case, what is their respective annual salary as of October 1, 1970?

Hon. Jean Chrétien (Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): The list below indicates the

names and salary range of those officers who are engaged full time, in the Negotiation and Consultation Group: J. W. Churchman, $22,000-$27,000; C. I. Fairholm, $20,000-$25,000; L. L. Brown, $19,100-$21,700; G. E. Bell, $13,403-$15,229.

In addition, the following employees of the Indian-Eskimo Bureau provide assistance to the Negotiation and Consultation Group, as well as to other Branches and Divisions of the Department: Mrs. M. Blanchard, $15,565; W. A. Gryba, $15,229; C. F. Kerr, $15,229; H. G. Sprott, $14,304; A. T. Fuller, $13,731; W J. Fox, $14,304; L. G. Smith, $13,403; J. G. Couture, $11,638.

An additional 20 persons are on support staff.

HOME MAIL DELIVERY SERVICE

Question No. 93—**Mr. Mather:**

1. Up to October 1, 1970, which Canadian communities presently have the population to qualify for home mail delivery, but are not receiving such a federal service?

2. What are the reasons for this, and when is it expected that the above communities will be given home mail delivery?

Hon. Jean-Pierre Côté (Minister without Portfolio): For the Post Office 1. Amherstburg, Ont.; Arnprior, Ont.; Bridgewater, N.S.; Castlegar, B.C.; Chatham, N.B.; Coaticook, P.Q.; Courtenay, B.C.; Delhi, Ont.; Fergus, Ont.; Gander, Nfld.; Hanover, Ont.; Hespeler, Ont.; Lac Mégantic, P.Q.; Mont Laurier, P.Q.; Perth, Ont.; Sherwood Park, Alta.; Sidney, B.C.; Terrebonne, P.Q.; Whitehorse, Y.T.; Windsor, P.Q.

2. The establishment of letter carrier service at the above centres would increase expenditures by approximately $1,050,000. per annum on a continuing basis. Because of this, the introduction of letter carrier delivery service has been deferred as a result of the Government's economy programme which became effective on the 1st March 1968. The inauguration of letter carrier services in the aforementioned communities is dependent on the relaxation of the existing economy measures.

PURCHASE OF CF-5 AIRCRAFT

Question No. 104—**Mr. Mazankowski:**

1. When was the decision made by the Department of National Defence to purchase the CF-5?

2. Was this decision unanimous among the Chiefs of Staff?

3. Who, if any, were the dissenters?

4. Was the decision based on the actual requirements and needs of the forces at that time and in the future?

5. Was a thorough study made, prior to the commitment, of such a requirement by the forces and, if not, for what reason?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): 1. The decision to purchase the CF-5 aircraft was announced by the then Minister of National Defence and the then Associate Minister of National Defence on July 15, 1965.

2 and 3. See *Hansard* of February 28, 1966, page 1845.

4. Yes.

5. Yes.

23226—63

HALIFAX INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT—INSTALLATION OF AIR CONDITIONING SYSTEM

Question No. 131—**Mr. Forrestall:**

Will the government proceed this year with plans to install an "Air Conditioning" system to (a) alleviate the, at times, extreme heat conditions at the Halifax International Airport (b) ensure humane conditions for both employees and users?

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): The Ministry has no plans to install additional air conditioning equipment at Halifax. The policy of the Ministry has been to install air conditioning where it can be economically justified and there is a continuous comfort need. This is generally in areas where exterior humidity index equals or exceeds 75° for 3 per cent of the time during the summer season, where there is high people occupancy or operational equipment demands mechanical cooling. These conditions do not exist at Halifax to justify any large installation.

EDMONTON INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Question No. 144—**Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West):**

1. Is it proposed to expand the facilities of the Edmonton International Airport to prepare it for jumbo jets and supersonic aircraft and, if so, what is the nature of these proposals?

2. What is the estimated cost of such modifications and how are these divided?

3. When is it proposed to commence such modifications and what is the estimated time of completion?

4. Is any intermediate purpose, such as training air and ground crews, to be made of such facilities before the introduction of jumbo jets and supersonic aircraft in Canada's domestic air service, by whom and under what conditions?

Mr. Gérard Duquet (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport): 1. Yes. It is proposed to expand the Air Terminal Building by the addition of a finger with the capability to accommodate B747 and L1011 (Jumbo) type aircraft.

2. Estimated cost is $1,266,000. It is planned to make expenditures of $400,000 in 1972/73; $400,000 in 1973/74 and $466,000 in 1974/75.

3. It is planned to start construction early summer of 1972 with a projected completion date of mid 1975.

4. Air Canada has tentatively indicated to the Ministry their intention to use Edmonton International Airport for flight crew training on the Boeing 747 aircraft during the period previous to placing this aircraft in commercial service early in 1971.

Due to the uncertainty of the supersonic aircraft entering commercial service, the Ministry has not any active programs specifically tailored to its individual needs at the present time for Edmonton International Airport.

INFORMATION CANADA CONFERENCE

Question No. 150—**Mr. Dinsdale:**

1. Did the Director of Information-Canada call a conference of top government information officers for October 4-7?

2. Was this conference called to coincide with the Opening of Parliament?

Questions

3. (a) Where was the conference held (b) who authorized it (c) was it held in Ottawa and, if not, for what reason?

4. What was the total cost of the conference?

5. How many people were involved?

6. What was the purpose of the conference?

Hon. Robert Stanbury (Minister without Portfolio): 1. Yes.

2. No.

3. (a) The Conference was held at the Gray Rocks Inn, Saint-Jovite, Quebec; (b) The Director General of Information Canada; (c) No. As is the practice of other government departments and much of industry, the conference was held outside the city in order that delegates could work efficiently, day and evening, without official or personal interruption.

4. The total cost of the conference may be split into two parts: (1) Common conference costs paid by Information Canada such as conference room rental, sound systems, coffee, copying services, etc., $740.75; (2) Room and board charged to each individual at $23.50 per night.

5. Fifty-two.

6. The aim of the conference was to bring together information heads of all departments and agencies to outline existing and proposed programs of Information Canada, and to obtain their views and proposals on these programs. Common problems, most of which were outlined in the report of the Task Force on Government Information, were discussed with a view to resolving them through coordinated effort.

STEPHENVILLE, NEWFOUNDLAND—NEW FEDERAL BUILDING

Question No. 155—**Mr. Marshall:**

1. What progress is being made in providing a new federal building at Stephenville, Newfoundland?

2. Is a site acquired and, if so, where is it?

3. What is the expected date for construction of such building?

4. What departments will be housed in the federal building?

5. Will a new post office be located in it?

Hon. Arthur Laing (Minister of Public Works): 1. Planning is under way.

2. No.

3. It is anticipated that construction may start during 1971-72, if funds are voted by Parliament.

4. Departments of Manpower and Immigration, National Revenue (Customs and Excise) and the Post Office Department.

5. See answer to Part 4.

INFORMATION CANADA CONFERENCE

Question No. 174—**Mr. Mather:**

1. Which persons were invited to attend the conference sponsored by Information Canada at Gray Rocks Inn, St. Jovite, Quebec, October 4 to 7?

2. Which persons attended this conference?

3. What was the purpose of this out-of-town conference?

[Mr. Dinsdale.]

4. Was this conference open to the press and, if not, for what reason?

5. What is the estimated cost of this conference by (a) Information Canada (b) departments and agencies?

Hon. Robert Stanbury (Minister without Portfolio): 1. All Directors of Information of federal government departments and agencies.

2. All those invited with six exceptions: Canadian Transport Commission; National Capital Commission; National Health and Welfare; National Revenue (Customs and Excise); Defence Research Board; National Arts Centre.

3. The aim of the conference was to bring together information heads of all departments and agencies to outline existing and proposed programs of Information Canada, and to obtain their views and proposals on these programs. Common problems, most of which were outlined in the report of the Task Force on Government Information, were discussed with a view to resolving them through coordinated effort.

4. No. It is not the practice for the press to attend departmental and interdepartmental meetings in the Public Service.

5. The total cost of the conference may be split into two parts: (1) Common conference costs paid by Information Canada such as conference room rental, sound systems, coffee, copying services, etc., $740.75. (2) Room and board charged to each individual at $23.50 per night.

USE OF DIRECT DIALING FOR POLICY STATEMENTS

Question No. 181—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. How many radio stations have made use of the offer of direct dialing for policy statements made by the Minister of Communications in speeches or press conferences as offered to news editors in a letter from Frank Howard, Director, Information Service, Department of Communications?

2. For each month since October 1970, how many recorded statements have been telephoned to the radio stations of Canada?

3. Has this service been extended to television stations?

4. Have other Ministers made use of this service and, if so, which Ministers?

5. What is the estimated cost of this service?

Hon. Eric W. Kierans (Minister of Communications): 1. Since the recorded statement is played back automatically by a device called a code-a-phone and since there is no monitoring of radio stations in connection with this service it is impossible to say how many radio stations have made use of this device; however a survey conducted in December, 1969 showed that some five out of 42 radio stations had used the service.

2. There have been five recorded statements in French and English since October 1969. Three have been prepared in November 1969, one in January 1970 and one in June 1970.

3. This service has no video equivalent in our department.

4. No.

5. The estimated cost of this service is $40 per month.

LOANS UNDER PIDA PROGRAM

Question No. 193—**Mr. Saltsman:**

1. What firms have applied for loans under the Pharmaceutical Industry Development Assistance Program (PIDA) administered by the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, up to September 30, 1970?

2. What firms have received loans under PIDA, and what is the amount of these loans?

3. What firms have been refused loans under PIDA, and what reasons were given for these refusals?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): 1, 2 and 3. The names of specific firms and the amount of assistance applied for cannot be released in order that the commercial confidentiality assured each applicant is preserved. The following information can be made available: As of September 30, 1970, two loans had been approved for a total of $296,000 and 22 applications or preliminary inquiries had been received of which five have been declared ineligible under the regulations.

The reasons for ineligibility were as follows: One applicant did not manufacture or plan to manufacture prescription drugs in dosage form. One applicant obtained the required financing from another federal government agency. One applicant could obtain all needed funds from its parent organization and two applicants proposed plans beyond their financial capabilities.

PARTICIPATION OF PROVINCES UNDER SALTFISH ACT

Question No. 222—**Mr. Comeau:**

Do all the provinces affected by the Salt Water Fish Marketing Board participate in the Salt Water Fish Marketing Board and, if not, which ones do not and what are the reasons given by the provinces for not joining?

Mr. Eymard Corbin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): No. Draft agreements with the provinces of Nova Scotia and Quebec are under consideration by the governments of those provinces. Consideration of an agreement has been deferred for the present by the governments of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island on the ground that production of cured fish within their jurisdictions is relatively insignificant.

BUREAU OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Question No. 225—**Mr. McGrath:**

1. How many consumers written inquiries are received daily by the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs?

2. Where and how many information officers does the Department have to handle phone inquiries?

3. Is this staff multi-lingual?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): 1. The Bureau of Consumer Affairs currently receives 135 written complaints and inquiries daily through its Box 99 service and its regional offices.

2. The Bureau has ten officers in Ottawa whose principal duties concern the handling of complaints and inquiries, including telephone inquiries. An additional five officers are attached to the Bureau's regional offices in Halifax, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg and Vancouver to handle telephone and other inquiries.

3. Six of these officers are bilingual.

DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES AND FORESTRY—MAN-HOURS SAVED BY UTILIZATION OF COMPUTERS

Question No. 258—**Mr. Robinson:**

How many man-hours have been saved as a result of the utilization of computers by the Department of Fisheries and Forestry during each year since computers have been used?

Mr. Eymard Corbin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): No direct estimate is possible of man-hours saved as a result of use of computers, because a large proportion of the worthwhile analysis of data done by computers in the Department of Fisheries and Forestry could not have been undertaken by manual or desk calculator methods if the computer had not been available.

*SASKATCHEWAN—SECOND NATIONAL PARK

Question No. 263—**Mr. Southam:**

1. Has the government reached an agreement with the Province of Saskatchewan for a second national park in that Province and (*a*) if not, what are the reasons (*b*) if so, when will the development of the park commence?

2. Where will the park be located?

Mr. Judd Buchanan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, the answer is as follows: 1. No formal agreement has been signed yet. (a) It is believed that all major difficulties have been resolved, which means that the way should now be clear to reach formal agreement. (b) Development of the park might commence 1½ to 2 years following signing of an agreement provided that lands have been transferred to the Canadian Government by then and provided the necessary funds are available.

2. The proposed park would be located in the Val Marie-Killdeer area of southwest Saskatchewan.

LIFT PROGRAM

Question No. 264—**Mr. Southam:**

1. To date, what sum has been paid out to western farmers under the Lift Program?

2. How many farmers have received payments to date?

3. What have been the administration costs to date under the PFAA office in Regina and branch offices over the Prairie Provinces?

4. What was the cost of the aerial survey as a separate item?

5. Who were the aerial survey firms engaged and how many planes were used in each case?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): 1. $27,653.006.

2. 94,525.

3. $1,055,249.86.

4. $270,000.

5. Spartan Air Services, three planes; Lockwood Survey Corporation—one plane; Northwest Surveys, two planes; Range Survey Co., 1 plane.

USE OF COMPUTERS BY TREASURY BOARD

Question No. 267—**Mr. Robinson:**

As a result of the use of computers by the Treasury Board how many employees have been (a) laid off (b) hired?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): (a) None; (b) eight.

TREASURY BOARD—MAN-HOURS SAVED BY UTILIZATION OF COMPUTERS

Question No. 268—**Mr. Robinson:**

How many man-hours have been saved as a result of the utilization of computers by the Treasury Board during each year since computers have been used?

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): The Treasury Board Department does not employ computers on the kinds of tasks in which the saving of man-hours would be involved.

NUMBER OF "SEPARATISTS" EMPLOYED IN FEDERAL PUBLIC SERVICE

Question No. 343—**Mr. Robinson:**

How many "separatists" are there employed in the federal public service?

Mr. J. A. Jerome (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): The information which is required to answer this question is not available to the government.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS

PAYMENTS UNDER CANADA ASSISTANCE PLAN

Question No. 38—**Mr. Orlikow:**

1. How much money was paid to each province under the provisions of the Canada Assistance Plan in each of the past three years for the period from January 1 to September 31?

2. How many people in each province were receiving assistance under the provisions of the Canada Assistance Plan in March of 1968, 1969 and 1970?

Return tabled.

ADULT TRAINING PROGRAM BUDGET

Question No. 158—**Mr. Hales:**

1. What amount was budgeted for the Adult Training Program in Ontario by the federal government for each year since the start of the Program?

[Mr. Olson.]

2. What courses were covered in these budgets?

3. Have any courses been discontinued and, if so, for what reasons?

4. What amount is left or overspent of the budget for each of the courses in this present year and, if budgets have been spent, what plans does the department have in mind?

Return tabled.

NORTHERN COMMUNICATIONS CONFERENCE, YELLOWKNIFE, NWT, SEPTEMBER, 1970

Question No. 160—**Mr. Macquarrie:**

1. What department or departments sponsored the northern communications conference held at Yellowknife NWT in September, 1970?

2. What other groups or organizations joined in sponsoring and/or arranging the conference?

3. What was the purpose of the conference?

4. What are the names of the people invited?

5. On what basis were the invitations extended?

6. How many of those participating are residents of the Northwest Territories or Yukon Territory?

Return tabled.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

WAGE DEMANDS—SUGGESTED MEETING OF PRIME MINISTER AND LABOUR LEADERS

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): I wish to address a question to the Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. As the heads of the principal business organizations have stated recently that their members will not continue price restraints past January 1 unless organized labour agrees to limit wage demands, and as the leaders of organized labour have recently restated their refusal to do so, does the Prime Minister intend to meet with the labour leaders to discuss with them the need for their co-operation if price restraints are to be continued next year?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I do not think I would completely agree with the hon. member's premise. I do not believe business leaders have turned down in such a categorical way as he implies the suggestion that some kind of moderation should be continued. As to the question itself, I can say there have been meetings at various levels between officials of the federal government and labour leaders, and there will be more.

Mr. Hees: As the reports which the public of Canada receive concern meetings that are being and will be held between the chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission and the heads of the business organizations, not with the leaders of organized labour, would the Prime Minister not put the good of the economy ahead of his fear of a rebuff by these labour leaders and meet with

them, because it is vitally important that this matter be resolved—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The hon. member's supplementary amounts to debate, I would think.

APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN OF PRICES AND INCOMES COMMISSION

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Could the Prime Minister tell the House whether at this critical time he can announce the replacement for Mr. Gérin-Lajoie as vice-chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission, and not leave the commission half-staffed or continue this game of musical chairs?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I am glad to see support from the opposition side for the important work of the PIC. The question of a suitable replacement for Mr. Paul Gérin-Lajoie is being discussed now with Mr. Young, the chairman of the commission.

EFFECT OF POSSIBLE RAILWAY STRIKE—SUGGESTED MEETING WITH UNION LEADERS

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Since it would now appear there is likely to be a breakdown of negotiations between railway management and railway workers which could lead to a serious strike and a serious dislocation of the markets for grain and other commodities important to western Canada and elsewhere, would the Prime Minister consider meeting the leaders of the unions in an attempt to avoid an economic setback of this kind?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Whenever possible I have the federal Minister of Labour engage in those meetings; he is generally more effective than I could possibly hope to be.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps I will allow the hon. member to ask a supplementary, although I have some doubt whether it is supplementary to the question asked originally by the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings. It seems that from supplementary to supplementary we get away from the original question which was raised. In any event, perhaps the hon. member should ask his supplementary now.

Mr. Woolliams: Thank you for your graciousness, Mr. Speaker. May I now put this question to the Minister of Labour; no doubt he was listening very intently to the question that I put to the Prime Minister. Has the minister met with the union leaders in an endeavour to prevent a complete economic collapse, as far as western Canada is concerned, which would result if there is a railway strike which hinders the movement of grain?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I think it is time to remind the House, particularly the hon. member who has a legitimate concern about movement of grain, that it was only a few months ago that the unions in British Columbia showed their responsibility, at a time when management would not, in regard to moving grain for the western farmer despite the fact that at that particular time they were quite legitimately on strike. I imagine that the trade union movement in the railways will be just as responsive as any union in any other sector to the problems that are facing Canada, and I have no intention of interfering with the free, collective bargaining process at this moment.

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Central Nova): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister of Labour advise whether some of the special mediators who he announced some time ago had been appointed are now working on this very important problem?

Mr. Mackasey: Yes, Mr. Speaker. They have been working with both railways and unions for some considerable time in particular areas that could affect the ultimate outcome of the collective bargaining which begins at the end of this coming year.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

WAR MEASURES ACT—ARRESTS, RELEASES, CONTINUING DETENTIONS AND CHARGES

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Justice whether he can bring us up to date as to any new arrests or releases since last Thursday, which I think was the day of the last report to the House. If the minister does not have a breakdown since Thursday, could he inform us of the total number of arrests, persons released and charges, as well as those still kept in custody without charge, under the regulations pursuant to the War Measures Act?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the last figures I have from the office of the Attorney General of Quebec as at 11.30 this morning are to this effect: 439 were arrested; 378 have been released; one was rearrested, and there are 62 detained. Of these 62, 40 have been charged with 63 offences, of which 19 are offences under the Criminal Code and 44 are offences under the regulations issued pursuant to the proclamation of the War Measures Act.

QUEBEC—SUGGESTED USE OF IDENTITY CARDS

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question in the same general area to the Prime Minister. Has the Attorney General of Quebec been in touch with the government or any other federal minister or department regarding a study by the Department of the Attorney General of Quebec concerning the introduction of identity cards for residents of that province? Could the Prime Minister also inform the House whether the federal government is studying the constitutional implications of the introduction of such a system for the residents of only one province in the country?

Inquiries of the Ministry

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to answer the question directed to the Prime Minister, I have not to date been made aware by the provincial authorities of the details of any scheme of identification cards that they may have under consideration. In any event, the federal government has not given any consideration to a scheme of registration for the purposes of identification. While the legal requirement that citizens be in possession of clear means of identification through identification cards may facilitate investigations by law enforcement authorities, it is my view that we must bear in mind that consideration of any measure of that kind must be tempered by other factors. We are, of course, looking into the constitutional implications of that suggestion.

[*Later:*]

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice a question supplementary to the one put by the hon. member for York South regarding the introduction of identity cards as advocated by the Quebec Minister of Justice.

When he examines the constitutionality of this matter, could he also consider the possibility of using a card which would have the same value throughout Canada?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I cannot add anything to the answer I gave earlier to the hon. member for York South.

[*English*]

WAR MEASURES ACT—TIME SPENT IN CUBA, ALGERIA OR JORDAN BY THOSE CHARGED

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice whether any of the people arrested and charged under the War Measures Act have spent any period of time in Cuba, Algeria or Jordan during the last two years?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): I cannot pretend I can answer that question, Mr. Speaker.

WAR MEASURES ACT—DYNAMITE, ARMS AND AMMUNITION RECOVERED

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice a supplementary question. Has he any information as to the amount of dynamite, other explosives, ammunition and weaponry seized as a result of the raids under the War Measures Act following the proclamation of that Act? Further, could he give us some precise details about the quantities and whether they bear any relationship to the knowledge that the government has of the quantity and type of such material stolen over the last while?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to give those precise details, nor have I really assessed the problem of whether I should.

[Mr. Lewis.]

STATEMENT BY MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE ON PROCLAMATION OF WAR MEASURES ACT

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, this supplementary question is directed to the Prime Minister. Can the Prime Minister inform the House whether the Minister of Agriculture was expressing government policy on Thursday night in Manitoba when he said it would have been impossible for the government to produce documentary proof that the proclamation of the War Measures Act was necessary, and that the act was "too severe... unnecessary, under the circumstances..."?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Well, Mr. Speaker, I myself admitted that the Act was too severe the very day I brought it into the House and I explained to the House that very shortly we were going to bring in another Act to replace it. However, under the circumstances even all opposition parties agreed there was a state of terror in Quebec at that time and that it needed exceptional measures which are not in the Criminal Code, and therefore this was the only way we could act with any expediency. I cannot vouch for what the minister said. He can do that for himself, but for that part of it, it is no great news. As I say, that was the government's position from the outset.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Would the Prime Minister address himself to the first part of the question and indicate whether or not the government now believes it is not possible to prove it was necessary to bring in the Measures Act?

Mr. Trudeau: It may be difficult to prove a negative, but it seems to me we now have the admission of all parties sitting opposite, in their very own words, that there was a state of terror in Quebec around the middle of October which needed extraordinary measures. There was some disagreement, I understand, about whether the Act was not too strong an extraordinary measure, but we conceded that from the outset. From the point of view of the need for extraordinary measures the opposition is conceding that even by voting for the new replacement legislation a full two weeks after the worst of the crisis is over. Therefore, retroactively, surely they must admit emergency measures were needed at that time.

AVAILABILITY OF WEAPONS—TIGHTENING OF CONTROL—PASSING OF ORDER IN COUNCIL

Mr. Warren Allmand (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Justice regarding the availability of weapons. Considering the evidence of Mr. Lortie at the coroner's inquest on Saturday that he and his fellow kidnappers were able to go down to Notre Dame Street and obtain several machine guns and/or repeater rifles a few hours before the kidnapping of Mr. Laporte, is the government considering the introduction of further legislation regarding the control of guns, or tightening the administration of the present legislation?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, before I answer that question I would like to review the circumstances in more detail. I do not know whether

it is the law which is at fault or the enforcement or application of the law.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the minister. I am sure he appreciates that last year we passed new section 82(e) of the Criminal Code dealing with restricted weapons, stipulating that they could be restricted by Order in Council. Did the government measure up to its responsibility and pass an Order in Council setting out that machine guns such as were sold to these people are restricted weapons?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): As I said earlier, I would have to take a look at the facts of the situation to see whether it was covered by the type of provision to which the hon. member for Calgary North referred.

WAR MEASURES ACT—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF DETAILED CHARGES

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Justice give consideration to obtaining the detailed charges that have been laid to which he referred and perhaps table them in the House?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): I will give consideration to it, Mr. Speaker, but it is a rather unusual procedure although these are unusual times.

* * *

[*Translation*]

GRAIN

PRESENCE OF RUSTY BEETLE IN WHEAT SHIPMENTS—EFFORTS TO ELIMINATE

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

Has the Wheat Board or the Canadian government received formal complaints from the Soviet Union, China or Poland concerning wheat shipments in which insects have been found? If so, as a result of those claims, by whom will the losses be incurred, the Canadian Wheat Board or the farmers themselves?

[*English*]

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, a number of complaints have been received by the Board of Grain Commissioners not only from the Soviet Union but from other countries respecting what is referred to as rusty mites in wheat shipments, but we are now engaged in a concerted effort in co-operation with the provinces to have this eradicated from the damp wheat that went into storage in the fall of 1968.

Mr. Speaker: Is the right hon. gentleman rising on a supplementary?

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Yes, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that this situation has been known for some time to exist and that Poland, China and Russia, among other countries, have pointed out that this rusty beetle is to be found in the wheat they are purchasing, and in view of the fact that shipments through Vancouver of wheat containing the beetle have been discontinued, would the minister say what action has been taken in the past three weeks and whether an all-out effort is to be made to meet this situation, however costly the undertaking may be and not at the expense of the western wheat farmer?

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, not only will a great deal of concerted effort be made now but, indeed, last February 5 a seminar was held at the Department of Agriculture research station in Winnipeg to look into all aspects of the problem and in March of this year the Board of Grain Commissioners issued a bulletin to all country elevator operators to provide them with information in respect of identification and extermination of these beetles. There are many other publications which have gone out from the Department of Agriculture alerting farmers to the possibility of such a problem arising and giving some information and instructions on how to deal with it.

Mr. Diefenbaker: In view of the fact that action has been continuing since February, and has increased in the last few days as shown by the statement of the chief of the Board of Grain Commissioners, would the minister say that the concerted effort, whatever it may cost, will not be charged back to the western farmers, because it is not their fault that the wheat was not sold?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar on a supplementary.

Mr. Gleave: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether or not the farmers are to get hooked on this.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Perhaps the minister might reply to both questions at the same time. The hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar had already begun.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, in view of these reports of infestation may I ask the minister whether he can assure the House that measures are being taken to increase the inspection of rail cars of grain en route to terminals so that contaminated grain will be spotted before it reaches the terminal elevators?

Mr. Olson: Yes, we are attempting to do that in so far as it is possible to do so.

In reply to the right hon. member for Prince Albert, I should like to say that we intend to do everything we can to co-operate with the farmers but I am sure he knows as well as I that the management of the farmers' operations, with their own granaries on their own farms, bears some responsibility too.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Is the farmer going to get hooked for these expenditures?

Mr. Gleave: Mr. Speaker, could the minister inform us whether the Board of Grain Commissioners has reinstituted the automatic inspection of all shipments of carloads of grain as they go through the Winnipeg yards, which was previously in effect some years ago?

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that every car is inspected as it passes through Winnipeg but I can get the hon. member statistics concerning the number of cars from which we do in fact take samples.

Inquiries of the Ministry

POST OFFICE

ESTABLISHMENT OF CROWN CORPORATION

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. Now that the Post Office Department seems to be in the news again, can he advise whether the government is still considering the conversion of this department into a Crown corporation and, if so, may it be proceeded with during this session?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, when the Minister without Portfolio responsible for the Post Office took over I discussed this question with him. He undertook to study the matter and make a report in due course. I did not encourage him to have legislation ready for this session.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

PUBLISHING INDUSTRY—FOREIGN OWNERSHIP POLICY

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister. In light of fears concerning the Canadian publishing industry and the continuing sales to United States interests, is the government reviewing the situation and does the Prime Minister expect that a statement concerning the government's attitude will be made shortly?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this question has been dealt with many times in the past several weeks. I have nothing to add. I have told the House we expect to have a general statement on our policy in respect of foreign ownership rather than proceed on an ad hoc basis if it would be possible to do so.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, is the government aware of any further pending sales of publishing businesses to United States interests and, if so, is any action being taken in this regard?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, I personally am not aware. It is conceivable that some other minister, particularly the Minister of National Revenue who has been entrusted with the study to which I just referred, might be aware if such a state did exist.

REPORTED TAKEOVER OF CINEPIX INCORPORATED BY FOREIGN INTERESTS

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Secretary of State. I would ask him whether the government intends to take any action with regard to the reported takeover of Cinepix Incorporated, a film company which it is understood received assistance from the federal government, or will this be another case of the Canadian people being skinned?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

[Mr. Olson.]

INFORMATION CANADA

ACTION TO REDUCE FLOW OF UNSOLICITED MATERIAL FROM DEPARTMENTS

Mr. Rud L. Whiting (Halton): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for Information Canada. In view of the fact that the task force on information reported that the information apparatus used by most departments of government and Crown corporations was characterized by incompetence and duplication, is the government planning to take corrective action soon on the large amount of unsolicited material which is being sent out to the news media by departments of government and various Crown corporations?

Hon. Robert Stanbury (Minister without Portfolio): Mr. Speaker, I noted the hon. member's comments on this subject during the debate on the Speech from the Throne, as well as the criticism in the report of the task force on government information. I am glad to be able to tell the hon. member that the government has decided to act on these criticisms. All federal departments and agencies are being required to institute an annual review of mailing lists for information material and confirm these lists by March 31 next. Any persons who do not indicate a desire to remain on these lists must be deleted from them by that date.

* * *

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

TORONTO—OPENING OF NEW OFFICES TO RELIEVE CONGESTION

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Labour. I would like to remind the minister through you, Mr. Speaker, that some time ago I asked him a question regarding the congestion in the unemployment insurance offices in metro Toronto, with consequent delay and inconvenience to the public. Has action been taken to remedy this situation?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): The hon. gentleman is quite accurate in saying that he brought to my attention some months ago the congestion in unemployment offices in the greater Toronto area, as well as a series of articles in the *Globe and Mail* on the subject. As a result we have opened five new offices and to take into consideration the problem of many new Canadians and the additional need of personnel with a knowledge of more than the two official languages of this country. These are in effect walk-in offices. There are now five of them across Toronto, and I thank the hon. gentleman for his original suggestion.

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): I have a supplementary question for the Minister of Labour. I would ask him to draw to the attention of the Prime Minister the worsening unemployment situation in this country which requires his department to open five new offices in Toronto.

CANADIAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION

APPEARANCE BEFORE STANDING COMMITTEE

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): I have a question for the Secretary of State. Would the minister, in his capacity as spokesman for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, use his good offices to arrange for that Crown corporation to appear before an appropriate committee of Parliament so that its activities may be thoroughly examined by members of the House? I ask the question in view of—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member has asked the question. I doubt whether it is in order to give an explanation for the question after the question has been asked. Perhaps the hon. member might allow the minister to reply and then make his explanation by way of a supplementary question.

Mr. Nesbitt: I thought, Your Honour, that it might help the minister in answering if a brief reason were given for the type of investigation to which I referred.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, I think that as usual the management of the CBC will be summoned to appear before the parliamentary committee as soon as the latter gets down to work, namely, as soon as the estimates are referred to it by the House, if I remember correctly. However it is up to the committee itself, as the hon. member knows, to summon the witnesses it wishes to hear, and I have no doubt that each year it will feel the need to call in the CBC management.

[*English*]

Mr. Nesbitt: I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the many rumours and stories concerning the activities of some branches of the CBC regarding the present FLQ situation in Quebec, I thought it might be a good thing if this were done somewhat earlier.

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS RESPECTING NEWS PROGRAMS

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): I wonder if the Secretary of State has a report from the CBC on the question I asked on November 4 as to what news broadcasts, if any, on either the English or French-speaking networks were changed, before they were broadcast over radio or television, by direction either of the CBC or officials of the government?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): No, I have not yet received the answer, Mr. Speaker. I do not remember if the hon. member had mentioned what period his request for information covered. If not, I would ask him to let me know or to write to the CBC.

[*English*]

PUBLIC AFFAIRS PROGRAMS—PROVISION OF EQUAL TIME FOR DIFFERING POINTS OF VIEW

Mr. Norman A. Cafik (Ontario): My supplementary question is obviously directed to the Secretary of State.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Last Friday I raised a question regarding equal time provisions on radio and television which I addressed to the Minister of Finance. He referred the question to the Secretary of State. I wonder whether today when he is in the House he would be prepared to answer the question.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Yes, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member has only to read section 2 of the Broadcasting Act which states that the CBC's information and public affairs programs must be balanced. This, I think, should allay the concern expressed by the hon. member.

[*English*]

MONTREAL—ALLEGED CENSORSHIP OF WORK OF NEWS STAFF—DISMISSAL OF PERSONNEL

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): I would like to ask the Secretary of State whether he has inquired into allegations of censorship by the CBC management of the work of its news staff in Montreal and the dismissal of one or more of the news personnel in that city by the CBC because of the censorship charges?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have followed developments. I know the matter is not, strictly speaking, a *sub judice* one. However, the union has appealed against the CBC management decision and reliable sources have informed me that it is not customary for a minister to reply to questions on matters which, while not really *sub judice*, have been brought, or are to be brought in the immediate future, before an arbitration board.

[*English*]

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): When the minister thinks it would be appropriate to make a statement on this matter, would he do so, particularly in the cases of Mr. Denis Vincent and Michel Bourdon? Would he inquire of the CBC the reasons for their suspension and make a statement to the House as soon as possible as to the CBC position on this matter?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pelletier: Mr. Speaker, I might say that I already know the reasons why the CBC has taken action. I have just given the reason why I do not think it is advisable to comment on it at present. But if the advice I have received proved to be wrong and if it became my duty to report to the House, I shall do it with the least possible delay.

[*English*]

ARREST OF CERTAIN NEWS BROADCASTERS UNDER WAR MEASURES ACT

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): I wonder whether the Secretary of State is now in a position to advise whether those three or four members of Radio-Canada who were picked up under the War Measures Act and who, according to one or another minister, were believed to be communicating by a code with the FLQ,

having been released are now back in the service of the CBC?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Gérard Pelletier (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, the CBC has no answer for that since absences in a corporation employing thousands of people can happen for various reasons. It would be up to the Justice Minister of Quebec to say if some persons already arrested or detained under some charges have stated they were CBC employees. Since I have not received a reply from the Quebec Justice Minister, I am unable to give this information to the right hon. member.

[*English*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Would the minister get in touch with the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion and secure from him the names of those whom he had in mind when he said they were connected with the FLQ, and having those names could he have the records of the CBC looked up to ascertain whether these gentry are back in its employ again?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

SOCIAL SECURITY

INQUIRY AS TO TABLING OF WHITE PAPER

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Is the minister now able to give us the assurance that the white paper on social security will be tabled during the present month?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I cannot do so, Mr. Speaker. As I have mentioned last week, the matter is under consideration by the government. When a decision is taken, it will be announced in the House.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Is the government considering the possibility of introducing legislation rather than waiting for the white paper?

Mr. Munro: Mr. Speaker, all these matters are under consideration at the present time and when a decision has been arrived at on either of the aspects the hon. member has brought forward, it will be announced in the House.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

PROGRESS TOWARD HOLDING OF THIRD INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES CONFERENCE

Mr. Lloyd R. Crouse (South Shore): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the decline in our fisheries resources, what progress has been made toward calling a third international conference to deal with the convention on the territorial sea and contiguous zones, the convention on the high seas, and the convention on fishing and conservation of the living resources of the high seas?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I would have to check my records to see what progress has been made but both the Department of Fisheries and Forestry and the Department of External Affairs have been pressing very hard in this direction. We agree with the hon. member that the fisheries resources should be conserved not only in the interests of Canada but of the world at large.

Mr. Crouse: In view of the importance of France and its ownership of the Islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon and the fact that it was not present at the discussions in Geneva in 1958, will the Secretary of State for External Affairs make every effort to see that this nation is invited to the next international conference?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member is making a representation.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON MARINE RESOURCES

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): I wonder whether the Secretary of State for External Affairs can indicate whether Canada is giving consideration to a specific conference on marine resources in view of the fact that the law of the sea conference could very well take five years to be convened, according to Canadian representatives at the United Nations?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I think it would be desirable that these matters should be discussed together as they are closely related. However, if the prospects were to be so poor we would certainly be very happy to consider moving on to a discussion of the marine resources themselves. Of course, there are many things we will be able to do ourselves that I think will be helpful.

DISCUSSIONS WITH FRANCE ON TREATY FISHING RIGHTS

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister could tell us whether Canada is continuing to hold bilateral talks with France with regard to that country's treaty rights on the south coast of Newfoundland, especially in view of the provisions of Bill C-2 now before the House with respect to pollution of the sea and the fishing zones which are set as jurisdictional limits by that bill?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I do not know that the discussions are going on at this very moment but there have been discussions recently and we will be having more not only in the context of this subject but of many others.

DECLARATION OF CANADIAN FISHING ZONES

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): I have a supplementary question for the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Speaker. Inasmuch as the government made a clear

commitment to Parliament during the last session that the passage of the bill to amend the Territorial Seas and Fishing Zones Act would mean that fishing zones in Canada would be declared almost forthwith, could the minister tell us what steps or plans the government has to so declare these fishing zones?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the subject is under active discussion. I think the hon. member will realize it is related to many other things that Canada is trying to achieve. I am sure he will agree that we should act in the best interests of the fisheries industry as a whole, of which this is only one part.

* * *

[*Translation*]

AGRICULTURE

DAIRYING—DELAY IN PAYMENT OF GRANTS

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture.

As several milk producers have written us to find out why they have not yet received the subsidies for their end of July deliveries, could the hon. minister order the Canadian Dairy Commission to send to the producers involved a statement of their account in order to explain to them why the penalty they have been charged with under the current regulation was higher than the amount of subsidies they expected?

[*Translation*]

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, if there has been any undue delay in the payment of subsidies to any individual producer I would be very happy if the hon. member would provide me with the names and addresses and I shall ask the Dairy Commission for a report on why the payments are being held up, if that is the case.

* * *

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

ATLANTIC PROVINCES—ADDITIONAL ACTION TO STIMULATE ECONOMY

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise the House, in light of observations by the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council that while his department is doing much the Maritime provinces are still falling behind the national average growth rate, whether his department or the government is giving any consideration to other innovations under this program so that this serious slippage might be overcome this winter?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, we make uninterrupted efforts to improve our programs in order to help the underdeveloped regions.

[*English*]

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister for Regional Economic Expansion would indicate whether he plans to visit Atlantic Canada to say hello to the two new premiers and hello to the outgoing premier, Mr. Smallwood?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON RECOMMENDATIONS BY COUNCIL ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister is prepared to tell the House, or perhaps make a statement on motions, what his department plans to do with the third report of the Canadian Council on Rural Development which has been in his hands since July, was made public last week, and recommends firm changes in government policy in different regions, particularly the Atlantic area?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): The report is in the hands of department officials. It is being studied at present and, if necessary, we will make a statement in the House about that matter.

* * *

[*English*]

INFORMATION CANADA

OBTAINING OF EXCERPTS FROM CBC SCRIPTS

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the minister responsible for Information Canada. For the purposes of Information Canada, is the CBC now regarded as an agency of government and is it necessary for citizens desiring to secure excerpts from scripts aired on the CBC to secure them through Information Canada?

Hon. Robert Stanbury (Minister without Portfolio): No, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

HEALTH

LEVELS OF LEAD AND CADMIUM IN FOOD—REQUEST FOR TABLING OF INFORMATION

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): My question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare, Mr. Speaker. In light of the revelations about dangerous levels of lead and cadmium in Canadian diets, can the minister assure the House that the conclusions and data gathered by the Federal Food and Drug Directorate monitoring program into this danger will be tabled in the House and, if so, when?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I shall be pleased to consider the tabling of that information in the House and I shall let the hon. member know when.

Public Order Act, 1970

NATIONAL SECURITY

EMERGENCY POWERS—STUDY BY LAW REFORM COMMISSION

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. Have the chairman and the members of the Law Reform Commission been appointed? If so, would the minister refer to them the study of the emergency powers for the preservation of public order in Canada so that we may have their report prior to the passing of permanent legislation by this House?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): No, Mr. Speaker, they have not been appointed. If the subject is dealt with perhaps it should be dealt with by this House.

* * *

GRAIN

PRODUCTION AND RECEIPTS POLICY—FARM CONSOLIDATION PROGRAM

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture and arises out of the recent grain policy proposal tabled by his colleague which proposes a program of adjustment aimed a creating consolidation of existing farms into more efficient sizes. Can the minister indicate to the House when such a program will be introduced and whether it will be in the form of a proposal or legislation? Also, will the details be made available in good time so that the whole matter of the grains policy can be discussed in unison with the policy of consolidation of farm units?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has raised far too large an area for me to reply during the question period.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PUBLIC ORDER (TEMPORARY MEASURES) ACT, 1970

PROVISION OF EMERGENCY POWERS FOR PRESERVATION OF PUBLIC ORDER

The House resumed from Friday, November 6, consideration in committee of Bill C-181, to provide temporary emergency powers for the Preservation of Public Order in Canada—Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)—Mr. Honey in the chair.

The Chairman: When the committee rose on Friday, November 6, 1970, clause 2 of the bill was under consideration with certain amendments. Shall clause 2 carry?

[Mr. Munro.]

On clause 2—*Definitions.*

• (3:00 p.m.)

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, may I raise a point of order. It may shorten the debate on one of the main clauses of the bill. I wonder if the Minister of Justice would answer a question. I did not wish to take up the time of the House with it during the question period. Can the Minister of Justice say categorically that there has not been any censorship, either under the War Measures Act or under any other authority, with respect to the news media in the Province of Quebec?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, I think the best way I can handle that question is by saying that in the opinion of the law officers who report to me, and according to the opinion which they gave to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation which receives its legal advice from the Department of Justice, there is nothing under the regulations currently in force pursuant to the proclamation of the War Measures Act that provides in any way for censorship. I had the opinion expressed to me which was relayed in turn, on my instructions, to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, that the regulations do not prohibit broadcasts in the course of ordinary news or public affairs coverage of statements which, when originally made, could have been made on behalf of the FLQ or by the FLQ for that matter. In the opinion of the law officers, only when the news media allows itself to be used as a propaganda vehicle for the FLQ and communicates statements of the FLQ would there be an offence. The key words are, "on behalf of", which are meant to establish an agency, express or implied. So, the answer is that there is no such provision within the regulations or within the bill currently before the House.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the minister one further question, and it may shorten the debate. In view of the minister's answer on the law, will the minister take the committee into his confidence and say that there has not been, in fact, any direction by any department of the federal government or of the Quebec government with respect to censoring the radio, the television or any other news media?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, that is not what the hon. gentleman asked me. He asked me what the position is under the regulations, and I have answered that.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I should like—

The Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member for Regina East.

Mr. Burton: Mr. Chairman, I should like to make some comments on this bill as we begin the detailed study of it clause by clause in committee of the whole. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I should like to draw to the attention of the committee the fact that we have had emergency situations in Canada before now. I say that as a member from the province of Saskatchewan where we had what was known in Canadian history as the Saskatchewan rebellion in 1885. That, of course, predates a good deal of the

modern history of the province of Saskatchewan and, indeed, of much of Canada. Nevertheless, that was a very important episode in the history of Canada in which a group of people who had a set of grievances against the government of Canada, and against many people in Canada, felt that they had to take strong action in order to try to rectify the situation. I think it would be fair to say that there are many people who today acknowledge that harsh and repressive steps were taken at that time. There were unnecessary steps taken at that time in dealing with the problems that existed. It must be acknowledged that some action must be taken when problems such as these arise. Nevertheless, unnecessary and harsh steps were taken. Unfortunately, some of the unhealthy effects, some part of the legacy of these steps, can still be seen in the pattern of events in Canada today, some 85 years later in our history.

I think this particular point can be best illustrated by some words that were uttered in Regina on October 2, 1968, on the occasion, I believe, of the unveiling of a statue in memory of Louis Riel who was hanged in 1855. The words of the statement are as follows:

> How many other Riels exist in Canada, beyond the fringe of accepted conduct driven to believe that this country offers no answer to their needs and no solution to their problems? How many of us understand the loneliness, the sense of futility of such a man? How many of us are willing to concede that future historians, in chronicling the events of our lives, may choose to emphasize and applaud the activities, not of the privileged majority but of some little-known leader of an unpopular minority?
>
> For me this is the lesson of Louis Riel. For me this is the reason why we are here.
>
> A democratic society and system of government, while among the grandest of human concepts, are among the most difficult to implement. In a democracy it is all too easy for the majority to forget the rights of the minority, and for a remote and powerful government to ignore its protests.
>
> It is all too easy, should disturbances erupt, to crush them in the name of law and order. We must never forget that, in the long run, a democracy is judged by the way the majority treats the minority. Louis Riel's battle is not yet won.

Those word were uttered by the present Prime Minister in Regina on October 2, 1968.

This bill is extraordinary legislation and as such it imposes a special responsibility on legislators to examine both the general purposes and thrust of the bill as well as its specific contents very carefully. It imposes a special responsibility on the minister; this, I think, has to be said in view of the minister's credible record on many aspects of civil liberties.

Right now, I suggest, the minister's record is being put to the test. I hope that the minister will not take a rigid stand with respect to this bill. I hope that he does not even leave the impression that he has orders simply to hold the line with respect to this bill. I hope that he does not exhibit a non-flexible stand in dealing with the various proposals that will be put forward. The House has approved the principle that special legislation may be required to deal with situations such as this. We are prepared to consider the principle and to examine the bill based on that principle; but the contents and nature of the special powers contained in the bill still require close scrutiny. It does not necessarily follow that the particular provisions requested are justified merely by reason of the decision that special legislation is required. Thus, Mr. Chairman, I hope the minister will be responsive to proposals made by the opposition. I think, if the minister is truly concerned about national unity, this concern will be reflected in a serious sensitivity to the many objections which have been registered both inside and outside the House about this legislation and about the previous actions of the government.

I certainly hope that we do not hear any more statements such as those the minister made on Wednesday last. I say this, Mr. Chairman, out of sadness and concern for what is happening rather than in anger. The minister first of all said that, certainly, it is the right of anyone to question the government's actions; but then he seemed to brand those who chose to question the government's actions. We even find that he accused those who were arguing against his stand of intellectual dishonesty. How can the minister take such a stand when he admitted in his remarks last Wednesday that the government's position represented a value judgment? Why is he so concerned about the fact that there has been opposition when he admitted that the government had taken harsh measures and when it was also admitted that not all of the facts have been made public? That is what the minister said on October 16. I suppose the minister had to defend himself, but I suggest he did himself no credit in his performance last Wednesday.

I think we are prepared to grant that the minister is human, as we all are. We hope, now that he has got this matter off his chest, he will be prepared to be both responsive and responsible. I do not have to remind the minister that not only is he responsible for carrying out the letter of the law and the letter of his duties as set out in the statute establishing his position and his department, but he has to ensure that justice is done, with all its implications and ratifications in Canada. I am sure it is not necessary to remind the minister of that.

• (3:10 p.m.)

There are a number of serious questions which must be answered when considering this legislation. The first question I wish to ask the minister is whether there is still a need for this sort of legislation, taking into account the events as they have developed up to the present time. As expressed by their vote, some members approved of the action taken by the government and others disapproved. I am one of those who disapproved. However, that is now a matter of the past. We are looking at current events, the situation as it is today, and attempting to determine where we go from here.

In his remarks last Wednesday, the Minister of Justice indicated that there was still a continuing need for this sort of legislation. I accept that as an expression of his view, but the minister did not back up his statement with an adequate explanation of why he considers powers of this sort are still required. The minister owes this House such an explanation.

I wish to refer to what has occurred up to the present time. During this afternoon's question period the minister reported that 439 people had been arrested; that is approximately ten more than were reported last Thursday. Of these 439 people, 378 have been released; one has been rearrested and 62 are under detention at the present time. Charges have been laid against 40 of these 62 people. Last week the minister indicated that there were still approximately 40 people to be arrested. That is a small number.

The one reasonable point made by the government is—although I think there is an effective answer to the point—that the element of surprise was required when the government invoked the War Measures Act. However, that is now a matter of the past. The cat is out of the bag. The situation is being dealt with in the open. The government should be able to deal with most of the problems that remain through the provisions of the Criminal Code.

I suggest that hon. members have a responsibility to examine the implications of this bill and its consequences. Most members reluctantly conceded that there may be occasions when special powers are required, but I think most members would agree that special powers which infringe on the rights of people must be kept to an absolute minimum. We must demonstrate that our problems can and will be dealt with within the framework of responsible democratic government which safeguards human rights. If existing problems are responded to with repressive legislation, and it must be admitted there are repressive features in the bill now before us, that will reinforce the arguments of those against whom the government wishes to act and to whom we must answer in the long run in Canada's political development.

I wish to deal with a point raised on Friday by the hon. member for Calgary North. He recited an incident which occurred near his home in the early 1930's. A shooting occurred at a meeting being addressed by Mr. M. J. Coldwell. This resulted from the pressure created by discussion of the problems that existed in the 1930's. I have attended many of Mr. Coldwell's meetings, both as a boy and as an adult I have know him personally for most of my life. I can state that there is no more non-violent man in all of Canada. I do not wish to suggest that the member for Calgary North left a different impression, quite the contrary. However, it must be pointed out that men such as M. J. Coldwell, and the present leader of the New Democratic Party, succeeded in keeping hope alive in Saskatchewan and the rest of western Canada in the 1930's at a time when we were faced with difficulties as great or greater than those with which we are faced at the present time. That is important to note. These men kept alive the idea that things could be and would be better, and that changes and improvements could be brought about through the democratic process.

During the past week or two there have been many quotations from the book published, or about to be published, by Pierre Valliere, one of those arrested and against whom charges have been laid. He has been quoted in a number of newspapers. This man points out the deplorable conditions under which he was raised. I can point to many examples I have witnessed of people who have been raised under conditions as bad or worse than those described by Mr. Valliere. The important point is that for many of those people who lived under such conditions, hope was kept alive that changes and improvements could be made. That is a critical point. I think most people will admit that hope has been snuffed out for some people in Canada today. Those with that feeling will be joining groups such as the FLQ. We must demonstrate our faith in the democratic process and show that it will work. By keeping repression to a minimum and by tackling the social and economic problems that exist, we will show that democracy does work.

There has been a good deal of discussion on various sections of the bill. I do not intend to repeat all of the comments which have been made. At the present time we are debating clause 2 of the bill which sets out the definitions. When we note the definitions in this legislation, we realize the far-reaching implications of the bill before us. A wide definition is given to such terms as "communicate", the group which may be classified as peace officers, statements, and unlawful association. I wish to deal briefly with one of the definitions. I hope the minister is listening from behind the curtain because this point must be dealt with. It is the definition of a peace officer.

The hon. member for Matane made some points with respect to this definition last Friday. I wish to raise one further point. The definition of a peace officer is extended beyond that provided in the Criminal Code to "include the members of the Canadian Forces". I am prepared to acknowledge that under emergency situations, when legislation such as this may be put into force, there may be a need to give members of the Canadian Forces the powers of a peace officer. However, as the subsection is worded at the present time, it is open-ended. It automatically gives a member of the Canadian Forces the power of a peace officer. This is my interpretation of the problem as a layman, although I have discussed the matter with other people. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that a safeguard needs to be placed in this particular extension of the definition of a peace officer by adding certain words in relation to members of the Canadian Forces. I suggest the following words might be added after the word "Forces"—"when assigned to perform the duties of a peace officer under the authority of a competent civil authority". I would be interested to hear the minister's comments on this proposal. When we are dealing with special legislation of the kind before us, I believe we must be doubly careful to see there is adequate legislative provision to ensure maintenance of civil authority over the military. I am not suggesting there is any present danger involving the situation or position of the Armed Forces, but we should not leave the door ajar when such an issue arises.

• (3:20 p.m.)

One of the main thrusts of this bill is to be found in clause three which outlaws the FLQ. I think all of us would agree without argument that there are undesirable

aspects to the activities of the FLQ and that some action should be taken to deal with them. The question is, what kind of action is best suited to meet the circumstances. First of all, how wide a net does the government intend to cast upon the basis of its definition of FLQ or associated organizations? Is there a significant danger that innocent people will be caught in such a net when this bill comes into force? Second, there is the point which has already been discussed by various speakers in this debate, as well as on second reading, concerning the effectiveness in practice of any provision outlawing a particular organization. Is this really the way to get at the problem in the long run? Many people hold the view, that it is not.

There is also a curious circumstance which arises as a result of the termination date which has been inserted in the legislation. Clause 3, as I say, provides for the outlawing of the FLQ, but there is also included in the bill a termination date.

The Chairman: Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member but I do so in order to inform him that his time has expired.

Mr. McCleave: Carry on.

Mr. Burton: Just a few more minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: Is there unanimous consent?

Mr. McCleave: Agreed.

Mr. Burton: I thank the committee for its indulgence. I assure hon. members that I shall not take too long. As I was saying, provision is made for this legislation to terminate on April 30. After that date, presumably, the FLQ will no longer be an outlawed organization. The government has spoken about bringing in some form of permanent legislation. Is it intended that the FLQ shall continue to be outlawed after April 30? It seems to me we are faced, now, by a curious feature which requires further examination.

I further suggest that attention be paid to the wording of the preamble to the bill. The second paragraph contains a description of what it is about the FLQ that we do not like; as to a good many points contained in that description, there will be no argument, but I wonder whether this is sufficient background to establish the need for this legislation. Again, in the third paragraph of the preamble, reference is made to the invocation of the War Measures Act. It is, of course, true that this took place and that this particular step was approved by a vote in this House. Nevertheless, I question whether it is necessary to make this particular reference in such a way as to imply there was over-all approval of the action of the government up to this particular point in time. Possibly the wording should be reconsidered.

In conclusion, I submit that the amendments proposed by my hon. friend from Greenwood, and outlined by him on Friday, should be most carefully considered by the House if we are to handle this legislation in a responsible way. It involves our approach to the issues of civil disorder, of terrorism, to the extent it exists, and to the protection of citizens' rights throughout this country. The legislation before us has political and social consequences which go far beyond the impact of this particular measure. Each of us has a heavy responsibility. In my opinion, members of this House have dealt with this matter in a responsible way so far. The opposition has responded by its vote on second reading, a vote which indicated it was prepared to consider further a measure which provided special powers to deal with the situation which the Minister of Justice and others have described. It has been introduced on the basis of certain facts which are known, and others which have had to be deduced or assumed; we certainly need more explanation of this aspect. But I maintain the opposition has responded. It is now up to the government to respond, in turn, to the opposition's proposals. History will judge us on the basis of our sensitivity and adherence to democratic principles during this difficult time for Canada.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Chairman, I do not rise to speak at any length but I was struck by certain words used by the Minister of Justice a few moments ago. I shall await his return to the House before dealing with them in connection with the subject of censorship.

Today, we are considering an extremely serious matter. The subject of the bill before us is of paramount importance and the question whether its terms are to be preserved or amendments made should be, I would think, a challenge to ministers of the government and parliamentary secretaries to be present in the House. At this moment, in point of fact, there are two ministers in the House and there are, if my count is correct, three parliamentary secretaries. A minister finds it necessary, from time to time, to attend cabinet meetings, and that is understandable, but parliamentary secretaries are not in that category. The fact that there are so few of them in the seats of the mighty indicates that the debate is, to all intents and purposes, worthless and ineffective.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I know that the right hon. gentleman would wish to be fair. He, and other members of his party, have suggested that the opposition is the conscience of the House. The conscience, also, is somewhat ill-staffed at the moment.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am glad to note that my remark that the opposition was, indeed, the conscience of the House, has struck home and that the Minister of Justice has imbibed and inhaled it. But the conscience can do nothing if the heart is absent. In this case, the heart of the government is gone.

The minister made a statement this afternoon, and I have to depend upon my memory as to what he said, in connection with censorship. He was entirely correct in saying that censorship within the meaning of the War Measures Act is not in effect. In fact, various sections of the War Measures Act which people sometimes consider

as being in effect are not in effect. I wish to make this clear immediately. A question was asked concerning whether there was any censorship of radio and television, and the answer given by the minister was that there was not within the terms of either the regulations or the present bill before the House.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): With the indulgence of the right hon. gentleman may I, through you, Mr. Chairman, make sure that we understand each other. I said that there was nothing in the regulations or in the terms of the present bill, which in this respect duplicate the regulations, to authorize censorship.

Mr. Diefenbaker: No, there is no misunderstanding at all; we are clearly in agreement on this point. However, there is censorship today, and therefore it is censorship that is being illegally applied. Across the country various radio stations, or at least their representatives, have been advised, informed, made aware, that the publication of certain material would not be in the public interest. Indeed, as far as certain universities are concerned, the student bodies who edit university papers have been given to understand that they are subject to censorship, and that censorship applies today despite the fact that the minister stated clearly, unequivocally and properly that legally it could not be applied.

This is the most dangerous form of censorship, the subtle kind that determines what I shall read, what I shall see, what I shall hear, without there being any legal justification for such censorship. The minister used these words—and I give him the opportunity of saying whether or not he actually used them. He said that there was no censorship of the news as far as radio or television stations and the like were concerned. Unless they were being used as propaganda agencies, he said, there would be no interference.

I should like to know who determines whether they are being used as propaganda agencies. Is not that the essence of censorship—that somebody determines for me what is propaganda and what is not propaganda? On this basis, certain ministers of the Crown should have kept their mouths shut, for some of the statements made by them indicate an irresponsibility that is not in keeping with membership on the government benches.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, and again with the indulgence of the right hon. gentleman, may I clarify what I said. The crucial words in the regulations, which are repeated in the bill, are if the statement is made "on behalf of"; and then there are the words "as a representative or professed representative of the unlawful association". This means that the crucial element in distinguishing between the valid reporting of news and fair comment on the one hand, and its being used as a propaganda vehicle on the other hand, is the idea of agency. Is the journalist allowing himself to be used as an agent?

Mr. Diefenbaker: That is what I like about a debate in this House, Mr. Chairman, with opinions being exchanged. I am glad to have that statement from the minister, because accepting his view we have censorship in Canada. It is censorship not legally brought into effect, but rather left to certain individuals who determine whether a radio or T.V. station or the press itself comes within the definition of the words just enunciated by the minister. I suggest this is a dangerous proposition. It is of the essence of the imposition of censorship without accepting the responsibility of having censorship put into effect either by Parliament or, as under the wartime regulations, by order in council.

I pass on now to the next phase. For several days I have been trying to get some information regarding certain individuals who were alleged to be with Radio Canada—news broadcasters, commentators and the like. There were three or four of these people. This is not a matter picked out of the air; rather it comes from the confines of the mind of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. On many occasions he stated that several people were involved, and in every phase. One began to look at ministers of the Crown, even at parliamentary secretaries and Members of Parliament. He said that the dangerous permeation of this philosophy through the various strata of society had undermined everything. As a matter of fact, the minister used some very big figures. In Ottawa, the minister stated be thought the FLQ had 3,000 members. When the minister appeared on a television program with Jack Webster, he was reported to have said that the figure was twenty-five to fifty thousand. The minister spoke of thousands of weapons and masses of dynamite. Then he went on: "We can't tell you everything because if we did the security of the state would be undermined".

Then, the minister of Indian affairs joined in, and he drew a horrid picture of fear and danger. He said: "We can't tell you. We know, but if we were ever to tell it would bring into focus men high in public life, and we can't do that". This is all nonsense, Mr. Chairman. Like every member of the House, I have been following the evidence given at the inquest last Saturday in the city of Montreal. If you read the evidence given by the man Lortie, it is the most infantile example of amateurism that could have been put together. The government said that these were professional wrongdoers. In my view, if Lortie's evidence is accepted, their whole conduct indicates they were a bunch of novices.

To return to the people employed by Radio Canada, according to one minister, and by inference another, these people were actually engaged in using a code for the purpose of passing on information to FLQ members while pretending to be giving the news. They interpolated certain statements, observations or letters in one way or another into their reports. Three or four of these people were picked up, and that is what should have happened to them.

However, I have been trying to find out what has happened to these gentlemen. The Secretary of State has had several days to find out. Can you imagine the colos-

sal wisdom inherent in the statement that he made today? He said: How do we know who they were? How do we know which ones were released? I am not going to designate what I consider that statement to be, but I think that even the Minister of Justice will know what I have in mind.

• (3:40 p.m.)

These people were traitors to this country. They operated within Radio Canada to undermine the state; to ensure that the FLQ conspirators would be successful in their aims. It must be taken that they were trying to cover up the tracks of those who kidnapped Mr. Cross and the minister of the Crown of the province of Quebec. They were passing out information and then they were picked up. Where are they now? The very fact that the minister, in the last few days, refused to give information in that connection would seem to indicate that they are back on the job. That is what we have been trying to find out. They are paid by the taxes of the people of Canada, and on the basis of a statement made by one of the ministers of the Crown in the present government, they were actually engaged, not only in a seditious operation but in something even close to treason itself.

They are picked up. They are taken into custody. They are released. Where are they now? I would like to know. Is the minister in a position to advise as to whether or not these people are back on the job? That is all I am trying to find out. I was surprised the ministers did not have some communication between themselves in that connection and ask, "These quadruplets of treason and treachery—where are they"? They were on the job with Radio Canada. They were engaged in nefarious and treacherous work. They were picked up. Where are they? Have they been released? It has been stated that they have been. Where are they now? If they are back in the CBC, the people of Canada as a whole will be able to conclude a great many things.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I just wonder if I could ask the right hon. gentleman a question. Suppose there were employees of the CBC who were picked up. Suppose they were detained. Suppose they were thereafter released. Is the right hon. gentleman entitled to make any assumptions from this, or should the assumptions be made only after they are charged, if they are charged? I am asking this in all seriousness because it may be that, if charges are not laid, the police found there was no connection. I think the right hon. gentleman has to be very careful when he is dealing with this sort of thing.

Mr. Diefenbaker: I am pointing out that they were not in that position. They were picked up and, according to a minister of the Crown, they were engaged in giving information to the people in the FLQ to undermine the state. He would not have made a statement like that unless he knew.

Mr. Lewis: Wouldn't he?

Mr. Diefenbaker: They are not in the position of others who were picked up on suspicion and then released. The minister said they were engaged in this activity, and no minister of the Crown would make a statement like that without knowledge. If anybody wants to disavow that minister, I am willing to accept the disavowal.

What the Minister of Justice has done has been to refer to the general case of the person who is picked up, and I cannot disagree with that. You can be picked up by mistake and misunderstanding, but these men were not in that category. According to a minister of the Crown, they were guilty of treachery. He was shocked into a state of deep concern, and worry was apparent on every line of his face as he spoke of the danger to the state.

These people are not in the category to which the Minister of Justice has referred. These are treacherous people who are known to have done these things, and the man who actually designated them as being such is a minister of the Crown. That bothers me, and I don't suppose we will ever get the information because, after all, it is a very difficult thing for the Secretary of State to find out which members of Radio Canada were taken into custody and which ones have returned to the haven of their former positions.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Diefenbaker: I don't mind questions, but I have dealt with the point raised by the Minister of Justice. I will now deal with the point he has just made, of how careful one must be in picking up these people, that they be not unfairly and unjustly treated, or designated as potential wrongdoers by reason only of the fact that they have been taken into custody under the regulations.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Exactly.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The fact that he points this out indicates he realizes what terrible mistakes can be made, and that brings me to the need of protecting such people. The hon. member for Calgary North has an amendment to the effect that there should be a board of review set up. I have not seen any rush on the part of the government to accept it, but in view of the declaration just made by the Minister of Justice I take it he is giving it serious consideration, believing as he does in the dangers of innocent people being picked up. With his dedication to justice I am sure he will give it that consideration. You see, Mr. Chairman, that is what discussion does. You actually clear the atmosphere. I am so glad the minister has taken that position.

In the meantime, while this board is being set up, may I recall a suggestion I made, I think it was on October 15, that something in the nature of what was done in 1940 and 1941 might be valuable at this time. Without going into a lot of detail, Mr. Chairman, it was not a commission that was set up, but a group of Members of Parliament with some knowledge of the law. Everyone who is a lawyer is presumed to have that, because ignorance of the law does not excuse anyone, even a lawyer. This group met. They were sworn to secrecy, and they were shown the files. There was a most interesting thing. Not

one leak ever took place from the day to day or the week to week meetings of this group.

We looked over the records. I do not want to designate anyone because, even though years have gone by, it might do him harm, but I will mention one man as an example of a person against whom there was no evidence whatever. In fact, he afterward became a Member of Parliament. There was not one scintilla of evidence against him, but it took him a long time to show that. There was a Canadian contractor who was incarcerated and held for months. There was not a suggestion of anything that approached evidence against that man.

The Chairman: Order. I regret to interrupt the right hon. member. I do so to advise the committee that his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

The Chairman: Is there unanimous consent that the right hon. member continue?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Diefenbaker: We looked over the evidence. I remember that case very well. Do you know what his offence was? Some employee, some maid in the house, was present the night Italy declared war and she saw this man dump some papers into the fireplace. She did not know what the papers were, but she felt sure they must be very self-incriminating. That was the entire case. We looked it over, and it wasn't long before he was out of jail. That is why I am again suggesting that procedure. We have so many Members of Parliament who would like a job to do, and the greatest job of Parliament is not to turn out legislation but to preserve and ensure freedom for even the humblest in the land.

This would in no way interfere with the provincial government of the province of Quebec. We cannot slough off our responsibility on the province of Quebec, although whenever things go wrong I have seen a tendency on the part of the government to say, "You better get in touch with the Bourassa government because, after all, we are not an agency. We are just looking after the things of the state, and the responsibility falls on the province."

• (3:50 p.m.)

Let Parliament assume that function. Let Parliament pick out nine or ten members of this House to determine whether or not any of these people have been held without justification. There may not be any basis for their being held. I know the minister entirely agrees with that. That is my suggestion. I give support to the setting up of a board of review although, from the attitude up until the minister interjected a while ago, I was not very hopeful this would be accepted. Certainly, this would give Members of Parliament an opportunity to look into this matter. Set up such a committee. It cannot embarrass you in any way. If such a committee were set up, we would be able to follow the peregrinations of those people from Radio Canada who were designated by a minister of the Crown as criminals and dangerous to the state. If they should be let out, we will find out whether they go back to the sequestered and protected position of broadcasters for Radio Canada.

Mr. Saltsman: Mr. Chairman, as one who supported the implementation of the War Measures Act, I should like to speak on this clause. A number of weeks have passed and we have had an opportunity to look at the events and at the public evidence, some of the not so public evidence, and some of the inferences and circumstances surrounding the events of that time. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, I have no reason at this time to doubt or regret the decision I then took. I still feel it was correct to implement the War Measures Act and if I had it to do over again I would support it. Others, of course, had doubts to begin with and at least one member had reason to express his doubts just the other day. The decision concerning whether or not the introduction of the War Measures Act was correct will not be decided at this time. History will decide it or it may very well be that this debate will never be resolved because all the people involved obviously gave their actions a great deal of thought. They had to make decisions based on their judgment of the situation.

Today, however, the issue before us is whether the War Measures Act should be replaced with a more circumscribed measure and, on this occasion, I find I cannot support the government. I had hoped that some legislation could be introduced that would meet the needs of emergency situations but would not contain the dangerous provisions of the War Measures Act. I have looked at the bill before us. I have even looked at the amendments my party is offering to this bill as well as the amendments of the official opposition. Even if all these amendments were accepted, I do not think I could support the bill. I do not see how a bill could be drafted, containing some of the powers asked for, which could be considered safe or satisfactory. If we look at our Criminal Code, we will realize it has been developed over hundreds of years so we have been able to place certain safeguards in it. The minute you remove any of those safeguards you depart very sharply from the traditional concepts of freedom, which is an aspect of our society I like.

Therefore, any emergency legislation that departs from the present provisions and safeguards in the Criminal Code in my view is dangerous. This brings me to the point of view that the only time such emergency powers can be justified is during extreme conditions, and then only for a short period. I can see no justification for prolonging legislation of a dangerous nature beyond the immediate circumstances that call for the implementation of such legislation. In some ways, I believe the legislation before us is more dangerous than the War Measures Act. I am not saying this from a legal point of view because I am not in a position to make that kind of a legal judgment. I do not have a legal background. I say this from the psychological point of view. Whatever the dangers may be of the War Measures Act, it has one advantage. This is an argument that was first advanced by the hon. member for Skeena. This legislation is so terrible in its

implication, and so jeopardizes every one of our civil liberties, that its very danger is its safety. We know its dangers and what could happen if it should be prolonged. Since, we are aware of this—and the government obviously is aware of it—we are on our guard and are careful about how it should be used.

Everytime someone starts talking about using the War Measures Act, whether in respect of hippies or school teachers, one becomes aware of the real concern of the members of this House. We realize how dangerous an instrument the War Measures Act is, and how careful we must be with it. Now, we have a bill before us which says, in effect, that the War Measures Act is too broad, too dangerous, and therefore we must bring in legislation which, to some extent, can deal with the problem in a more specific manner and remove the difficulties with which we are trying to deal. I am suggesting that once we take this attitude, once we think we can curtail civil liberties in a mild way, we are on the road to finding ourselves in serious difficulty. We are pretending this course is not dangerous. What is worse, there is an additional danger of isolating the problem to the province of Quebec and the FLQ because many people will say this legislation is better since it takes us off the hook and places on the hook those who should be there.

• (4:00 p.m.)

I am suggesting it is not possible to curtail the civil liberties of any group in this country without curtailing the civil liberties of everyone. I think whenever we see this kind of curtailment we must all continue to be on guard in respect of how it may affect us personally. It is a great mistake to try to isolate one group and pretend that the civil liberties of this country are not in danger. We just heard a very moving address by the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert. He pointed out the difficulties that are already arising as a result of the implementation of the War Measures Act. We have had admissions from the Minister of Justice that people may have been picked up who were not guilty and who have been released. What does this mean? It means we are living with an enormously dangerous instrument and it is not possible to design an instrument that is in harmony with our traditional concept of liberty in this country. The only safeguard, if there is a safeguard, is, first, that we are constantly on guard against the implications of such emergency legislation and, second, that we remove it as quickly as the emergency disappears.

I want to suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that in my view the implementation of the War Measures Act did accomplish some useful objectives. If there was an apprehended insurrection—it does not appear to be the case now—in some respects we have achieved a short term gain. However, there are many things that we have not accomplished. We had hoped to save the life of Pierre Laporte. The War Measures Act was not able to do this, and neither will this legislation. We may still be able to save the life of Mr. Cross, and all of us are hopeful that this will be possible. If the War Measures Act will in any way contribute toward this objective, then it will be helpful.

It seems to me that the chief advantage of the implementation of the War Measures Act is that we have, in some ways, won a psychological victory. For years now, people in Canada have been very concerned about violence in our society. This violence is not limited to Quebec. People have been concerned about violence in the world, violence in North America, and they have been worried that the government would be unable to cope with it. Now, I think they have to be told that violence has deeper causes than can be cured by legislation alone. But they have to be reassured that, to the extent that legislation is helpful or can be useful, the Parliament of Canada has that legislation at hand and is prepared to use it on their behalf. It seems to me that this is an important thing to say to the people of Canada. We must say to them "Don't be frightened; don't panic, Parliament can and will act if it is necessary". We have made that point.

Whether or not this bill passes, the War Measures Act will still exist. The Parliament of Canada can invoke it in an emergency if it is required. It seems to me that we will lose that short term psychological victory if we continue this or any subsequent act beyond the period of the immediate emergency. At any rate, there can be no justification now for continuing emergency legislation, let alone for contemplating writing a new piece of legislation. Rather than look back or hang on to something which in my view has done some good, we now have to direct our attention to the long term problems associated with violence in our society. Unless we do that, and unless we act quickly, we can lose the advantage we gained through the implementation of the War Measures Act.

What are those things about which we should be thinking? I do not believe legislation is the answer. It is useful up to a point, but it will not solve the problem. Although there are people who objected to the position that my leader took when he talked about the underlying root causes, the economic problems of Quebec—there are people who say that the revolutionaries are middle class, they are not poor—let there be no mistake that this is where the problem really lies. It may be that we could solve the economic problems of Quebec, and Quebec might still wish to separate. It may be that we could solve these economic problems, and there might still be violence. But let us be sure about one thing, there is a chance of success in this course. The other course, that is the use of emergency legislation, offers no chance of success. Either we solve the deep rooted problems, many of them economic, many of them social, that afflict the people of Quebec, that are real grievances in the minds of people who are not revolutionaries or fanatics, who are not terrorists, or we will have gained nothing. The turmoil and soul searching that this House has been through will have been for no purpose at all.

I think there are dangers if we continue with emergency legislation. We are going to create a whole new set of martyrs. I cannot see how you can have legislation that asserts guilt by association and say it is fair legislation or that it is an improvement over the War Measures Act. This is just not possible. Even if you remove the retroac-

tive features of the legislation, which I think would probably make the whole bill pointless, you would still be left with legislation that is not fair. The minute you say that membership per se, or the support of any organization per se, constitutes a crime, you violate one of the basic premises on which our freedom is based. I do not think I have to demonstrate this. I am quite prepared to be tough in defence of democracy. I think that the defenders of democracy can make a mistake by being excessively permissive, but I think they are also wrong if they are tough and unfair for no good purpose.

Therefore, I think it would be a mistake for us to use the War Measures Act to charge those who are now held, and thus to create a set of martyrs. The longer they are kept in prison, the greater will be their martyrdom. Sooner or later, they will have to be let out, and sooner or later the memory of the atrocious murder of Pierre Laporte will recede from people's minds; their grievances will come to the forefront. People will forget the terrible violence and remember only their present unhappiness. This is a danger. One only has to look at the history of violence in other countries to see that many of the leaders came to their positions as a result of the martydom of imprisonment. It is difficult to think of these people as martyrs, but it is even more difficult to think of them as leaders now. However, let us learn something from the past.

There is also the danger that if we prolong this measure beyond the immediate and specific emergency, we will discredit the ability of the democratic system to operate at all. For instance, when will this legislation be withdrawn? It is becoming a crutch. The legislation will be in effect until April of next year. Is the FLQ going to go away by April? Are the difficulties in Quebec going to disappear by April? Will violence stop in Canada, in North America, in the world, by April? I do not think so. Whenever you try to withdraw this legislation, there may be some event, a death, a kidnapping, a bombing, that will prevent its withdrawal, and people will learn to live with this legislation. They will learn to justify the injustices. They will learn to forget about those who have been in prison and released, and will learn to accept this as a measure which had to be adopted, although it was unfortunate. It will become a great crutch. The police will say "we cannot operate without it". It will become more and more difficult rather than less and less difficult to remove this legislation as time goes on. Let us do it now.

To a very large extent, the House of Commons has shown its willingness to be the conscience of the nation, as some members decided to be; to be tough, as other members decided to be, but it has acted. No member in the House has stood in the way of Parliament acting decisively. Therefore, I think we could take this opportunity to withdraw this bill and withdraw the War Measures Act along with it.

The other danger is that we are going to drive the FLQ underground. The minister will probably say they are underground anyway. It is true that murderous activities are always underground, but we can deal with them through the Criminal Code. Most criminal activity that can be dealt with by the Criminal Code is underground. But let us look at the situation. Who has been picked up? The people who were underground were not picked up, but the people who were above ground, who spoke publicly and who could be identified. If you drive the FLQ underground, then you will not know who to pick up the next time; you will have to do everything in the dark.

• (4:10 p.m.)

It is important to bear this in mind. We made other organizations illegal and drove them underground. I can go along with making the FLQ illegal by implementing the War Measures Act for two weeks or ten days, because you have to act quickly when men's lives are at stake. Beyond that, you have nothing more to gain. When you have reached that point it is wise to say "We shall do what we have to do, so let's do it now".

To sum up, Mr. Chairman, I think the defenders of democracy have their point. They have proven that they can not only be fair but understanding. They have also proven they can be tough in defence of democracy. The public has been reassured by this act, and Parliament has shown that it can move quickly. It can move as quickly in the future if it has to do so.

The War Measures Act has not been repealed; it is still in effect and that should be most reassuring. Now is the time to withdraw that act, and now is the time to stop thinking of short term legal approaches. We should commit ourselves to an honest attempt at solving the long term and significant problems of the province of Quebec because those are the problems which create conditions on which violence feeds.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Chairman, during the course of this discussion on clause 2, members have attempted to point out some of the real dangers inherent in introducing the legislation that the government has brought in during the past few days. Last Thursday, when the vote was called, I was the only person who would not accept the government's justification for bringing this legislation forward.

I think I could begin by saying there is one point of complete unanimity in this House: all members would like to see an end to the problem as it has existed in the province of Quebec. What has not helped the resolution of the problem, however, has been the fanning of emotional discussion concerning the sometimes naïve interpretation of events in that province, and the simplistic and misleading suggestions that have been put forward as to the exact nature of the problem. The very fact that the problem is one of terror and disquiet has unsettled many hundreds of thousands of Canadians. To some degree or other, most people in this country, seem to believe that we have not been able to deal with the problem because it is not easily understood. The emotions of people were fanned very easily at that time with the kidnapping of Mr. Cross, and later with the kidnapping and brutal slaying of Mr. Laporte.

One of the greatest disservices of this government was that, instead of attempting to quiet down the substantial emotions in this country during this period, it has in fact done exactly the reverse. The government has fanned the flame of emotion, as the Prime Minister said last Friday night, by polarizing public opinion in this country.

Since the early days of this crisis we have been treated to a round of interpretations as to the exact nature of the problem. Viewed officially as insurrection, it has been described variously as terror, revolution, social unrest, anarchy. A whole variety of other terms have been used in an attempt to explain, not through a reasonable process of presenting facts but through an emotional charge as to the nature of the situation. Indeed, if one takes an over-view of the past five weeks, one can see that there has been a trilogy of explanation by the government.

In the early stages, particularly when the government introduced the War Measures Act, we were told both inside and outside the House by the Prime Minister and ministers of the Crown that at root this problem was so sensitive, and the apprehension of some of the key people so imminent, we could not be given all the facts. At first, it seemed that it would only be a matter of days before such facts might be available. Then, the Minister of Justice remarked, outside the House I think, that some of these facts might never be known, and if they were to become known it might not be until some time after 1972. Why he would fix on the date of 1972 one cannot but wonder.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I never said that. I think the question might have been framed that way, but I did not say it.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I am sorry if I have inadvertently misquoted the minister or if the newspaper has misquoted him. I think I am right that he said it was impossible to give the facts at that time and that he did not know when the facts would be available. Since the minister does not disagree with me, I assume he agrees.

This is the first rationale we were treated to in the light of the government's invoking of the War Measures Act. This seemed to have great credibility, and I think it had great credibility for the opposition members of this House in the early days of this crisis, that because of the difficult nature of the situation and the problem of security all the facts could not be told. Even during the debate on the War Measures Act, I questioned that assertion. I did so because I think that is always a very cute argument to allow an authority to do pretty well as it pleases. I think the parliamentary system is not well served by that response! It was not well served even in the public mind, because shortly afterwards the Prime Minister brought forth the second argument in this trilogy by a statement to the effect that the facts were well known.

There was a rehearsal of the kidnappings and other deaths attributed to the FLQ over the past seven years; the capture of a large cache of arms and dynamite; the uncertain situation in Quebec; rather veiled suggestions about some parallel power and the need for some kind of sweeping powers such as these. The story was repeated so that the people would accept it; a neat package of obvious events supposed to prove sufficient to justify the government's action. That has been the response of the Prime Minister and other ministers until recently.

However, Mr. Chairman, in the last day or so the Minister of Agriculture has decided to play his part. Last Thursday night in Manitoba, as reported by the Winnipeg *Tribune* on Friday, he said:

> Federal Agriculture Minister Bud Olson said here Thursday that it would have been impossible for the government to furnish documented proof that the proclamation of the War Measures Act was necessary.

Now, we come to the third stage in this trilogy of explanation and that is, that really it is not a matter of not being able to make the proof public because that would endanger the apprehension or arrest of individuals, nor that the facts are well known, but basically that it is the kind of thing you can never prove anyway. Having heard this third argument, through his answer to me this afternoon, the Prime Minister has supported it as being a cute way to round out this argument.

I hope the country will not be fooled by a later coming to terms with a basic question that has faced this government, both in the implementation of the War Measures Act and the necessity for this legislation. The fact of the matter is that it has not been shown, and this will be of increasing concern to the people of this country, that the War Measures Act regulations and this legislation are what is required in dealing with the situation in Quebec. No one in this House disagrees that steps must be taken to deal with the kind of fear that has led to the sort of paranoia we are witnessing in Quebec. That is the real effect of what has been happening. But whether the answer is that we must extend amazing powers to the police and judiciary in Quebec is something that I do not think has ever been faced by the government. The damage that will result from this legislation, as has already been said by other members of the House, has very serious implications for us.

• (4:20 p.m.)

If one needs further proof of the dangerous leadership that the Prime Minister has given to this country, one has only to look at what the Prime Minister said last Friday night on the CBC program "Encounter" when he answered questions by Mr. Pierre O'Neil. Mr. O'Neil asked the Prime Minister this question:

> Does the polarization of public opinion make it easier or tougher for you to fight separatism?

The Prime Minister replied:

> In my opinion it makes it easier. I like a country where people have to stand up and be counted. I don't like wishy-washy thinking on anything. As much as possible I like people to have clear choices. That's the way I am and that's the way I will remain. Now if Canadians prefer some more wishy-washy type of government which won't fight separatism so hard, they can elect it next time around.

There, in a capsule, we have the essence of the Prime Minister's philosophic approach to one of the most dif-

ficult problems we have ever faced in this country. It was the height of dishonesty for him to suggest on the public media of this country that this kind of problem can easily be resolved by resorting to strong opinions, to disagreements, or to simple answers.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): If this question is so simple I ask why, in God's name, did the government not solve it during the past seven years instead of bringing out this kind of response to what I consider to be the most basic problem this country faces today. The Prime Minister wants people to stand up and be counted. Well, I for one have stood up and been counted.

An hon. Member: You are the only one.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I may be the only one in this House, but not the only one in this country; let no one in this House make that kind of mistake.

An hon. Member: The hon. member does not believe in democracy.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Yes, I believe in democracy. That is why I cast my vote against the measure.

Mr. McGrath: That is why the hon. member stood up.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I will let the people be my judge. I, for one, had no doubts, especially after hearing the Prime Minister suggest that simply by polarizing public opinion we could resolve this most difficult human problem.

What does this legislation do, Mr. Chairman? Notwithstanding the proclamations and window dressing of the Minister of Justice and others, it does pretty much what the War Measures Act does. Basically, it is the same sort of legislation. The chassis of it is the War Measures Act regulations, but its body has been made a bit more attractive. The government has been trying to make the measure more palatable for those who are not willing to go to the heart of the problem, for those who believe that the problem can be dealt with by outlawing membership or support for organizations such as the FLQ, by providing for a detention period not of seven days but of 90 days, and by introducing a retroactive provision involving people who may or may not have been active members of an organization half a dozen years ago. I, for one, feel that this bill will do the country great damage.

I am also disturbed because this will not be the final discussion that we shall have on legislation of this sort. For reasons that are not fully explainable, I think the Prime Minister has set himself on a new course. The defender of civil liberties of ancient days will not be seen acting as he has acted up until now. I say that because of another reply the Prime Minister gave on the program "Encounter" after having been question by Mr. Charles Lynch. Mr. Lynch asked:

> Are you ready for a renewal of the situation that confronted you a month ago?

The Prime Minister replied:

> I think all Parties in the House are, and that's why they've agreed to consider the introduction eventually of something a little short of the War Measures Act,—

We are to have something a little short of the War Measures Act. I find it passing strange that people who greatly treasure their liberties—and within a day or two we shall commemorate the sacrifices of our men in two great world conflicts who fought in order to protect our basic freedoms—should publicly accept a government statute which will inhibit and greatly limit the freedoms and responsibilities that have existed in this country. If this legislation is but a prelude to what the Prime Minister calls "something a little short of the War Measures Act" then I for one will not accept it and will not vote for it.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Supporters of the government have suggested that there has been much fuzzy thinking in this House. There may have been much fuzzy thinking in many parts of the House, but that is what happens when solid information is lacking. I think there has been much fuzzy thinking by government benches with respect to what is required in the law.

Perhaps at the risk of stepping into an area in which I have no professional experience, I may be allowed to read two sections of the Quebec Coroners Act. As I understand it, this law is in force today. This act, brought into force on June 29, 1967, sounds like a fairly inoffensive piece of legislation. Allow me to read section 22, to show what powers are available to the authorities of Quebec in dealing with some of the very real problems that exist:

> 22. When the coroner is of the opinion that a person whose testimony he deems necessary will fail or refuse to be present at the inquest, he may order such person arrested, with or without a warrant, and brought before him within twenty-four hours after his arrest or, if that is impossible, within the shortest possible delay; the coroner may then, in order to ensure his presence at the inquest, require bail of such person or direct that such person be detained in a common gaol.

Mr. Woolliams: Every coroners act includes a clause like that.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I have used the Quebec Coroners Act as an example.

Mr. Woolliams: A death must take place before that section can be operative.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): A death has taken place. I say that the temporary emergency powers bill goes beyond what is needed. The second paragraph of the Coroners Act reads:

> No person shall be so detained for more than eight days without being brought again before the coroner;—

The Coroners Act provides that a man shall not be detained for more than eight days; that goes a good deal farther than the provisions of this legislation.

By citing this act, I am not trying to say that it is the answer to our legislative problems; I will not go into all the ramifications of the legislation, because this has been dealt with by other hon. members. I am simply saying that we have been badly misled into thinking that the only answer for dealing with terrorism, sedition and the sort of violence taking place in Quebec is new and massive legislation. I think government members suffer from some sort of absentmindedness when they forget the kind of federal and provincial legislation exists in this field.

Later we shall have the chance to discuss the ramifications of specific parts of the bill. The clause we are considering contains definitions. According to those definitions almost anyone may be apprehended. For instance, clause 2 (c) reads:

—'statements' includes words spoken or written or recorded electronically or electromagnetically or otherwise, and gestures, signs or other visible representations;—

One wonders at the limits of the definition; there is a possibility of arrest, charge and conviction for almost anyone.

I will not enter into details at this point. I want to say something about what this bill obviously does not do, and what is so desperately important about the problem we face here this afternoon. The Minister of Justice may have indicated, in an answer in this afternoon's question period, how difficult this problem is. One of the basic problems is not even dealt with in this bill. I refer to the degree of the effectiveness or otherwise of police detection and the over-all effectiveness of the courts and prosecution. The different stories that have been presented over the past four or five weeks show that there is some need for farreaching adjustments to the present police work being carried on in the province of Quebec. To try and masquerade that problem by hiding behind this kind of legislation, which gives more farreaching powers to an agency that may not be effective, seems to be compounding the difficulty and not alleviating it.

• (4:30 p.m.)

As pointed out in the popular press, there has been little willingness on the part of this government to consider its own Royal commission report on security. That report clearly sets out that there must be some major changes in our security provisions if the country is not to be endangered. I do not know how serious the government took that report, but by and large it chose to ignore it. The time has now come for the government and Parliament to seriously consider it. I also point out that the security aspect is not covered in this bill.

As pointed out by some members of this House and a number of perceptive commentators in Canada, underlying the problems of Quebec is the serious economic situation in that province, something which is not new. In addition, there are the more recent and grave implications involving unemployment and labour unrest. It is the duty of this government to address itself to those questions with the greatest possible urgency and concern. The Prime Minister sometimes gives the impression in this House that all of these problems are minor in nature and have been more or less dealt with to his satisfaction. They have not been dealt with to the satisfaction of the people of the province of Quebec. Unless the government realizes that fact, they are not going to stamp out the root causes of terrorism and unrest in Quebec or anywhere else. This cannot be done by the use of more repressive legislation. Fourth, we have to realize—

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allotted to him has expired.

Some hon. Members: Continue.

The Deputy Chairman: Does the committee give unanimous consent to the hon. member completing his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I thank the committee. I will try to be reasonably short. Fourth, there was a very great loss of public morale, in the city of Montreal particularly, and in the province of Quebec generally. I find it odd that the Prime Minister never questioned the reason why hon. members from Quebec on both sides of the chamber so willingly voted in support of the steps being taken. His interpretation is that what he is doing is absolutely right. That is his privilege. Looking a little deeper, I suggest that the unanimity on the part of the Quebec members was an indication of the tremendous sense of fear, indeed the word fear is too weak to indicate the panic that existed amongst the people of the city of Montreal and the province of Quebec during the past few weeks.

It could be argued that by adopting these sweeping measures the government has, in effect, restored the loss of public morale. That may be true on the short term, but I fear for the long term. One can only reflect on the extent to which it would be very easy, if indeed acts of terrorism were to recur in one month, three months or three years, for the people of Montreal and the province of Quebec to have a much better understanding of the problem, if they could see that root causes of terror were being removed. The response of massive police and military intervention is immediate and effective, but it carries with it great dangers. Its successful termination of the problem may be shallow.

We must recognize that there has been a substantial body of opinion in the province of Quebec that has been increasingly alienated, not only from the federal system of government which we have in this country, but from the total operation of government. We must not accept that kind of feeling passively or simply react with hostility. We must try to understand and resolve those frustrations in the best interests of the country, not by

appealing to the worst instincts of men, violence, prejudice and hatred, but by appealing to their best instincts, idealism, humanitarianism and participation. If we do that, we will have no just cause to fear. If we place our inner and physical security on repressive legislation, we will do little to deal with the root cause of violence which is what this debate is all about.

How are we going to deal with the problem of violence? Through invoking the War Measures Act regulations and by introducing this bill, the government has indicated that these are the necessary laws to deal with violence. By reading this bill and the War Measures Act regulations, I, not being a lawyer, find that they state what is to be done after the violence has occurred. Are we incapable of responding in some fashion and only able to deal with situations of such proportionate violence after they have occurred? We must address ourselves to the causes and prevention of violence in our country. That is our basic responsibility. If we do not do that, it may appear by the repressive measures that we are taking, and the publicity included in the process, that we are giving some aura of attractiveness and even martyrdom to those who least deserve it. Not only must justice be done, but it must appear to be done so that violence will not occur in our society.

The right hon. member for Prince Albert described one process that would balance the tremendous powers the government feels are necessary with the responsibility it has to the people of this country. The government is again hoping to have these powers accepted through this temporary public order bill. If the government, in good conscience, feels such legislation is necessary, it has a duty to provide some kind of balance to these sweeping powers. We have heard about the possibility of parliamentary committees. Indications are there will be amendments suggesting judicial commissions.

Shortly following World War II there was a national crisis in this country. The then Prime Minister came into possession of a network of intelligence that was being communicated to a foreign nation. There was the great danger that there had developed a very elaborate spy system in this country. At that time the Prime Minister decided to take extraordinary powers to arrest and detain certain individuals. He also appointed the Taschereau and Kellock Commission, which reported to Parliament on an interim basis, and on the termination of the commission made a final report. I am speaking of course about the Gouzenko affair.

The Gouzenko affair was not exactly parallel to the present situation, but it was a national crisis. It was recognized that the government required special and sweeping powers. The Liberal government of that day felt that it was not sufficient to simply say, "We know what is best. We have the facts, but the need for these powers will be difficult to prove; just give us the powers." They said: We shall take these powers but we shall ensure the public welfare by setting up an independent judicial commission which will report to Parliament. It must surely seem reasonable to members of this committee, and to citizens of this country as a whole, that any government which seeks such powers as have been exercised for the past three weeks should also be ready to commit itself to a role of public stewardship, and the only means by which I see this being done is the establishment of a judicial commission of the kind suggested. I wonder whether the government of the day can really believe it is exercising a public trust unless it accepts this kind of discipline and this kind of stewardship on behalf of the people.

• (4:40 p.m.)

[*Translation*]

Mr. De Bané: Mr. Chairman, regarding clause 2, I would have three remarks.

First, concerning clause 2 (d), one might, at first sight, find it purposeless. As a matter of fact, it is not so, for its main purpose, I think, is to make an equivalence in English between "the unlawful association" and "an unlawful association", and in French between "l'association illégale" and "une association illégale". I feel this is deplorable. Indeed, it is because of this clause 2 (d) that, in the remainder of the bill, there will be no further reference to "an unlawful association" but only to "the unlawful association". In other words, this clause is used to conceal, psychologically so to speak, the fact that this bill not only affects the FLQ, as stated earlier, even in the preamble, but also other associations.

Clause 4 says that it is prohibited to be a member of the unlawful association. Well, under clause 2 (d), it should be "an unlawful association", and I will show that in clause 3, it cannot be defined. In fact, each time the expression, "the unlawful association" appears in the bill, it should read instead, "an unlawful association".

Accordingly, I suggest first that clause 2 (d) be simply removed.

My second comment has to do with the logical sequence in the wording of the bill. Clause 2 is entitled, "Interpretation", and it defines some words. Then, I do not see why clause 3 could not be included in clause 2 where phrases such as "communicate", "peace officer", "statements" and "the unlawful association" are defined. I think that clause 3, which gives a definition of "unlawful association" should replace the present clause 2 (d).

I propose to introduce the following change, which is only editorial and does not alter the substance of the wording:

"Unlawful association" means the group of persons or association known as the Front de Libération du Québec, any successor group or successor association thereof, as well as any group or association that advocates the use or force or crime to accomplish or as an aid in accomplishing the same or substantially the same governmental change within Canada as that advocated by the said Front de Libération du Québec.

Again, I propose to substitute the wording of clause 3 to clause 2 (d) and later on I will deal with the substance of clause 3.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, here is my most important comment which refers to clause 2 (b). When you look closely for the purpose of this act, you notice that obviously it is

not to decree heavier sentences. As a matter of fact, sections 60 and 62 of the Criminal Code stipulate that a person who advocates, without using it, the use of force to overthrow the government is liable to 14 years imprisonment, while under the present bill, the person who not only advocates, as stated in the Criminal Code, but effectively engages in the use of force, as stated in clause 4, (g), is liable to imprisonment of only five years.

Therefore, the bill under study obviously does not intend to prescribe heavier sentences. Thus, we must look elsewhere for the characteristics of this bill.

Nonetheless, in my opinion, if this project does present basic features which provide a unique and exceptional character that is reflected in the powers it bestows on policemen under the authority of clause 9(1), to arrest without warrant any suspected persons.

That is the main thing, and I admit it with humbleness and vigour, so true is it that all Canadians agree to punish those who are guilty of the worst crime of all, to threaten this freedom of ours.

• (4:50 p.m.)

So the argument is elsewhere; the danger of clause 9(1) is to arrest innocents on mere suspicion.

You may answer that this misfortune is inevitable. I then shall answer: let us make it a little less inevitable. According to section 2 of the Criminal Code the expression "peace officer" includes:

(a) a mayor, warden, reeve, sheriff, deputy sheriff, sheriff's officer and justice of the peace;

(b) a warden, deputy warden, instructor, keeper, gaoler, guard and any other officer or permanent employee of a prison.

(c) a police officer, police constable, bailiff, constable or other person employed for the preservation and maintenance of the public peace or for the service or execution of civil process;

Many of these people do not come under police authority at all, and, in this specific instance, under the Quebec Police Act. The implication is that those many individuals will be empowered to make arrests on grounds of mere suspicion under clause 9(1) and keep people in jail up to seven days, or up to three days without the consent of the Attorney General who, evidently, cannot personally study each prisoner's file.

All the classes of persons I have just enumerated are peace officers, as defined in clause 2. They will be empowered, under clause 9(1), to arrest people because of mere suspicion and this without being liable to any suits for damages. The fact that arrest *per se* is a denial of justice is borne out by the Criminal Code's stipulation that arrest without warrant cannot be resorted to in the field of what are called, in our jargon, "criminal offenses". As a matter of fact, it can be used only if a person is caught red handed. Then, to arrest without warrant, the police must see the person really committing the offence. Only in the matter of crimes, he may arrest without warrant if he has reasonable and probable grounds, according to Section 435 of the Criminal Code.

Now, I suggest that precisely because it is a law of exception, this power should not be granted to an officer of the peace, under subclause (1) of clause 9, that is the power to make an arrest without warrant merely on suspicion. Too many people fall in this category.

Here is an example out of a thousand: The mayor of a small municipality is suspecting three bearded men who have just arrived. He will be able to put them under arrest merely on this suspicion.

Here is another example: During a municipal election campaign, the mayor suspects that his opponent wants to use "telegraphers", according to the familiar term, meaning impersonators on election day. He could then under such suspicion and without any recourse, under clause 9(1) and under one subclause in clause 4, subclause (g) in particular, arrest and detain his opponent during the last three days of the campaign.

Thus, honest people cannot help thinking that Dr. Bellemarre's arrest at the last municipal elections in Montreal was motivated by such considerations.

I therefore conclude as follows. I move that clause 2(b) be rewritten so as to limit this power of arrest without warrant—which is one of the main points of this legislation—to the limited classes of persons specified in the orders in council of the Governor General or of a Lieutenant Governor in council.

Finally, I remind the House that peace officers who for weeks have prevented some prisoners from seeing their lawyers—a right which is recognized in the Canadian Bill of Rights and which is not abrogated by the invocation of the War Measures Act—may have violated sections 408 and 107 of the Criminal Code.

In short, I wish to propose three amendments. First, subclause (*d*) should be struck out. In my view, it changes the whole aspect of this bill in which the words "unlawful association" are often repeated. Under that subclause those words cannot be used. Second, there is no logical order in the bill. In clause 2, "unlawful association" should be defined. Third, I propose that the definition of "peace officer" in subclause (*b*) of clause 2 be restricted to a category of persons, the list of which to be proclaimed by an order of the governor in council or the lieutenant-governors in council.

This is all I have to say about clause 2, Mr. Chairman.

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please, I would draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that if he wishes to propose his amendments at this stage, it must be done in writing so that the chair may get acquainted with the precise contents.

Mr. De Bané: I can submit them immediately, Mr. Chairman.

[*English*]

The Deputy Chairman: Was the hon. member for Timiskaming rising for the purpose of participating in the debate?

Mr. Peters: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The Deputy Chairman: The chair will recognize the hon. member for Timiskaming while looking at the amendments that have been put to the committee.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, I have been very concerned, as I am sure have other Canadians, over the situation that has developed in the last month in our nation and how the government reacted to the events in the province of Quebec. I think everyone would agree that as the picture in the province of Quebec unfolds, less and less light is being shed and more and more confusion is being created about what the government knew to warrant such sweeping powers as those in the War Measures Act being invoked.

I have had the opportunity of reading the newspaper report of the evidence given by Lortie at the inquest, and the whole thing sounds to me very much like a play. Everything had been rehearsed, and more was being left unsaid than was actually said. I think as more people take the opportunity of studying the evidence that is adduced, they will come to the conclusion that the longer the matter is before us the less likelihood there will be for thinking Members of Parliament to consider extending the terms of this type of legislation in a situation that obviously does not warrant the consideration it previously received.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. In order to permit the House to proceed to the consideration of private members' business, it is my duty to leave the Chair.

Progress reported.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants (Mr. Forrestal), the Canadian economy; the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow), regional economic expansion; the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau) manpower.

It being five o'clock p.m. the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business as listed on today's Order Paper, namely notices of motions, public bills.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

CHANGE IN OPPOSITION ALLOTTED DAY

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think it is generally known that there is mutual agreement to have our opposition allotted day on Thursday rather than tomorrow. However, in order that the Order Paper may reflect this agreement, I think something has to be said about it in the House. In fact, I think it is necessary for a minister of the Crown to withdraw the designation of Tuesday as an allotted day and make a new designation for Thursday. Perhaps the Minister of Justice will oblige.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre is perfectly correct. Discussions have been held, and if the House agrees we would designate tomorrow to continue the present debate on Bill C-181, if the debate is not concluded by ten o'clock this evening, to be followed, if debate is concluded tomorrow on Bill C-181, by Bill C-182, an act to provide for the examination, publication and scrutiny of regulations and other statutory instruments, which is also under the name of the Minister of Justice. The rest of the business to follow will be that originally indicated by the Government House Leader.

On Wednesday the House will not sit, and Thursday will be designated as an opposition day, the subject of which is at the option of the members of the New Democratic Party.

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions along these lines and, while we would like to see this debate concluded tonight, I understand the arrangements are made in the event it does not. We concur in them.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): The House has been informed of the work program for the rest of the week. I do not think there is need to ask for agreement unless somebody else wants to comment. I will now call Private Members' Business.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): If there is no disagreement, it is agreed.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): You are perfectly right, Mr. Speaker, it is agreed. That is the way it is.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): I don't need to ask if the House is agreeable, but is there agreement to the suggestion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' NOTICES OF MOTIONS

CREDIT RECORDS

REQUEST FOR MEASURE TO PROTECT PRIVACY

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of introducing legislation to protect the privacy of every person against the improper disclosure of credit rating records and to protect the reputation of every person against misinformation contained in such records.

He said: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I hope you will pay attention to the fact that five minutes of private mem-

bers' hour today have been taken up with government business, and I hope that provision will be made today to make up for that lost time because this is a very important motion. I know that many members of the House would like to participate in this debate. I know a number of hon. members opposite, including the hon. member for Ottawa West (Mr. Francis), are very anxious to participate in it. I know it is a subject upon which we are all in agreement. I know they are just as anxious as I am to have the government bring down legislation to protect the consumer.

I am sorry the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) is not present because I was going to quote him as an authority on the need for protection of privacy. At the outset, I want to make it clear that I shall not take up all the time allotted to me because I believe there is agreement that a decision should be taken on the motion. All my motion asks is that the government give consideration to the advisability of introducing legislation. As I say, I know most hon. members are just as anxious as I am to have the government do that.

The Minister of Justice, in a very interesting paper which I am sure all hon. members have read, delivered at a seminar at Queen's University in May of this year, said:

> The erosion of privacy is the beginning of the end of freedom.

He also said in the same paper:

> The orbit of privacy will be an ever-shrinking one, but the need for privacy will become more paramount than ever. The law must ensure that the right to privacy remains sacrosanct.

I believe that this is a very serious matter. I think that 1984 is almost here. In this age of computers and data banks the citizens of Canada have no protection against false and misleading information which is often fed into computer banks and data processing centres—

Mr. Gibson: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. McGrath: No, I will not permit an interruption from the hon. gentleman who can make a speech on his own time.

Mr. Gibson: I just want to a ask a question.

Mr. McGrath: I am sure that the hon. member, who is so anxious to interrupt me, has never had this problem because he was brought into this world with a silver spoon in his mouth and he doesn't know what we are talking about. But, if he does, perhaps he will favour us with a contribution to the debate before the hour is over.

There is a growing concern in this country over the question of the invasion of privacy, particularly with regard to commercial reporting agencies which gather information from peoples neighbours and friends, and sometimes from competitors, in order to report on individuals to credit card plans, to industries, to retailers, to banks, and in many cases to government agencies. When I think of the information, stored by computers of all sorts, on personal matters I just wonder whether the government or the private sector is going to win the race to 1984, which I believe is almost here.

I can accept the existence, indeed the need, for these reporting agencies. I believe that in many instances they perform a very useful and necessary function in helping to facilitate the business and commerce of the country, and in helping to avoid bad debts. However, what I object to is the fact that these agencies are allowed to function in a completely unregulated fashion. The time has come when we should give consideration to bringing in legislation which would make it necessary for these reporting agencies to apply for federal licences and to operate under the terms of those licences.

I know that hon. members will agree that this is an area of growing concern. It is one we read a great deal about. Indeed, many of us are becoming growingly concerned over the widespread use of computers and the techniques that are being developed to assimilate information about every single one of us, and about our private acts. While individuals may have partial rights to checking the information in these information banks, as legislators it is incumbent on us to ensure that the individual has complete rights in this particular regard. Most Canadians frequently voice a claim to the right to privacy as a basic right in our society. If we were to ask for 20 definitions of what we understood by that right to privacy perhaps we might come up with 20 different definitions. However, I am sure we would all be in agreement on one thing, the right of the individual to have his reputation protected from unscrupulous credit reporting, reporting against which he has no redress.

It is an awesome thing to consider that in this computer age with techniques so sophisticated that computers can store every minute detail of every piece of information. Already in California, a new model laser has been developed which is capable of providing 645 million items of data on a single square inch of magnetic tape. This means that this technique could efficiently store data in respect of every single citizen of Canada. Robert Merton, in his book "Social Theory and Social Structure" said:

• (5:10 p.m.)

> Privacy is not merely a personal predilection; it is an important functional requirement for the effective operation of social structure. Social systems must provide for a portion of the self which is kept apart, immune from social surveillance.

We must act now, I believe, to protect the individual whose rights and whose reputation could and, in many instances, often are taken away by false and misleading information without the individual concerned having any redress whatsoever. When we consider the enormity of this at a time when we are approaching what has been termed a cashless society, a society of credit cards, data information and computerized systems, then obviously the need exists for action to be taken soon.

I know hon. members will raise the question of jurisdiction. I know some hon. members who are very anxious to participate in this debate, and who are anxious to see the resolution brought to a conclusion by having a vote on it, will raise the problem of jurisdiction and the constitutional limitations placed upon Parliament. I would point out, however, that the Parliament of Canada has already acted in many

areas by bringing in legislation which requires consumer protection from unjust, false credit reports. For example, the Small Loans Act, the Bank Act, and indeed some provisions of the Income Tax Act come to mind. But apart altogether from these specific areas in which the government already has acted in a legislative way, recognizing the rights of the provinces in the area of proposed changes, what rights do I as a Canadian living in the province of Newfoundland enjoy if that province has no legislation in respect of credit agencies. In the province of Ontario there may be such legislation or, if not, it certainly is contemplated. But I would not enjoy the protection of the Ontario legislation if I did not live in that province.

For this reason, I believe as a federal Parliament we have a responsibility to act in this particular area. I believe there are many and ample constitutional precedents for doing so. Mr. Speaker, I know hon. members are becoming impatient to make their contribution. Before I conclude, however, I should like to refer hon. members to recommendation No. 18 of the Special Joint Committee on Consumer Credit. This committee did not make many very specific recommendations, but one specific recommendation it made concerned the setting up of a federal-provincial committee on consumer credit. Here, surely, the need for such a committee is manifest because the federal government must take the responsibility of protecting Canadians from being victimized by these computer banks, these data processing agencies and credit agencies, which go around collecting this information and selling it in many cases to the highest bidder. In many cases these agencies destroy the reputations of individuals involved without their ever having had any knowledge of it. Mr. Speaker, I commend this motion to members of the House. I ask that they support it and allow it to come to a vote.

Mr. Colin D. Gibson (Hamilton-Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, may I say very briefly that if there are any silver spoons lying around this chamber, I would be very glad if someone would give one to me. They are rather scarce so far as I can tell. My hon. friend raises a very interesting problem, but I submit there is really no substance to his motion. I do not say that disparagingly because I think it is a provocative motion and a subject matter into which we should all be looking, along with the subject of wiretapping, eavesdropping and the general problems created by the invasion of privacy. However, I question whether in law there is actually a specific right to privacy. We have invasions by the media, by the telephone, and by all types of people who interfere with our lives to some extent. It is a question of just where the line should be drawn. I submit it would be very easy for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) to bring in very stiff regulations and restraints against improper disclosure of credit information, but how does one enforce these things? Would our time as parliamentarians not be better spent in seeking...

Mr. McGrath: Licensing.

Mr. Gibson: Please; do you want to ask a question?

[Mr. McGrath.]

Mr. McGrath: I was answering your question.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. I remind both hon. members that they might address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for taking up the hon. member's time. I am sure he is anxious to proceed.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Speaker, I am interested in proceeding, but I question the value of bringing in a lot of words which would look great in print, and probably help win a few votes, but which would do little to alleviate the situation until technology has advanced sufficiently to take care of these breaches of which my hon. friend complains. I have not heard any evidence from my learned friend concerning a number of flagrant breaches or abuses of these credit reports. There does not seem to be any mass outcry from anyone. I do not know whether my friend has received letters of complaint from Canadian citizens. I have had none, and I have heard of none having been received by members either on my side of the House or on his side of the House.

With great respect, may I say that I think the hon. member is really drumming up an issue which does not exist as an enforceable matter. We could pass regulations and make long impassioned speeches about the right to privacy which is not inscribed in any textbook on common law or in any statute. What is the right to privacy? There are the offences under trespass, assault, libel or slander. I really submit the law on libel and slander is probably the most efficient law by which to approach these wrongs. If it is possible to trace the person who maliciously or unfairly promoted an improper credit rating, there is action in the courts. The courts will find the damages. I say, leave it to a jury. A jury is composed of men who are very fair in sizing up the parties and in considering the merits of a situation. The jury would give consideration to the specific type of abuse to which my friend refers.

I suggest that basically the subject matter would be found to come within the purview of civil rights rather than credit and security regulations and, therefore, would come under the law of libel or slander rather than under any special legislation on credit which would normally come within the provincial sphere. If the House should find that the matter should be referred to a committee for consideration, I suggest that it be dealt with not in isolation but in the broader context of abuses by way of eavesdropping, wiretapping and the other so-called breaches of privacy, upon which I think legislation is needed.

• (5:20 p.m.)

The individual needs to have protection from abuses of this type, and the whole trend of our modern living is an attempt to catch up with the tremendous technological advances made by science. We have computers and we are worried in Canada today about whether we have control over our sources of information as a result of foreign computer industries entering the country. We

have to look at these problems in the context of a changing society, the post industrial era.

I submit that my hon. friend's motion has a lot of merit because it stimulates thought. I do not criticize him for it at all. I think it is great that we have this kind of discussion and research, and we should plod on with it. However, I would rather have seen some constructive ideas advanced regarding how he would propose to enforce the regulations. Does he envisage a sort of control board of counter-detective agencies or counter-electronic devices checking on officials? We might end up in a quagmire of electronic spying wars. This may be what it will come to, but I hope it never does. I hope that our teaching process will somehow develop the kind of Canadian most of us know, the kind of person who does not believe in snooping and backhanded methods. We will get there eventually, but we are certainly a long way from being able to control this situation.

My hon. friend did not specify what committee would deal with this matter if it ever gets to a committee. The Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs dealt with the problem of wire tapping and eavesdropping. In spite of having had the Bell Telephone Company before it, and having had a demonstration of the type of electronic eavesdropping devices and wire tapping devices that are used, no conclusive legislation has been advanced to date.

We are hoping that the government, with the research staff it has available and, I hope, with its friendly relationship with the computer industry, will be able to find some practical answers. But then, we still have the unanswered question of enforcement. Will this be left in the hands of the police force or will it be left to the Attorney General? There are advantages one way and the other.

If my hon. friend's motion were to succeed, what department of government would undertake the administration of this measure? What sort of tribunal would be set up to enforce it? What sort of administrative group would work under the agency? What sort of cost would be involved? I submit that you would perhaps inhibit the value of having any creditable reports, and you would end up with an expense that would be positive but a result that would be negative. For those reasons, I am opposing the motion.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): The hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Gibson) who just finished made a typical speech, the kind he usually makes. Whenever a subject is discussed or a proposal made that something be done to alleviate the difficulties of ordinary citizens, one can be certain that the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth, if he is in the House, will rise, and in his own inimitable way, will defend the rights of those who are privileged to exploit those who are being mistreated in our society.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Orlikow: I wonder if the hon. member has followed the work of his own government.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth is rising on a question of privilege.

Mr. Gibson: I suggest that this is the type of second rate, lowbrow, personal insinuation—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Orlikow: I wonder if the hon. member has followed the work of his own government? Has he gone back to the studies and reports of the Joint Committee on Consumer Credit, the co-chairman of which was the present Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford)? I wonder whether the hon. member has followed the work of the government department concerned with credit problems. I do not have my files with me today but the minister has spoken on more than one occasion, as have other members, about the need to protect the rights of ordinary citizens. I suppose the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth, who was born with a silver spoon in his mouth, does not have to worry about having to live on credit. He is in that privileged 1 per cent of the population that does not. But the rest of the people of Canada have to worry about buying a house with a mortgage, about buying a refrigerator, a stove, a car or television set on credit; very few people in Canada, even people in the middle and upper income brackets, can pay cash.

If they do not pay cash, somebody has to do a review of their credit. One cannot blame the company which is making the sale for wanting to get some assurance that the person who wants to make the purchase will meet his payments. So retailers, mortgage companies, carry out credit checks on people who want to make purchases, and I do not fault them for that. How do they do it? We know something about that. A lot of studies have been carried out about it. The hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth obviously has not read any of them because he is not interested, but many studies have been made and the information is pretty clear. Retailers go to other retailers, as they should, to find out if the person who wants to make a purchase and who wants credit has been paying his bills.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth is rising again on a question of privilege.

Mr. Gibson: The hon. member has implied that I did not attend committee meetings. I attended them all, but I do not recall one occasion on which he was there, and if he was, he has not made any contribution whatsoever.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I think hon. members would make a better contribution to this debate if they tried to stay on the subject matter rather than on such ancillary matters as committee meetings.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not think the hon. gentleman should be allowed to take up the limited time in this debate on pseudo questions of privilege.

Mr. Orlikow: I am discussing the question which is down for debate. May I say, for the information of the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth that I was on that committee only in the years before the member came to this House. When he says I was not there; that is the kind of stupid thing which I would expect from the hon. member. It may be the hon. member was there. If he was there, he certainly sat there with closed ears because he absorbed nothing.

I will now come back to the problem of the motion which is under discussion. What the hon. member who moved the motion is saying is that the person who wants credit should be told—I presume, and I listened to him very carefully—about the adverse things which may be said about him by certain people. That is all that is being proposed. I say that retailers and other people who are making sales go to other retailers for information. They also go to neighbours and to supposed friends. Let us suppose the neighbour does not like the person who wants credit and says that that person has a reputation for being drunk, for moving too frequently or for living with somebody who is not his wife. All these are examples which have been documented again and again in newspaper stories in every part of Canada. That information goes on the credit report, and a company decides that it will not extend credit to the person who wants to make a purchase because of these allegations.

• (5:30 p.m.)

The hon. member makes the ridiculous suggestion that one can go to court and sue. Of course one can, if one knows the misdemeanour, the mistake or the allegation made against the person. But if it sits in the credit file, unsupported and unknown, how is the person who has been adversely affected by misinformation to go to court? Of course he cannot, and the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Gibson) knows that; he is not stupid. But he does not want them to have the protection which would be given under this proposal. It is as simple as that. He is fronting, as he so often does, for the interests that do not want that kind of disclosure.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

An hon. Member: That is unadulterated nonsense.

Mr. Orlikow: The hon. member has already spoken, and I enjoyed his remarks. The record tomorrow will prove how ridiculous he is. If one can be serious with that member, Mr. Speaker—and that is difficult—I tell him that before he speaks out criticizing a member of the opposition, he should take a look at what his government and ministers are proposing. If he did that, he would see that what is proposed in this motion is four square with what the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is moving toward, and that is that we have more and more disclosure of information for the consumer and that the consumer be given the protection which he has not had in our society all these years.

If the hon. member would listen to his own minister and follow the course which the minister is moving toward, he would not attack members of the opposition who are in fact, by making a proposal like this, endorsing and supporting the views so frequently expressed by the minister. Mr. Speaker, I close by saying to the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth that with friends like him, the minister does not need enemies.

Mr. Douglas A. Hogarth (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, this is the first opportunity I have had this session to speak in private members' hour. It appears to me that of all the rules of the House which require reform, private members' hour should be looked into first. It must appear to be a hopeless task to the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) to put before the House a resolution with the validity of this one, knowing that the whole matter must be considered within one hour with only a remote hope that the government will ever adopt it. Only in that remote hope is there any value at all in putting forward this resolution.

Those of us with bills which have been discussed in private members' hour have given a great deal of thought to reforming the rules of the House, perhaps by the creation of a committee on ways and means or some of the many other methods available, so that this hour, with the good ideas so often projected in it, should have some meaning and purport.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hogarth: I am equally concerned that both members opposite have made an attack upon our friend, the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Gibson). I do not think that those who suggest they have been born in poverty—and I do not think there is much poverty among them—should attack a person because from birth he has been more fortunate. I have always found the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth to be most concerned with people from all walks of life, regardless of his own background.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hogarth: I am surprised that the hon. member for St. John's East did not present this motion in bill form. I find the motion to be extremely restrictive. It provides that the government should consider the advisability of introducing legislation to protect the privacy of every person against the improper disclosure of credit rating records and to protect the reputation of every person against any misinformation contained in such records. First of all, there is no suggestion by the hon. member for St. John's East that a person cannot be investigated without his knowledge, and it appears to me that this is where a great deal of the evil arises out of records of this nature. When a person is investigated without his knowl-

edge, hearsay evidence creeps into such a report, he is never presented with a copy of it, and for reasons never made known to him his contractual ability is affected. I think that, per se, is grossly unfair.

More and more we are coming to consider the protection of the privacy of the individual, making it the subject matter of modern legislation. More and more we are aware of the fantastic and overwhelming power of not only government but of bodies corporate acting in the commercial field within our society. Certainly, last year in the Justice Committee we spent a great deal of time on the invasion of privacy by electronic devices. Many provincial governments have passed legislation dealing with the subject. It is interesting to note from the Speech from the Throne that we can anticipate legislation along that line from this government.

In conjunction with this matter I would like to consider the problems pertaining to the storage of information about the person, the ability of machines to consolidate tremendous amounts of information about one person or many persons and to make it readily available throughout the world. Control of these machines and the organizations behind them must be a matter of great concern. One frightful aspect of this which is in the minds of us all is that of "Big Brother". As George Orwell wrote in "1984", the concept of government completely overshadows the privacy and right of the individual. The prospect of international corporations and multiconglomerate corporations having access to these data banks and the like which could so affect the individual in his daily life, is rather frightening. I think it is something with which we are concerned now and must be concerned about in the future.

As I have suggested, this resolution is relatively narrow in that it deals only with a very minor problem in relation to the whole issue. I have doubts about several aspects of the resolution. First of all, it has been suggested that it is a question that should properly be put in the hands of the federal government from a constitutional point of view. Certainly, it might be said to come within banks and banking, but it would not affect the many financial institutions which are subject only to the laws of the provinces in which they operate. Nor would it affect protective agencies which are under the law of the provinces and which so often find the information about which the hon. member complains.

It is certainly questionable whether it applies to the criminal law, though it is probably closer to that than any other aspect of the powers of the government of Canada. In that respect I am inclined to the view that it is far closer to provincial powers than to the Constitution. For my part, I am inclined to suggest that a resolution of this nature be left with the provincial government. In any event, the revelation of the material contemplated in the resolution might well be libellous and actionable if the motives of the person releasing it were not bona fide under the circumstances. I think it would be improper, under certain circumstances, to release such information even if it were the truth.

There are many circumstances which arise whereupon the disclosure of such information is very valuable to citizens of the community. For instance, somebody in the ordinary process of collecting judgment in the courts who wished to examine the ability of a judgment debtor to pay, would find this information of value, and surely it should be made available to the judgment creditor. I can think of many other situations that might arise which would limit this resolution in its present context.

Mr. Jack Cullen (Sarnia-Lambton): Mr. Speaker, I too have sympathy for the hon. member's notice of motion and I commend him for bringing it forward. It is not too often that I disagree with the conclusions of the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Gibson), but in this instance I am at odds with some of them. That is one of the great things about being Liberals; we are not afraid to disagree among ourselves.

• (5:40 p.m.)

I think the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow) might have said more on this motion instead of attacking an hon. member of this House. I suppose that since he is a member of one of the smaller opposition parties in the House, he and his group are seldom subject to criticism. As a result, they have become unduly sensitive. That has been demonstrated by the leadership contest, so called, that has taken place and powder puff fights that have taken place among leaders of that party.

The hon. member who introduced the notice of motion has not suggested that it is the be-all and end-all of this matter. I think he was probably right in not introducing a bill and in bringing this matter forward in the form of notice of motion. For the first time I have heard that hon. member admit that he does not have all the answers. That is quite right. I think he suggested that the problems raised by the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth ought to be given careful scrutiny, and that they should be embodied in a government bill.

I have found, in talking to former clients of mine, that many of them have experienced difficulty in establishing a good credit rating or any credit rating. They see nothing wrong with someone inquiring about their credit background and very often say to the inquirer, "Go and speak to my bank manager." Often they mention someone with whom they have done business.

The notice of motion we are considering is carefully worded. The hon. member suggests that the government should consider the advisability of introducing legislation to protect the privacy of every person against the improper disclosure of credit rating records. That is the part that appeals to me. Very often an individual with a poor credit rating is unaware of his rating. Very often his poor credit rating results from an incident that took place when he was a young man and new in business. Perhaps then he was unable to pay a bill. That incident shows up on his credit rating and he may be unaware of it.

The invidious aspect of this is that he has no opportunity to defend himself when applying for credit. The bank may say to him, "We are sorry but we cannot grant you credit," and the applicant is not in a position to defend his record. Then the applicant begins to wonder if the debt he could not pay some years ago has more weight than he suspected on his credit record. He may wonder what the reason is for his poor credit rating. Nevertheless, the information is not made available to him; it is given only to the individual seeking information about his credit rating.

Often, when clients come to me and say, "Apparently I have a bad credit rating," the first thing I say is, "Do you deserve a poor credit rating? Do you have debts?" On the other hand, a person may early in his career have been sued, and as soon as action is instituted against the man, the credit bureau immediately takes cognizance of the fact. What the man's credit record does not show is whether he had a good defence to the action. If he is sued for a debt, that fact automatically is included in his credit record. What is not indicated, very often, is how the matter was resolved before the courts. Very often a person applying for credit may feel that he had a bona fide defence to the court action.

There are many instances in which an individual has been asked to defend an action wherein he is sued in respect of goods he has bought on credit. He may have bought the goods and signed a promissory note, and on refusing to pay on the promissory note because the goods were defective or not delivered, he is sued. The court will say to him that his defence is not a good defence in view of the promissory note; that his claim or counterclaim must be directed against the establishment which sold him the goods, but so far as the promissory note is concerned he owes the money and must pay.

Sometimes an individual in that situation will thumb his nose at his creditors, or perhaps leave the community. I remember one such incident. The individual returned two years later. The finance company sued him. By way of defence we alleged that the kind of interest the finance company was trying to collect was unconscionable. We were successful in our defence against the interest claim of the finance company. All too often such companies claim an usurious amount of interest on debt.

Another situation in which an individual is named as a defendant in a court action arises in the following manner. A person has bought a home, placed a first mortgage on the home and has paid regularly, say for five, six or seven years, on that mortgage. Then he has sold the house. The individual who has bought the house from him has made regular payments for a considerable time, then he has suddenly gone into default, possibly because of unemployment or other reasons. He has not kept up the payments. In that case the mortgagor sues, not only the individual who presently owns the home and who is responsible for making the payments but also the first owner because the name of the first owner is on the convenant under the terms of the mortgage. That person, of course, has a perfectly good defence; he has paid his money. Surely, therefore, his credit rating should not suffer.

Because an individual has no opportunity to defend his credit rating, because he has no way of knowing whether he deserves his rating or not, I support the motion of the hon. member. It is not complete in its proposals. The hon. member does not say it is. It lacks many, many things. The hon. member is only suggesting that, in the opinion of this House, the government should consider the advisability of introducing—here I would add the adjective "appropriate"—legislation to protect the privacy of every person against the improper disclosure of credit rating records. Therefore, I support the motion of the hon. member, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Jacques Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): Mr. Speaker, I should like first to commend the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) for introducing this motion which I think is quite necessary.

The hon. member is not the first one to object to the disclosure of facts concerning the private life of individuals. I remember reading, a few years ago, a book written by an American, Vance Packard, entitled *Naked Society*, where the activities of American credit bureaux were described in detail and which contained several cases where the life of an individual had been publicly revealed and scrutinized by those agencies.

Personally, for the last four years I have been closly associated with a large insurance company. I have had the opportunity to look at credit reports and I have often noticed, with disgust, that some of those credit reports contained information which had nothing to do with the financial situation of the persons involved. I read, in those credit reports, sentences such as these: "This individual is often intoxicated. He is a shady character and goes with several women."

I would say that those famous little pink reports often contain similar information and that they are handed to dealers, or any person who is in business and who regularly requests information of this kind from the credit bureau, information which have absolutely nothing to do with the financial situation, the steadiness and solvency of the individual involved.

Those are the reasons why I think the member for St. John's East is quite right in presenting his motion and I will support it.

I would like to offer two constructive solutions along this line, mainly intended for the Minister of Consumers and Corporate Affairs (Mr. Basford) whom I invite to introduce soon in the House a piece of legislation aimed at protecting individual privacy.

This legislation should at least have two characteristics. First, a copy of any credit record should be sent to the individual concerned. I see no reason why a bill should not be submitted to the House including such a

provision and ensuring that the individual who has been inquired upon be sent a copy of the report. If this report is true, what is wrong with letting the individual involved having a copy of it? The individual is supposed to know the content of the report. Why not let him know the content of a report that will be circulated on request to several financial organizations?

And now my second recommendation: the individual receiving a copy of his report should be entitled to request the deletion of erroneous information contained in it.

I myself have checked the contents of certain reports with the people concerned. They contain, for unknown reasons, information that is entirely false, that was collected by the agent entrusted with the inquiry who could question neighbours, the neighbourhood grocer on the habits of the person concerned. Still, that information is in the report and often gives a distorted picture of the life of the individual.

To my mind, when we deal with facts and not opinions, and the facts are erroneous, on receiving copy of such a report, the individual should be able to have the false information deleted.

I feel, it might be well to introduce a bill containing far more details than those I have just mentioned. Such a bill would surely please the hon. member for St. John's East as much as me.

In closing, I merely wish to add that I am very pleased with the initiative taken by the hon. member for St. John's East, and were the government to introduce such a bill, I would be the first to support it.

• (5:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Robert P. Kaplan (Don Valley): Mr. Speaker, I rise to participate in this debate, not only because it is five minutes to six o'clock but because of an observation made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow). I support the principle of this resolution. Measures should be introduced which would adequately ensure that the reputation of individuals concerned is properly protected. However, I do not agree with the way in which the resolution is put forward, "to protect the privacy of every person". It is not specific enough. I object to the suggestion of the hon. member for Winnipeg North that my colleague, the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth (Mr. Gibson), raised this as a class objection. Measures of this sort make no difference to two classes of people, the very rich and the very poor, because they do not have to resort to credit. However, to most of us, the average Canadian, credit is extremely important.

I agree with the point raised by the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. McGrath) that we are becoming a cashless society. It is apparent that credit is very important. It is desirable that we become a cashless society. However, this can only be accomplished by great technological advances, improved communication and advanced merchandising techniques. When these goals are attained, it will be desirable for our society to use them. A cashless society will depend upon those who extend credit having ready access to the records of individuals who wish to buy from them. If dependable information is to be available, some sort of communications system will have to be devised whereby this information can be readily produced.

This brings us to the problem raised by the hon. member for St. John's East. It is not only in the interest of the purchaser, or borrower, that credit information be available. The vendor is just as anxious to have an opportunity to make a sale, but he must know the accurate and truthful credit position of his customer. I do not think there is any class factor involved in this question. I do not regard it as one in which sellers are pitted against producers. There is a common interest in all society that accurate information be available and that it can be verified.

I was impressed by some of the suggestions made, including that of the hon. member who proposed the resolution, that the important thing is not that this information be unavailable to the marketplace, people who want to see goods or extend credit, but that the information be available in a ready way to a person who wants to take advantage of his credit rating to buy or borrow. If this information is available to him, he can periodically check to see if it is accurate.

If we are to move into a cashless society, it is obvious that this sort of information must be available to all parties. For this reason I am pleased to support the idea behind the resolution. I congratulate the hon. member for having introduced it and in being fortunate enough to have it presented to the House at this time. I appreciate the discussion that has taken place. I have no doubt that it will be drawn to the attention of the government. Anything of value that is said this afternoon will be taken into consideration when legislation is being considered or introduced. I regret that the hon. member did not spell out in more detail the manner in which privacy could be protected. Nevertheless, our entry into the cashless society—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. The hour for the consideration of private members' business having expired, the House will revert to the business which was interrupted at five o'clock.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PUBLIC ORDER (TEMPORARY MEASURES) ACT, 1970

PROVISION OF EMERGENCY POWERS FOR PRESERVATION OF PUBLIC ORDER

The House resumed consideration in committee of Bill C-181, to provide temporary emergency powers for the preservation of public order in Canada—Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)—Mr. Honey in the chair.

At six o'clock the committee took recess.

Public Order Act, 1970

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. Peters: Before the committee rose, Mr. Chairman, I was saying that we have now had an opportunity to look at some of the reasons behind this bill.

One of the recent developments is the inquest which has just taken place in Montreal. As one follows the evidence, one appreciates the fact that only the information the prosecutor wishes to bring out is brought out during the proceedings. So the public is still left with an incomplete picture, despite the testimony of Bernard Lortie and Mrs. Rose. Nevertheless, reading the newspaper reports of this testimony one would be hard pressed, in my opinion, to find anything to be particularly scared of, though certain people were exercising a less than normal attitude toward human life in their treatment of individuals.

There is no indication that this was a great conspiracy, or part of a great conspiracy. The inquest proceedings showed that three of those directly concerned were down in Texas with the mother of two of them. They heard about the Cross kidnapping and then drove night and day to get back to Canada. They returned because they felt the others had kidnapped the wrong man, that they had no chance of securing the release of prisoners in accordance, I presume, with an FLQ decision made at a higher than cell level, that nothing could be expected from the kidnapping of Cross, a British diplomat, and that they would have to lay their hands on a political figure from Quebec. So they went out and captured Mr. Laporte.

The evidence at the inquest suggests that these were young people who acted on the spur of the moment, without planning. They took Mr. Laporte to a house where they had food enough for only one day. Indeed, they had to borrow from Mr. Laporte sufficient money for food for the next several days. This does not look like a grand conspiracy to me. It is more like a bunch of punks hell-bent on making a name for themselves in a very bad and nasty way. The testimony indicates that these young people made their decision on the way back. They were very surprised at the choice of victim for the other kidnapping, which was also an amateurish job.

Mr. Boulanger: May I ask the hon. member a question? The hon. member said this was decided at the last minute. Did he not read in the report that they had made up their minds, when they were at the Maison des Pêcheurs, to kidnap someone?

Mr. Peters: There is an indication that this is not the only kidnapping which has taken place in the past year.

An hon. Member: Or the only murder.

Mr. Peters: I suppose there were 50 or 75 murders. It is interesting that in Vancouver there are between 25 and 30 murders a year, most of which are not solved. There are many murders in Montreal, I am sure, because of the size of the city. Montreal to many of us is just a city to visit, but we must not forget that it is a very large city with some two millions inhabitants, and that murder is not unusual there. Four or five attempts, with plans or arrangements, had been made to kidnap other people. I believe the kidnapping of Mr. Laporte was probably more accidental than the evidence at the inquest would lead us to assume. I give some credit to the rumour, and it is only a rumour, that it was the Postmaster General whom they intended to capture and that Mr. Laporte was captured only as a substitute. This makes sense, in terms of some of the things which were said at the inquest. It appears to me to have been a very amateurish job.

There is no doubt that there is a problem with these young people. There is a problem in every country of the world with young people today. But to call this a conspiracy to destroy the whole fabric of our government and society is giving these people more credit than they really deserve. Condemn them all you like for the murder they committed and the kidnapping they arranged. At one time, my leader used the phrase that we were using a sledge-hammer to crack a peanut. The bill before us would be hard to justify on the basis of the evidence which came out at the inquest. This was hardly, it seems, part of a large conspiracy to destroy our democracy. It seems that more consideration was given to what was happening in Quebec City, inside the cabinet, and to its reaction to the situation than was given to the kidnapping and to the operations of the kidnappers.

• (8:10 p.m.)

For example, the government in Quebec city could have fallen apart. We could not have been too strong in our condemnation of this because it did not have time to gain experience as a government, and since this would have been a calamity that had never befallen a provincial cabinet previously, it could not have been anticipated in any way. The point has been made that it should have been anticipated, and I think this is a good point. We should be prepared for such situations.

The reason the Canadian public has been so shocked at the turn of events is that it believed this sort of thing could only happen in a banana republic; that it could not happen to Canadians. But our experiences on the Saturday and Sunday when Mr. Laporte met his untimely end were almost like a psychedelic trip for the entire Canadian public. Some Liberal members have stated that 98 per cent of the Canadian public supported the government, and I think that is true. This is a matter the broadcasting committee will have to examine and to which a great number of people will have to pay close attention.

I am sure that had the Prime Minister asked for the sort of powers that de Gaulle was given when France has been in serious trouble for years and years, the Liberal Party would have given the powers to him. So would the 78 members from the province of Quebec, without any question at all.

Mr. Woolliams: Seventy-four.

Mr. Peters: Seventy-four. To be fair to the Prime Minister, he was the only Liberal who had any qualms

about applying this sort of measure; he was the only one who said it was a dangerous piece of legislation. Every other Liberal was willing to go along with the government.

We shall have to examine why this happened. Perhaps there should be some curtailment of the freedom of the news media to prevent their producing stories that have no basis in fact. For example, Mr. Chairman, if you cast your mind back to that Saturday night when we were debating the proclamation of the War Measures Act, you will recall that it was reported that three bodies had been found. One was at St. Hubert, one at Dorval or some community north of the city, and a third body on the back seat of a car in a parking lot in downtown Montreal—and all were reported to be the body of Mr. Cross. However, somebody must have spirited those bodies away, or something, because they were not factors in the discussions that followed the next day.

The Minister of Justice must concern himself about the presentation of facts to the public in a way that forced us to adopt such a strong position. Most Canadians are very staid people. We come from the northern hemisphere, the colder part of the continent, and we do not usually react in the same manner as the more hot blooded people in temperate climates. As a nation, we reacted to this situation as a bunch of sheep would react.

I attended recently one of those early November 11 Remembrance Day observances in the town of South Porcupine, and was interested to hear many veterans who had served their country and had spent four or five years in uniform defending the very freedoms for which they had fought. Yet I am sure that most of those people would be in favour of law and order to safeguard their liberties. Recent events have made us for the first time consider just what democracy means to us, what we owe to democracy and what democracy owes to us. No doubt there are limits to freedom. There are also certain rights for which we have fought over hundreds of years, which we should guard very sacredly and should be willing to fight very hard and long to maintain.

I suggest that television had something to do with the recent public alarm. It reminded me of the Orson Welles play which took place years ago at Halloween and caused a public stampede in New York city. People turned on the radio news and were told that Martians had landed and were attacking the city of New York. A number of people were killed. Some had listened only to a bit of the play and had not appreciated that it was a play. Most of the people in the United States listened to the play that night, probably because the program on the other station was so bad. As Members of Parliament we will have to consider recent events impassionately and, in my opinion, without political bias. This is the sort of situation that can be duplicated and could possibly stampede people into taking a position that has not properly been thought out and which might make it impossible for the nation to function as a nation.

One thing that has been clear throughout the whole episode which resulted in the invocation of the War Measures Act and in this bill now before the committee is the total failure of our police forces to operate efficiently. This afternoon I boarded a plane in northern Quebec and overheard several businessmen talking about this question. They were concerned about the police because they were connected with municipal politics. They discussed what might happen in their own communities in view of the inability of the police in Quebec to operate efficiently. For example, I am told there are 51 police forces in greater Montreal, most of which do not talk to each other and jealously guard their territory. In the main they are three or four-man police forces. I suggest that some arrangement will have to be arrived at for making police jurisdictions more national in scope. No policemen can better serve a small community than those who know the area. The trouble is that most of these policemen do not have proper training.

What of our provincial police? I am sure every Member of Parliament was amused and at the same time shocked to hear the commissioner of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police say in a press interview the other day that all we needed to do to wind up the whole matter was to make one telephone call and then have an emergency cabinet meeting. This reminded me of the first speech made by the commissioner shortly after he was appointed, which he was then told was to be his last speech.

• (8:20 p.m.)

The Deputy Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth on a point of order.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Chairman, I submit that the conduct of the commissioner of the police has nothing to do with this amendment, and reference to it is out of order.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I would remind the hon. member that it was agreed by all hon. members that discussion on clause 2 of the bill would be of a general nature. That is why the Chair has been lenient until this stage.

Mr. Peters: Mr. Chairman, I welcome the hon. member for Hamilton-Wentworth back to the chamber. I was pointing out that the police commissioner had originally got himself into trouble, and this is the second time for him to be in trouble. It reminds me of the little guy who went out to the station with his horse and buggy to pick up the wife he had ordered from Eaton's catalogue. When they were driving out to the farm, the horse tripped. The farmer looked at the horse and said, "That's once." They drove along a little farther and the horse tripped a second time. The farmer looked at the horse and said, "That's twice". They drove a little farther and the horse tripped a third time. Then the farmer hauled out his pistol, shot the horse—

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please. I regret having to interrupt the hon. member, but I must inform him that his time has expired.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): We can't leave the horse half shot.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, we just have to find out what happened to the horse.

The Deputy Chairman: The hon. member may continue his speech if he has the unanimous consent of the committee. Is there unanimous agreement to let the hon. member complete his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Peters: I thank the committee for their indulgence. Anyway, he shot the horse and the new wife immediately started to berate him. He turned to the wife and said, "That's once". This is the same story with the commissioner. He was told once. Now this is twice. I am looking forward to the third time.

The point I would like to make is that our Canadian police forces have not been properly trained in riot control or in preventing assassinations. Our police forces, particularly the RCMP, spend a lot of their time tackling our national drug problem. They have infiltrated the youth, underground drug market. They have trained their dogs to sniff out marijuana, but very few of their dogs have been trained to sniff out explosives, something with which we will probably be concerned for some time yet.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, it would be dangerous for the House to pass this legislation unamended. If the government was justified at all in proclaiming the War Measures Act, that justification lasted for only the first 24 hours. There is a retroactive provision in this legislation. It is like saying that if you belonged to the Kiwanis five years ago, and we now outlaw the Kiwanis, you could automatically be committed to five years in prison. The idea is frightening.

Freedom is an expensive commodity. It has to be safeguarded. I believe the Minister of Justice will be as glad to listen to the conscience of small minority groups as he is to accept the support of members of his own party. The minister could easily be stampeded into taking action that would cut the essential liberties of the Canadian people, unless it is pointed out to him that there are limitations on the amount of freedom we can forgo until the point is reached when we have lost freedom itself. Therefore, I hope he will consider favourably the amendments proposed, particularly those dealing with the retroactive clause. If he does not, he will find he will not have the support of many people in this House.

Mr. Nesbitt: Mr. Chairman, I have listened carefully throughout this debate and have noted an assumption made by many people that economic problems in the province of Quebec have been responsible for the creation of the FLQ.

Mr. Gibson: Is that so?

Mr. Nesbitt: I wish the hon. member for Hamilton Wentworth would contain himself at least until I get started on my remarks. Economic conditions in parts of Quebec may well have been responsible for some of the motivation behind the FLQ, but there are many other factors that one has to consider in this regard. In a situation such as this we are dealing with fanatical people who are not often motivated by logic, and economic problems are things that give rise to logical motivations. I would not like this particular assumption to go completely unchallenged because we are dealing with an extremely serious matter, something we will have to consider for a long time. As the Minister of Justice indicated earlier, we shall have to deal with permanent legislation along these lines at a future date.

Dealing with the legislation before us, as has been pointed out by various ministers the situation at the present time in Quebec is an unusual one. It is dangerous. It requires special measures, indeed, extreme measures. In my view, the people of Canada support the government both with respect to the invocation of the War Measures Act and the introduction of this legislation. A number of amendments having to do with some of the details of the legislation have been outlined by my colleague, amendments which I support, but nevertheless in general I think the people of Canada quite approve the government's actions. More than that, Mr. Chairman, the people of Canada want terrorists, terrorism and terrorist activities stopped.

Three or four years ago there was a general attitude in this country of allowing people in Canada to do their own thing. This extended to freedom of expression, no matter how free it might be. It was thought people should be allowed to do anything they wished, no matter what violent means accompanied their activities. But after the recent events in Quebec, particularly the horrifying murder of the provincial Minister of Labour, people have had enough of this. There has been a great change of opinion in Canada, a great feeling of revulsion toward this sort of activity. There is no doubt about that.

Some of us try to get around a bit and talk about these matters. We are not entirely confined to the ivory towers in Ottawa. We try to find out what people are thinking. In my view, most people are completely disgusted at the recent actions of this tiny minority group in Quebec, and indeed of related minority groups holding similar ideas in other parts of the country. People wish this kind of thing to be dealt with. I have had a great many letters, as I am sure have all hon. members, on this subject. From the inquiries and observations I have made, I have the impression that about 85 per cent of the people of Canada wish this Parliament to bring in pretty severe measures to deal with activities such as murder, kidnapping for political purposes and threats to blow up airliners with passengers on board, such as the FLQ reportedly has done.

• (8:30 p.m.)

As I have indicated, a few years ago people were more inclined to be sympathetic toward killers and murderers. They seemed to take the position that perhaps it was not their fault and we should look after them. Now, however,

people have come to the conclusion that we cannot go along with that idea entirely and that something must be done about people who, although they may be psychotic, are motivated to do these things. People are beginning to realize there should be some sympathy extended to the victims of murderers rather than to the murderers themselves.

The remarks I shall make in the next moment or so I indended to make at perhaps a later date when more permanent measures are brought in by the Minister of Justice, as promised. On second thoughts, however, it would seem that these remarks might be appropriate at the present time. This bill has a limited life. It is a temporary measure which is to expire next April. In view of the fact that it is a temporary measure, it would seem to me we might as an experiment introduce certain amendments. I would hope the Minister of Justice would give consideration to these.

Mr. Woolliams: He has made no statement concerning what he would agree to.

Mr. Nesbitt: As my colleague the hon. member for Calgary North has said, the Minister of Justice has not yet indicated what he might agree to. I suppose he is reserving his decision in this regard until he has heard all the representations. I hope this is the case. The present bill is more acceptable to, but reminiscent of, the regulations under the War Measures Act. It would seem to me that since we are in the middle of an experimental period regarding the removal of the death penalty in Canada, except of course in respect of a policeman or other law officer—apparently it is all right if the Governor General or a like person should be killed—the government might be well advised, because of the unusual circumstances which exist in Quebec, which on the government's own admission will probably exist until April, to reinstate the death penalty for murder during this period. In addition to that, since the FLQ reportedly has threatened to carry out bombings and kidnappings and has threatened death to victims, it might be desirable that capial punishment also be introduced as a temporary measure in respect of kidnapping where threats of death are made, or in respect of the hijacking of aircraft involving a threat to blow up the aircraft with passengers on board.

I would think these things might be introduced on a trial basis until next April. I do not wish to become involved in the argument concerning capital punishment versus non-capital punishment. Such arguments have been heard many times. We have heard that capital punishment is not a deterrent. In many cases capital punishment probably is not a deterrent when we are dealing with fanatical people. But very often it is a deterrent. If we were to follow the argument to its logical conclusion, we might ask why it is necessary to have penalties in law if none of them is deterrent. There is no doubt in my mind that capital punishment is a deterrent, and so long as it would prevent people being murdered or blown up I think it would accomplish something.

Thinking back to a time when I was very young, I recall a notorious kidnapping. I refer to the kidnapping of the son of Charles Lindbergh, the Atlantic flyer. This case received a good deal of publicity in the media which I do not think was very helpful. There was a rash of kidnappings throughout the United States at the time. Capital punishment was introduced for kidnapping and this put at stop to it right off the bat. In view of the unusual circumstances in Quebec and perhaps in other parts of Canada at the present time, I suggest that as a trial measure we might introduce the death penalty for murder and political kidnapping as well as hijacking of aircraft. Then we could examine the situation in order to determine the result.

In respect of the experiment we are now conducting concerning the removal of the death penalty, which I believe is to be reviewed in 1973, I think the statistics are somewhat misleading and confusing, but at the present time they would seem to indicate that the murder rate has just about doubled in Canada since the death penalty has been removed. It is more pronounced in some parts of the country than in others. This is a worrisome situation. The rate might have increased in any event. However, the fact is that the murder rate has since the death penalty was temporarily suspended.

I do not think there would be any harm in introducing these extremely harsh measures until next April. The government had no qualms about introducing harsh measures in respect of the province of Quebec, and possibly elsewhere, as has been suggested. It is true that since the troops have been around, the FLQ people have been playing doggo. They are lying low. But the moment the troops are gone, their activity may start again. I would hope the minister would consider putting some of these measures into effect until next April. Then if it should appear they have had a beneficial effect, well and good. If not, they can be reviewed. I believe this is a suggestion which should be considered and adopted.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Roy (Timmins): Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is the result of tragic events which happened in Quebec.

It is most unfortunate that this measure was not among the laws already existing and able to deal with the case of the FLQ. Such a law would have been much more suitable to the problem than the War Measures Act which the government had to invoke.

God willing, Mr. Chairman, I hope that we never have to invoke the legislation before us even if it is much less stringent than the War Measures Act.

This provisional bill it intended to replace the War Measures Act in this period of emergency. It is not a permanent bill, and I believe that the government deserves to be commended for dalaying the introduction of a permanent bill at a future date when calm has been completely restored and the judgment of individuals and Parliaments is more detached.

Hon. members opposite strike at details of the events. They desperately seek something on which to hang on to in order to defend untenable positions. They speak about the lack of information, while they already have supported much more stringent legislation with less information, as it were. They speak about the abuse of rights and repression, while they mention no name or no action to prove it. They speak about numerous rumours which allegedly come from sources inside the government, without having the courage to check those rumours and to reveal their authors.

Opposition parties say that they will support this legislation although they will submit amendments. Let us see what is suggested in this legislation.

It is asserted that our freedom is possible only to the extent that it rests on the respect of moral and spiritual values and on the supremacy of the law. I will never believe that one could deny this principle unless one is an anarchist.

It is also stated that the FLQ has exercised violence in Canada and that this movement is still dangerous. Certainly no one will deny that. In fact, that violence goes back to 1963 and continues with increased intensity.

It is stated that the Canadian Parliament wishes to take measures to protect society. Surely we will not be asked to wait for an insurrection before considering necessary legislation. In fact, the New Democratic Party blames the government for invoking the War Measures Act when other legislation was available. What other legislation, Mr. Chairman?

Even if the War Measures Act was secretly proclaimed, 40 odd persons are now being sought and remain undiscoverable.

It is said that the FLQ is an unlawful association. Indeed, all hon. members agree on that. One would have to be extremely naïve to believe that the FLQ is a lawful and commendable association.

It is said that if an offence is committed after this legislation is enacted, the past record of an FLQ member could serve as evidence against him. I cannot see that the FLQ members could not be identified as such before the coming into force of the legislation.

Some punishment is recommended for FLQ accomplices or supporters. Surely they are as guilty as those they help.

• (8:40 p.m.)

It is suggested that detention be much shorter than that stipulated by the War Measures Act. It must be recognized that detention is necessary in such circumstances.

Arrests are to be made without warrant. Of course such a proposal opens the door to abuse. But how can we fight the abuses of a revolutionary movement without adopting very severe measures?

It proposes entering without warrant any premises suspected of harbouring terrorists. Everyone will agree that such premises must be entered in order to find proofs and arrest the terrorists. A similar provision must also apply to the seizure of objects found on those premises.

[Mr. Roy (Timmins).]

Finally, the act is to apply for a set period of time. This shows that the government is intent upon avoiding abuse in the application of such severe and serious bills. While recognizing the seriousness of the situation, the government is anxious to normalize it and a definite duration is given to this bill.

I am convinced that the majority of my constituents will approve me when I have the pleasure of supporting Bill C-181.

The Deputy Chairman: Shall clause 2 carry?

Mr. De Bané: Are we going to vote, Mr. Chairman? Do you want me to read again the amendments?

The Deputy Chairman: Yes.

Mr. De Bané: I move that clause 2 (d) of Bill C-181 be deleted and replaced by the following:

(d) "unlawful association" means the group of persons or association known as the Front de Libération du Québec, any successor group or successor association thereof, as well as any group or association that advocates the use of force or crime to accomplish or as an aid in accomplishing the same or substantially the same governmental change within Canada as that advocated by the said Front de Libération du Québec.

And, finally, that clause 2 (b) be deleted and replaced by the following:

(b) "peace officer" means the limited classes of persons specified in the orders in council of the Governor General or of a Lieutenant Governor in Council.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I would first outline to the hon. member for Matane that it might be desirable to dispose of the amendment he is proposing in connection with clause 2 (b) since the Chair has some reservations as to the form of the amendment relating to clause 2 (d).

[*English*]

Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the said amendment?

Some hon. Members: No.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Deputy Chairman: Will those in favour please rise. Will those opposed please rise.

Amendment (Mr. De Bané) negatived: Yeas, 1; nays, 28.

The Deputy Chairman: I declare the amendment lost. Shall clause 2 carry?

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to participate in this debate. I think that the speeches made by the leader and deputy leader of our party express my views and that it is sufficient for me to vote as I feel I should. However, I am impelled to say a few words in this debate because of the speech which the Minister of Justice made last week in which, having asked the House to consider this matter calmly and dispassionately, he then proceeded to spend more than half his speech in a

bitter attack on the members of this party who voted against the government's War Measures Act.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): He was desperate.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, I am not hurt by what the minister did, but I must say that I am a little puzzled. I do not think I need say that we in this group, as all Members of Parliament and an overwhelming majority of the Canadian people, are opposed to violence. We oppose assassination. Mr. Chairman, our party has very close association with labour and democratic socialist parties in Europe. We know what our colleagues in Germany, Norway, Denmark, Holland and Belgium, to mention just a few countries, have suffered as a result of violence and totalitarian methods from both the right and the left.

• (8:50 p.m.)

An hon. Member: Even Russia had trouble.

Mr. Orlikow: The hon. member for Calgary North mentioned Russia in his speech the other day, but I do not intend to get into that subject.

So, Mr. Chairman, we could do nothing but oppose the kind of actions in which the terrorists of the FLQ in Quebec have participated. We support every action that this government or any other government would take to apprehend, to charge, to try, to convict and to punish those people guilty of criminal actions. But we were and are disturbed by the tremendous powers taken by the government when it implemented the War Measures Act, and by the tremendous power which the government will still have if it passes the bill which was introduced by the Minister of Justice.

We are concerned about the fact that the power which the government took, and will take for itself under this bill when it passes, will not be exercised by this government, this Prime Minister or this Minister of Justice, but will in fact be exercised by another government, by a provincial Attorney General, by provincial and municipal police over whom the federal government and this Parliament have little or no control.

Another thing that concerns us, Mr. Chairman, is that of over 400 people who were apprehended, held in custody for up to 21 days and questioned, more than 350 were released. I ask the Minister of Justice to give some thought in the days, weeks and months ahead to what the effect will be on those people who were not involved in terrorism, kidnapping and assassination because of the kind of procedures that were followed—

An hon. Member: They are out already.

Mr. Orlikow: —in arresting them when they were not guilty of any criminal act. All, or most of the people who were apprehended and have since been released must have been innocent or else there was not enough evidence to convict them. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it is extremely dangerous to arrest and hold people when they have not been guilty of illegal acts.

The government had tremendous support when it asked for endorsation of the War Measures Act. To my knowledge, not a single newspaper opposed the government, and as far as I know only one or two newspaper columnists opposed the government. The House voted 190 to 16 to support the government. We 16 who voted against the government knew that the government's action had widespread support. We knew that the vote which we were casting was unpopular but we took that action because we felt, and members of this House and the public may think we were wrong, that the government's measures went too far and that they could be used to harass innocent people.

Mr. Chairman, why did the Minister of Justice react so violently and bitterly toward the 16 members of the House of Commons who voted against the government's proposals?

An hon. Member: Read his speech and you will find out.

Mr. Orlikow: He knew and he said that we had no support. I think he was right two weeks ago, we did not have much support then. But he knew that and he did not need to spend his time attacking us. I do not mind that he attacked us, I am used to that, but as I listened to his speech I wondered why he carried on as he did. I gave it some thought and I think the reason he did so is pretty obvious now. The Prime Minister has had almost 100 per cent support of the press of Canada since he came to Ottawa, Mr. Chairman. While he was Minister of Justice—

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might rise on a point of order.

The Chairman: Order, please. Is the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka rising on a point of order?

Mr. Aiken: Yes, I am, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman: The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka.

Mr. Aiken: In rising on a point of order, I apologize to the hon. member for interrupting him but it is necessary to put this question under Standing Order 6(5) before nine o'clock, and the proceedings must be interrupted at this time. I am rising to propose, under Standing Order 6 (5) (a) (i), that the Committee of the Whole continue beyond the ordinary hour of adjournment for the purpose of completing the committee stage of Bill C-181.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Chairman: Order, please. The motion just put by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka is meant to be put to the Speaker in the chair, so I shall rise and resume the chair immediately.

Mr. Peters: The Chairman can't just do that.

The Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Peters: Order. He can't do that.

An hon. Member: Of course he can.

Mr. Peters: He had better ask about it.

Mr. Aiken: Certainly the Chairman has the right. The proceedings may be interrupted. Mr. Chairman, since I started this matter, may I point out Standing Order 6 (5) (a) (i) provides that the proceedings of the Committee of the Whole may be temporarily interrupted for the purpose of proposing this motion, and that it must be made to Mr. Speaker in the chair. Therefore, Your Honour should take the chair for the purpose of hearing the motion.

An hon. Member: That is right.

The Chairman: Order, please. It is the understanding of the Chair that this kind of motion is quite different from the one where the Committee of the Whole has to have permission to report progress. Therefore, I shall resume the chair at this time.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, how can you leave the chair unless instructed to do so by the committee?

An hon. Member: It is in the rules.

Mr. Olson: It is in the rules we wrote, Stanley.

Mr. Bell: You had better be careful; the bill might go through. Even the minister is against the bill going through.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I might also point out, Mr. Chairman, that when the hon. member moved his motion—

The Chairman: Order, please. If hon. members of the committee would permit me, I would refer them to Standing Order 6(5)(a)(i), which reads as follows:

• (9:00 p.m.)

The motion must relate to the business then being considered provided that proceedings in any Committee of the Whole may be temporarily interrupted for the purpose of proposing a motion under the provisions of this Standing Order.

According to my interpreting of this Standing Order, the committee does not have to rise and report progress.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Chairman, it is quite clear from the portion of the Standing Order that Your Honour has read, that if the proceedings of the Committee of the Whole are to be temporarily interrupted, surely that would have to be at the direction of the committee. Surely, it is not the right of one member to say, "Mr. Chairman, please leave the chair". Your Honour does not have to leave the chair, surely.

I might also point out that at the time the hon. member moved his motion he was not in order, although he would be in order now, it being after nine o'clock. I submit he would have to move the motion again.

[The Chairman.]

Mr. Woolliams: Surely that is not so.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): The motion must be proposed in the hour preceding the time at which the business under consideration would be interrupted. In this instance, the hour before ten o'clock is between nine o'clock and ten o'clock. The hon. member made his motion before nine o'clock. I am also suggesting to Your Honour that is is not a proper point of order when an hon. member who has not the floor interrupts for the purpose of bringing a motion. You can only bring forward a motion like that when you have the right to the floor. I think the hon. member did this the wrong way.

The Chairman: The Chair agrees completely with the last point raised by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. It is not permissible for an hon. member to seek the floor on a point of order and to put a motion of this type regarding the adjournment. The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka should seek the floor after the hon. member for Winnipeg North has finished speaking; otherwise we shall have all kinds of interruptions and all kinds of motions for adjournment. The Chair recognizes the hon. member for Winnipeg North.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, I was trying to say, before being so summarily interrupted, that I think the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister attacked the NDP so vigorously because they are not used to being criticized by the press. It is amazing that the press, which was unanimous in its support of the government when the government introduced the War Measures Act, has in the space of less than three weeks, turned so resoundingly to criticize the Prime Minister and the government. The Minister of Justice ought to have answered the kind of attack the press made on the Prime Minister: they were much more vicious, much more biting, than the attack made by any member of our party.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Orlikow: One columnist of a large and responsible newspaper headed a column with the words "Spiro Trudeau". I suggest that is why the minister took the time to attack the members of our party. He realized that it is not politically wise to attack and criticize the press; yet being disturbed by press criticism, he answered by attacking the NDP. The Winnipeg *Free Press*—and there is no more partisan Liberal in Canada—has in its editorials asked the Prime Minister to tell the people of Canada why he felt it necessary to invoke the War Measures Act. As I say, it was because of press attacks that the Minister of Justice attacked the members of our party so vigorously.

I said that we oppose violence; we oppose kidnappings and we oppose murder. We are, therefore, very pleased that one of the kidnappers has been arrested. We hope, as I am sure do all members of this House, that other arrests of the guilty ones will follow very quickly. If four,

five or six people can kidnap, hold captive and then murder a person, whether he is the Minister of Labour of a province or anybody else, and carry out their actions with a mindless sort of violence, we ought to be disturbed. That is very disturbing.

Nevertheless, if I have interpreted newspaper reports of Bernard Lortie's evidence at the inquest held Saturday correctly, that evidence indicates to me that the kidnapping of Mr. Laporte, reprehensible as it was and creating the extremely difficult problems for this country which it did, was not what some had alleged it to be. That evidence indicated to me very clearly that although this country is facing trouble and was facing trouble, we are not and were not facing the kind of danger which we were warned against by a many members of the government.

I will not go into detail with respect to all the speeches made by the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Agriculture and—I could go on and on. I will not speak about what the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion may or may not have said outside the House on that famous hot line radio program. But I want to put on the record again a couple of paragraphs from the speech the minister made in the House on October 16. It is reported at page 224 of *Hansard*. Among other things, the minister said on that occasion:

> Any person having knowledge of the FLQ organization in the province of Quebec at the present time cannot but be aware that the state of Quebec and the federal state are truly in danger in Canada.
>
> Why? The most pessimists say that the FLQ has some 3,000 members.

An hon. member interrupted and said, "More". The minister continued:

> I do not know if that figure is accurate but I am aware that there are quite a few.
>
> And I know something else: these people have infiltrated every strategic place in the province of Quebec, every place where important decisions are taken, and without giving complete details let us say that at the present time they are in a position to cause the Quebec and the federal governments, as well as the city of Montreal, irreparable harm, with the support of outside organizations which are not necessarily in agreement as to the measures taken because it is well organized.
>
> Some say: Why have you not made it illegal? That is what we are doing under these regulations though it might not be the best solution. It is known that the FLQ is made up of cells of two or three persons each, cells that do not know each other, that do not necessarily work hand in hand and that are now in touch simply through coded messages broadcast free of charge by our radio stations.

I pause to make it clear that the minister said that coded instructions were going out over radio stations. He did not imply, as the right hon. member for Prince Albert this afternoon attempted to imply, that those people worked for the CBC. They may have worked for other stations. It is interesting that we have not heard the minister repeat these very serious allegations since October 16. What about those coded instructions that were going out? Have the people involved been apprehended? Have they been charged? What about the infiltration that has been alleged? Were the police of Montreal infiltrated? Were the Quebec provincial police, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and the armed forces infiltrated? We do not know, Mr. Chairman.

• (9:10 p.m.)

It seems to our members, as it seems to most newspaper reporters, that if these charges were based on facts, we should have been told this so we could deal with it. It is because we have not got any of the evidence which may or may not exist—it has not been given to us or the public—that we have our doubts about the procedures which the government has followed. I ask the Minister of Justice why the government waited until October 15 or 16 to take action. After all, the activities of the FLQ did not begin with the kidnapping of Mr. Cross and Mr. Laporte? Bombings by the FLQ began in 1963, and thefts of dynamite have been going on for years.

What steps did the government take to combat the subversive, illegal actions of the FLQ? Was the security and intelligence section of the RCMP beefed-up between 1963 and 1970? We do not know, Mr. Chairman. The police forces in Canada have not been able to infiltrate the terrorist organizations in Quebec in the same manner as the FBI—without the acts that the government of Canada has asked Parliament to pass—has been able to infiltrate terrorist organizations in the United States. Canadians have a right to know what the government was doing between 1963 and 1970 to eliminate the dangers which have arisen and which occurred previously, namely, the dangerous, illegal, terrorist actions of the FLQ.

I believe that police action is necessary. But that alone will not eliminate the causes which led to the feelings of frustration which produced the terrorists of Quebec. I am not going to discuss economic and social conditions in Quebec, but I suggest that the Minister of Justice should read carefully the statement made last week by the Quebec Welfare Council, which is certainly not a very radical organization, to the Senate Committee on Poverty. They described the kind of situation that exists in the slum areas of Montreal and Quebec, the lack of adequate housing, recreational facilities, medical and hospital services. Until we do something about this situation, we will not eliminate those feelings which permit the FLQ to get the support of a small percentage of the people of the province of Quebec. Until we do that, we will fail.

The people of Canada, especially those in Quebec, are upset, disturbed and frightened because of what has occurred in the province of Quebec during the past few years. It is not surprising they feel the way they do. It would be surprising if they could be objective about the situation. They want action. We support their feelings. We support the government in any action it takes to correct the situation and to apprehend those who are guilty. Some people, including some members of this House, feel that the danger is so great that in order to stamp out the danger it may be necessary to arrest some innocent people; that this is not too great a price to pay. Some have said that you cannot make an omelet without breaking some eggs. Although I understand that feeling, I do not agree with it. We have tried to read and understand history. We have looked at other countries and we

have looked at the attempts of colonial powers to stop independent movements by imprisoning the leaders of those movements. All those attempts met with failure, Mr. Chairman.

I suggest to the Minister of Justice, who has some family relationships in Winnipeg, that he read the history of Winnipeg. In 1919, faced by a strike the government of the day passed an amendment known as section 98 of the Criminal Code which gave that government tremendous powers. Under that section of the Criminal Code they arrested and imprisoned six or more strike leaders. There is no similarity between the leaders of the 1919 strike and the leaders of the FLQ. The leaders of the 1919 strike believed, as we do, that changes in the system can be made democratically. However, Mr. Chairman, they were imprisoned because they led a strike.

The result of imprisoning those men has been that for more than 50 years the people of Winnipeg, at least that part represented by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre and myself, in almost every federal and provincial election have elected representatives who are not members of the Liberal party or the Conservative party. The arrests and imprisonment of the strike leaders resulted in a feeling of hostility toward the establishment which still exists among a large group of people in Winnipeg.

I am opposed to the FLQ, their philosophy and methods of terror. I disagree with them completely. Although separatism would be a disaster for the province of Quebec and Canada, advocating separatism by democratic means is not illegal. When people who are not terrorists are arrested and imprisoned, we are creating martyrs and sympathy for the cause of separatism.

I would support this bill if I felt that it gave the government and the police authorities the powers they need, but I cannot support it if it contains provisions which drastically curtail the democratic rights of people, or if it contains provisions which would make its penalties retroactive. That is completely contrary to the basic premise of a democratic system. I urge the government to consider seriously and agree to amendments which will make the bill fair and acceptable to members of this House and all Canadians.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Chairman, I apologize to the hon. member for unduly interrupting previously. Since Your Honour ruled that I should wait until the hon. member finished his speech, I now move, pursuant to Standing Order 6(5)(a):

That the sitting of the Committee of the Whole House continue beyond the ordinary hour of adjournment for the purpose of completing the committee stage of Bill C-181.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman, to ask whether the hon. member would give consideration to rewording his motion so that we sit for an additional hour beyond the time of adjournment, rather than the open-ended motion he is proposing. We would be quite happy to sit an hour beyond the normal time of adjournment, but we feel that to sit all night would not be the way in which to deal properly with this important legislation.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Mr. Aiken: If the intention is that the question be put after one hour, I would agree.

Mr. Forrestall: Which question?

Mr. Aiken: All questions.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Broadbent: I should like to speak against the motion. There are a number of serious—

An hon. Member: It is not debatable.

The Chairman: Order. Perhaps I should read the Standing Order which was cited as the basis of the motion put forward by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka. It reads as follows:

6(5)(a) When Mr. Speaker is in the chair, a member may propose a motion, without notice, to continue a sitting through a lunch or a dinner hour or beyond the ordinary hour for daily adjournment for the purpose of considering a specified item of business or a stage or stages thereof subject to the following conditions:

(i) The motion must relate to the business then being considered provided that procedures in any Committee of the Whole may be temporarily interrupted for the purpose of proposing a motion under the provisions of this standing order.

My understanding is that the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka has moved, under the provisions of this Standing Order, that the proceedings of the committee be temporarily interrupted for the purpose of putting his motion under Standing Order 6(5)(a). In these circumstances I think I should proceed to put the motion. Before doing so, I would read the relevant portion of Standing Order 6(5(b) which is as follows:

When Mr. Speaker puts the question on such a motion, he should ask those members who object to rise in their places. If ten or more members then rise, the motion shall be deemed to have been withdrawn, otherwise, the motion shall have been adopted.

Mr. Deputy Speaker resumed the chair and put the following question:

The hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka (Mr. Aiken) moves:

That the sitting of the Committee of the Whole House continue beyond the ordinary hour of adjournment for the purpose of completing the committee stage of Bill C-181.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I would ask hon. members who object to rise in their places.

And more than ten members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. There being more than ten members objecting and rising in their places, the motion is deemed to be withdrawn.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I rise on a point of order. Before Your Honour leaves the chair and

we go back into committee, I wonder whether there would be unanimous consent for the committee to sit until eleven o'clock? We would agree to that.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: I do not hear unanimous consent. I will now resume the chair in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Woolliams: Don't keep playing games, Stanley. If you don't want to sit, say so.

Mr. Lewis: You made a speech saying this legislation should be carefully scrutinized.

An hon. Member: They prefer the War Measures Act.

And the House having resumed in committee:

The Chairman: Shall clause 2 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. De Bané: Mr. Chairman, I moved an amendment to clause 2(d), so that it will read as follows:

(d) "the unlawful association" means the group of persons or association known as Le Front de Libération du Québec and any successor group or successor association of the said Le Front de Libération du Québec, or any group of persons or association that advocates the use of force or the commission of crime as a means of or as an aid in accomplishing the same or substantially the same political governmental change within Canada as that advocated by the said Le Front de Libération du Québec.

The purpose of this amendment is twofold. Firstly, I think that it in its present form, clause 2(d) tends to confuse the terms "the unlawful association" and an "unlawful association". Secondly, each clause of this legislation regarding public order should include the definitions of the terms used in that clause. Now, since clause 3 gives a definition of the term "unlawful association", I think that the definition should be included in clause 2 under the heading "Interpretation".

[*English*]

Mr. Howard (Skeena): With respect, Mr. Chairman, would you mind reciting the amendment?

The Chairman: I will ask the Clerk Assistant to read the amendment now before the committee.

[*Translation*]

And the Assistant Clerk (legal affairs) having read the following amendment:

Mr. De Bané moved that subclause (d) of clause (2) be deleted and replaced by the following:

"The unlawful association" means the group of persons or association known as Le Front de Libération du Québec and any successor group or successor association of the said Le Front de Libération du Québec, or any group of persons or association that advocates the use of force or the commission of crime as a means of or as an aid in accomplishing the same or substantially the same political government change within Canada as that advocated by the said Le Front de Libération du Québec.

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Chairman, I only wish to ask a question. If I understood correctly, the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Matane (M. De Bané) is not intended merely to modify clause 2 but also to strike out clause 3. Am I right?

Mr. De Bané: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member is absolutely right. If this amendment is adopted, all other clauses must be renumbered. As you see, clause 3 as it now reads is a definition, so its provisions should be included in the clause reserved for definitions.

In clause 4 and all subsequent clauses, the words "the unlawful association" should be replaced by "an unlawful association", since, at the present time, the only function of clause 2(d) is to equate "the" and "a". So, as clause 3 deals with several sorts of associations, one would have to say in French "une" and not "la". These two words cannot be confused.

[*English*]

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Having heard the amendment read by the Clerk at the table, and listened to the sponsor thereof explaining it, I feel one could perhaps vote yes or no if it made any sense or if there were any real purpose behind it, that is, if it altered the force of the bill. But it seems to do neither and I think the best one can do is to sit quietly in one's seat and vote neither way.

Amendment (Mr. De Bané) negatived: Yeas, 4 nays, 40.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Mr. Burton: Mr. Chairman, I rise to move a small amendment to clause 2. I discussed the matter earlier this afternoon and I had hoped the Minister of Justice would comment on it at some time, but since he has not chosen to say anything perhaps the best procedure is to move the amendment. I regret that I do not have it translated into French and I hope the copy I have will suffice. My concern is with respect to the definition of "peace officer" in paragraph (b) of clause 2. This paragraph provides:

"peace officer" means a peace officer as defined in the Criminal Code, and includes a member of the Canadian forces

On the assumption that this legislation will pass, I can see that the armed forces may be called upon to exercise a civil authority, and it seems to me that there is therefore need for some greater control. According to my reading as a layman, this provision would automatically make a member of the Canadian forces a peace officer. While it might be argued that there are provisions in other statutes such as the National Defence Act—which I have not had an opportunity to check—that cover the situation, it seems to me that when we are considering special legislation of this nature we should make certain we have adequate civil control of and authority over members of the armed forces and the way they are used within the scope of this legislation. Therefore I move, seconded by the hon. member for Saskatoon-Biggar:

That clause 2(b) be amended by striking out the semicolon and adding the following:

"when assigned to perform the duties of a peace officer by authority of the Governor in Council"—

Thus, the entire paragraph would read:

(b) "peace officer" means a peace officer as defined in the Criminal Code, and includes a member of the Canadian forces when assigned to perform the duties of a peace officer by authority of the Governor in Council—

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. Burton) agreed to: Yeas, 31; nays, 28.

The Chairman: I declare the amendment carried. Shall clause 2 as amended carry?

Clause as amended agreed to.

On clause 3—*unlawful association.*

[*Translation*]

Mr. De Bané: Mr. Chairman, with respect to clause 3, I wish to suggest first a new French wording which I think renders the English text better, and which is somewhat more consistent with the French language. I suggest—

[*English*]

The Chairman: Order, please. Will the committee come to order. The Chair has some difficulty hearing the hon. member who has the floor. I ask the committee please to come to order and remain that way.

[*Translation*]

Mr. De Bané: Mr. Chairman, I suggest another French version of clause 3 which does not affect the essence of it but only the wording. In my opinion, legislation that, at least *de facto,* is directed primarily to French-speaking people must be written in a style more characteristic of the French language.

I suggest the following French version of clause 3:

Le groupe de personnes ou l'association qui s'appelle Front de Libération du Québec, ou tout groupe ou association lui succédant ainsi que tout groupe ou toute association qui préconise de recourir à la force ou au crime pour réaliser au Canada un changement de régime politique identique ou analogue à celui que préconise ledit Front de libération du Québec ou pour y contribuer sont déclarés être des associations illégales.

[*English*]

Although my English is not very good, I should just like to say I have attempted both in this amendment and in the other amendments, without touching the essence of the provisions, to try to draft a better French version. As hon. members know, the content of this legislation is in fact mainly addressed to French Canadians, and I think the French version is very bad. This is why I have tried to make a better translation, and I hope I have succeeded. At least the French version will be more readable and will not look like a colonial law drafted by the English for the French Canadians, without the French style. What I just read was my amendment, and if I do succeed in changing the wording of the clause in my second amendment it will at least be more readable in French. I will now continue in French to say what to me is bad about clause 3.

[*Translation*]

It must be noted here that three categories of associations or groups are declared illegal. First, the FLQ; secondly, its successors; thirdly, any other association which would advocate the use of force or crime to reach the same or substantially the same goal as the FLQ.

It must be noted that this clause is entirely different from the second paragraph of the preamble which is actually restricted to the FLQ. It is my deep conviction, in the first place, that clause 3, beginning at paragraph 5, is ambiguous, or, if you want, can be interpreted in so many different ways that it is totally inconsistent with the usual rules governing the wording of an exceptional law, considering that this legislation is characterized by quite excessive powers which must be counterbalanced by a scope of enforcement as clearly defined and restricted as possible.

I am prepared to believe that the subject matter of this legislation, as stated, is restricted to the FLQ. However, allow me to point out that whoever drafted this legislation has a very poor knowledge of the FLQ movement. What did he mean by:

—the same or substantially the same—

• (9:40 p.m.)

[*English*]

—in accomplishing the same or substantially the same governmental change within Canada as that advocated—

—by the FLQ. In Webster's Third International Dictionary, 1967, "substantially" is defined as relating to the main part of something". Then I would ask, what is the main part of the FLQ? Nobody can say what it is. That is why I say the words "or any group" at the end of line 5 give rise to any interpretation.

[*Translation*]

For instance, the communiqué No. 11 of the FLQ dated November 2—and it is known today to have been a fake—read in part as follows:

The FLQ does not aim at political power; we are determined to make the revolution, as it is the only way for the Quebec workers to come into power.

Such stupid and morbidly anarchic nonsense is not even original. It is typical of all movements which keep harping on anarchic concepts termed by Lenin as a pass-time for bourgeois.

Finally, it is essential to show that clause 3, as worded, especially paragraph 5, lends itself to unacceptable interpretations in an exceptional legislation. Once more, the good intentions are exemplar: in fact, the circumstances are not deemed favourable to the introduction of a comprehensive bill, but I say that the challenge was not taken up.

Indeed, if one carefully considers the third group to whom the legislation applies, any group whose goal would be "the same or substantially the same"—

Now, let us agree on terms. What is the aim of the FLQ?

I find regrettable that such tremendous powers are given to the police over groups or associations when the wording of clause 3 makes it impossible to determine what is the prevailing element in the FLQ. In this connection, I shall give only one example: If two Newfoundlanders conspire to kidnap a federal minister represent-

ing a British Columbia riding, are they pursuing the same or substantially the same goals as those of the FLQ?

Another example: when an hon. member states that violence is spread not only by those we suspect, but also by Messrs. Laberge, Pépin and Claude Ryan, adding in the same breath that such people should be shot ten at a time, without trial, as well as some ten FLQ leaders, is he not pursuing goals very close to those of the FLQ?

Here is another illustration: let us assume that by ill luck a few distraught hot-heads among the Lapalme ex-employees were to explode a bomb, and considering that the FLQ had also resorted to criminal acts in order to impose the solution to their problems, would they be pursuing an objective by advocating means fairly similar to that of the FLQ?

In short, it may be seen to what extent the second half of clause 3 may lead to all kinds of interpretations and, again, the person who has been arrested on mere suspicion has no recourse. If it is true that the wording of legislation in general terms is preferable, the situation is altogether different when it comes to a provisional and exceptional measure which provides policemen with practically unlimited powers and eliminates any recourse for the arrested persons.

What does clause 3 actually mean? Briefly, it deals with associations which advocate the same means for accomplishing the same objectives. Obviously, clause 3 thus summarized is not as restricted as mentioned in the preamble.

That is all the more serious as jurisprudence is constant: in case of conflict between the preamble and a section of the act, the latter prevails. The preamble reads as follows:

—within Canada with respect to the Province of Quebec—

—whereas clause 3 stipulates:

—within Canada—

So if a Newfoundlander, member of a secret organization, comes to Ottawa to kidnap a federal minister from British Columbia will he not also be pursuing "substantially the same" goal as the FLQ?

What is the FLQ's goal? I would be pleased if somebody would explain it to us. Violent anarchy? It may be, but the criteria to define it are very nebulous.

I propose a version of clause 3 which is at least French, and fundamentally I propose to delete in line 6 the words:

—that advocates—

—and to substitute therefor

"appointed or described in an order of the Governor General in Council".

Evidently, my proposal does not entirely solve the problem, but it leaves to politicians the task of making decisions which could be discussed. If the bill is passed without amendment, an individual could be arrested and detained without bail. Only after several months, the Court could rule that he belonged to an association which was not unlawful. In my opinion, it is essential that the associations coming under the legislation be clearly identified.

I move that at line 6 which reads in English as follows:

[*English*]

The clause refers to any group of persons or association that is enumerated in a special order. That means at least there could be a debate on the decision of the government to call it an unlawful association. By the other law, an agent of the peace might arrest somebody whose association, in his opinion, was unlawful and it would take months before the courts decided that question. Therefore, I think the "loi exceptionnelle" should be the clearest possible. C'est tout.

The Chairman: Before we proceed I will ask the Clerk Assistant to read the amendment.

[*Translation*]

And the Clerk Assistant (Legal) having read the following amendment:

Mr. De Bané moved that clause 3 be amended—

[*English*]

He said: If I may, I would ask that you first present the amendment relating to the French version, without touching the essence of it.

Mr. Hogarth: Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise a point of order. It was my understanding that we were to debate all amendments at the outset of our discussion.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Hogarth: I may be wrong. I notice the hon. member for Calgary North agrees with me on this.

Some hon. Members: No; clause by clause.

Mr. Hogarth: Yes, they were to be voted on clause by clause as they came up. But with the greatest respect, it is extremely difficult to vote on an amendment to clauses 3, 4 or 5 without considering what might be consequential amendments to clauses 7, 8 or 9. It is my submission that copies of these amendments should be distributed to every member of the House so they may be examined before we are called upon to vote on them. I think the present procedure is grossly unfair.

When I asked the Clerk earlier today for copies of the amendments that had been filed, they were unavailable. It is grossly unfair that we are called upon to vote on amendments that are not before us. I ask that copies of these amendments be distributed, so that we may have them to reflect upon. Then we could vote on them clause by clause at the earliest opportunity tomorrow.

• (9:50 p.m.)

Mr. Hees: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order may I say that I find it difficult to understand the hon. member's difficulty, because we in the official opposition are not having any difficulty. We understand what is going on. Perhaps hon. members opposite would come over here and we could explain it to them.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member for New Westminster is perhaps confusing Committee of the Whole with a Standing Committee. In Committee of the Whole there is no rule which requires anyone to give notice of any amendment: we can move amendments as we go from clause to clause. It is impossible to arrange, every time someone moves an amendment, to have it duplicated and made available to all members in writing. I think such a procedure would be completely unworkable for all of us in respect of all bills.

This is not the only bill that has been before Committee of the Whole in this or in other parliaments. There have been bills just as complicated as this one. This is the way in which we have always had to proceed in Committee of the Whole. A little attention as things proceed makes it not too difficult to follow the amendments moved. The hon. member says it is impossible to vote on an amendment on clauses 4 or 5 without realizing its relationship to clauses 9 or 10. Of course, in such a situation it is the duty of the hon. member moving the amendment to indicate, if he knows, what its relationship will be to other clauses of the bill, if there is a relationship, and for other hon. members to agree to it or oppose it, indicating the effect it would have on some other part of the bill. I do not know of any other way it can be done otherwise.

I am under no obligation to give the members of this House copies of the amendments I propose to move. As it happens, we have given copies to the Minister of Justice because he is piloting the legislation through the House and we thought it only fair that he should see those amendments so that he could consider whether or not he agreed with them. But there is no obligation under the rules to do this. There is nothing to stop an amendment being brought to the floor as was done by the hon. member for Regina East earlier this evening. He moved it because he thought of something which ought to be improved. Should we not have voted on it, and should we have held up proceedings until it was duplicated?

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, this is an impossible suggestion, much as I appreciate the desire of the hon. member to have everything in writing before him. He might ask people who move amendments to read them slowly while he writes quickly, but that is about the only solution we could have to that problem.

The Chairman: Is the Minister of Justice rising on a point of order?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, at the commencement of the committee stage the hon. member for Calgary North suggested we ought to have a fairly wide debate on clause 2, so that those members who intended to move amendments could describe in general terms what they were and place them on the table for the benefit of other members and for the benefit of myself for which I am thankful since I have the obligation of piloting this piece of legislation through the House. Surely this has happened except for the amendment spontaneously introduced by the hon. member for Regina East, which on the face of it did not seem to complicate the bill in any way and which was voted on and carried. We accept that.

Mr. Burton: It was discussed.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I do not know who the hon. member discussed it with. He did not discuss it with me.

Mr. Burton: On a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman, I should make clear that I did discuss this matter in the debate this afternoon.

The Chairman: Order.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The amendment that was submitted did not come to my attention in the ordinary way. I believe all other members have put their amendments before me, and I put the one amendment I intend to move on the table. Amendments to legislation as important as this should be given a bit of notice so that hon. members on all sides of the House have an opportunity to deal with them. I think the point made by the hon. member for New Westminster is properly taken.

The hon. member for Matane I believe introduced his amendment because he felt that the French version was inaccurate. I have checked the French version of the bill again and am advised that it is perfectly in order. It may be that from an artistic point of view he does not agree with it, but from a legal point of view it is perfectly accurate. It does not advance the position of the committee if members are taken by surprise, because we are dealing with a very important piece of legislation which we all want to consider.

The Chairman: Order. Will hon. members resume their seats. The hon. member for Matane.

Mr. De Bané: M. le président—

The Chairman: If I might interrupt, there are two minutes remaining and unless someone has a burning desire to make a further contribution I should like to rule on the point of order raised by the hon. member for New Westminster. My recollection is there was a general agreement at the opening of this stage of the proceedings that members would outline in general terms the amendments they proposed to move. I think, however, that was not binding on hon. members but was a general agreement among all parties.

As has been pointed out by the hon. member for York South, there is under the rules no provision that would require the giving of notice by hon. members, although it would seem to me and I believe to most hon. members, as the minister pointed out, to be a desirable practice. Nevertheless, there is no such requirement in our Standing Orders. While the point of order is well taken, I do not think the agreement was binding on all hon. members and we should proceed, as the hon. member for York South mentioned, in accordance with the practice of the House.

It being ten o'clock—

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, it is not quite ten o'clock.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

The Chairman: Order, please. Would the hon. member resume his seat.

Progress reported.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY—EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT—FORECASTS BY ECONOMIC COUNCIL CHAIRMAN—GOVERNMENT REACTION

Mr. Robert McCleave (Halifax-East Hants): Mr. Speaker, it is always a great thing in one's life to see everybody fleeing as if they were—

Mr. Nesbitt: Just like the Grits did earlier.

Mr. McCleave: —being threatened by the plague, when one gets up to speak on the late show. None the less, I rise in an effort to do my duty. I do it for obvious reasons. The great question which brings us here tonight is the question I asked the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) which may be found by referring to page 876 of *Hansard*. I am sure everybody has looked at it four or five times in the last hour or so. My question is the following:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance and arises from the speech to the British Columbia Federation of Labour by the chairman of the Economic Council of Canada about employment and unemployment forecasts. Does the government agree with these projections?

The minister replied:

Mr. Speaker, I have not seen them at this point. I will take a look at them.

I then posed another question to the minister:

When the minister answers that question, will he also say what the government expects the unemployment situation to be if he differs from the chairman?

• (10:00 p.m.)

Really, Mr. Speaker, that is the sum and substance of my being here tonight trying to press for an answer to what surely must be the most important question for Canadians at this time. It is not an esoteric question; it does not deal with anything that happens abroad. It deals with what I would call the lunch-pail question: Is somebody going to have work? Will somebody be able to go home to his wife and children with money and say, "This is what I have been able to earn"?

I had to go home in somewhat different circumstances myself when I was faced with certain facts in 1963. But the fact is that every cotton-picking man or bread earner among us has to assume a certain posture. That may mean nothing to the Minister of Finance, but to us it may mean a very important posture—the right to be a man or woman, or the right not to be. It was in the spirit of that sort of question that I asked what was the forecast. The Minister of Finance cast it off in a cavalier fashion over his left shoulder. In that respect he almost becomes an imitative shrugger of his boss, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). But he answered it by saying, in effect: Oh, well; in due course that question would come before us. When I presented the question I did so seriously and I expected a serious answer, and I still do.

I should like to read 143 words into the public record. They come from the report of the Economic Council of Canada. The group of people who presented the report to the Minister of Finance was composed as follows, as appears at page 15 of the annual report of the Economic Council:

The council is assisted by a staff of approximately 120 persons, including about 60 professional and administrative officers, drawn from a wide variety of former positions with the federal government departments, other federal agencies, provincial governments, universities, business firms, labour unions, and international institutions. The wide range of training, experience and knowledge of the staff reflects the wide terms of reference given to the council. In spite of these wide terms of reference, there has been a deliberate attempt to keep the over-all size of staff relatively small and to expand it relatively slowly in order to maintain strength and consistency in the work of the council.

In the spirit of finding strength and consistency I ask the question: Where are we going, employment or unemployment-wise, this winter in Canada?

Mr. P. M. Mahoney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to be precise about the particular rate of growth in the economy that is required to give a given level of employment or unemployment, and the government is not prepared to comment on the projections made by the chairman of the Economic Council.

In his remarks during the Throne Speech debate, the Minister of Finance on October 13 dealt at some length with the present state of the economy, the difficult nature of the problems confronting us and the steps taken by the government thus far to deal with them. It may be recalled that the minister acknowledged, too, the fact that, as he put it, we shall need a substantial annual rate of real growth before any marked improvement in the unemployment rate will be forthcoming. These are the hard facts.

The minister also expressed his confidence that the economy is capable of returning to the rate of growth that will reduce the unemployment rate significantly over the next four or five quarters. He said:

We believe that our policy stand will guide the economy on this course.

The government will do the people of Canada no service if it rekindles the inflation by seeking to force an advance more rapid than productivity improvement and cost moderation will permit.

Before concluding, it may be worth reminding the House that in its last review the Economic Council itself stressed the extreme importance of moving the economy back toward its potential gradually, and with great care, so as to avoid the danger of renewed inflation.

Proceedings on Adjournment Motion

MANPOWER—SUCCESS OF RETRAINING PROGRAM IN PROVIDING JOBS

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): Mr. Speaker, on November 5 I posed a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration (Mr. Lang) asking him to give a statement to the House regarding the effectiveness of the training and retraining program carried out by the department. I wanted to know specifically whether this program was successful, because on the same day in response to a question at page 904 of *Hansard* the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) had said:

> Mr. Speaker, as I have pointed out before, the winter works program totalled something less than $50 million. We have replaced it by manpower retraining and mobility programs to the tune of several hundreds of millions of dollars.

The Prime Minister was boasting about this, saying this is the type of thing the government was doing in order to alleviate the unemployment situation. But I simply want to know how effective is the program. I do not see the minister nor the Parliamentary Secretary here, but I am sure somebody will answer the question. This important question lies at the heart of the problem in order to deal with unemployment and poverty in Canada.

To my knowledge we have not had a real accounting of the effectiveness of the program. I do not wish to criticize the program out of hand or disregard its benefits, but I am concerned that the government seems to place practically all its efforts to deal with unemployment on this manpower retraining program, and I submit that it does not always work though a great deal of money is spent. Last year the government issued press releases about the amount of money spent, but there was no mention of its effectiveness in bringing people from these courses into the labour force.

An hon. Member: There were no jobs to go to.

Mr. Comeau: That is exactly the problem—there are no jobs. This is why I want to know how the program is being assessed. It is better to have a program than to simply pay unemployment insurance. At least it gives the trainees something to do, but in itself that is not good enough.

What relation is there between the training and the unemployment situation? If we have 1,000 people or 1,000 jobs, are the 1,000 people trained for the 1,000 jobs, or is it the other way around? If we have 1,000 people training for particular jobs, are the same 1,000 people being employed in the field that they have chosen? How do we assess the program? Is it by the employment or is it simply by the training that we give?

For example, I am aware of a program where 700 people applied but only 200 were accepted. This raises the question of whether it is a program for the elite, if I may use that term in this context. Naturally, the best people get the training but what happens to the other 500 who applied for training under this program? Do we send them to other courses? I do not know the answer and this is why I asked for a statement, because if we have to shift people to other courses it presents another problem.

• (10:10 p.m.)

Are we simply trying to offer a complete range of courses? That is a question I should like answered. For example, I know of one case in which a gentleman was told to apply for three or four courses. That does not make much sense. Either he is suited for one course or he is not. Perhaps he did not want to take three or four courses; he only wanted one course. The department did not want him to apply for only one course. Apparently they did not have that course to offer. Why do they not tell the applicant they do not have the course, and try to help him in some other way? Let us not shift these poor people around.

Many questions could be asked about this training program. I want to know how the government assesses it. After going through a training program, are the people suitable for employment? Also, is the government really providing incentives for employers to hire these people? The first thing an employer asks an employee is, "Have you had any experience?" We must do something to encourage employers to hire these people. For all these reasons I want to know how effective is this program.

Mr. P. M. Mahoney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. member's receptiveness to enlightenment will be commensurate with his ingenuity for framing questions. In replying to the hon. member's question, I would say first that for the fiscal year 1969-70 alone some 320,000 persons were placed in training under the Canada Manpower Training Program. With reference to the success of this program, I would refer him to a survey tabled by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration on June 22, 1970, on adults who have taken Canada Manpower training courses. This survey involved 83,193 persons who completed full-time courses in public institutions between January and September 30, 1969, and indicates that graduates of Canada Manpower training courses have more than doubled their prospects of getting a job and increased their earnings potential by at least 12 per cent.

As these figures indicate, the results of this survey are very encouraging and demonstrate that the Canada Manpower training courses make a very positive contribution to higher productivity and income security for Canadian families. Specifically, the survey shows that 75 per cent of those who finished training and looked for work were fully employed within three to four months. Only 31 per cent were employed when they entered courses. Men increased their average earnings by $43 a month, and women by $47 a month. This was a gain of 11 per cent over pre-training earnings for men, and 24 per cent for women. Seventy-one per cent of those who took skill training found jobs in occupations closely related to their training.

I would also point out that this survey forms but part of the Department of Manpower and Immigration's continuing review and evaluation of the effectiveness of the training programs for adults. This review and evaluation is believed to be the most comprehensive of any country's. With reference to the higher proportionate wage gains for women, I would mention that one of the great

virtues of the training program is that it is tending to equalize opportunity for women who prior to training had substantially lower earnings. This is true for both women taking skill courses and those in basic upgrading.

These results indicate that, particularly in the case of women, improvement in the basics alone can lead workers to a more rewarding job and bring about a substantial increase in productivity and earnings. None the less, trainees who go to further skill development can, judging from the results, expect an additional increase in earnings. Both men and women completing skill courses showed substantially higher earnings after training than those taking upgrading courses.

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION—CORNWALL—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON STUDIES AND PROGRAMS

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, on October 29, as reported at page 693 of *Hansard,* I directed the following question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand):

Will the minister give consideration to making a statement on motions outlining the results of studies made by the federal government and the government of Ontario into the heavy unemployment in the Cornwall area and an early start on various programs under the provisions of the DREA legislation?

My question was prompted by the continuing concern of many people about the situation in the Cornwall area. In December of last year the secretary of the textile workers' union in Cornwall wrote to the minister, I think, and to the leader of the NDP pointing out that 650 people had been given notice of permanent lay-off by the Courtaulds plant in Cornwall.

On April 13 of this year the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker) directed a question to the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, pointing out that in the area of Stormont-Dundas-Glengarry 13.7 per cent of the total labour force was unemployed. He asked what was being done. The minister replied that his deputy had visited Cornwall and they would be giving serious consideration to the question.

On May 25, 1970, the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Douglas) directed a question to the same minister pointing out that the unemployment rate in Cornwall was approximately 18 per cent. He asked what the results, if any, had been of the special task force studying the situation in the Cornwall area, whether a report had been received and what action would be taken. On that day the minister said that the task force had returned the week before, that he had not received a recent report but that he would inquire and inform the House of the results of the study within a few days. That was on May 25. It is now November.

If the task force made a report, it is still in the files of the minister. If the task force recommended any special measures to help establish new industries in the Cornwall area, nothing has been done about them to our knowledge. The minister replied to the leader of the New Democratic Party that he had inquired about the plight of the 650 people laid off at the Courtaulds plant and that they had been offered the opportunity of a retraining course. No one wants to downgrade the importance of retraining courses, but it is a rather desperate situation if that is all that can be offered to people in an area such as Cornwall.

If the result of the retraining is that they will be offered jobs in other cities, requiring them and their families to move, this is a very serious situation for the people concerned. I join the right hon. member for Prince Albert, the leader of my party and others in asking the government what steps are being taken to help alleviate the situation in eastern Ontario, particularly in the city of Cornwall.

Mr. Martin P. O'Connell (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): For some months, Mr. Speaker, the federal government and the government of the province of Ontario have been working together to develop increased employment in the area of Cornwall. This effort applies not only to the Department of Regional Economic Expansion but to other federal departments such as transport, public works and manpower and immigration, which can help in making Cornwall more attractive to industry. There is a parallel and co-ordinated effort on the part of the various departments of the provincial government.

While I do not have concrete results that can be announced tonight, there is a likelihood that some positive results will occur quite soon. Everyone regrets that the problem is so difficult and solutions take time to develop. Every practical effort to bring them into being as soon as possible is being made.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.23 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, November 10, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[*Translation*]

THE LATE GENERAL DE GAULLE

EXPRESSION OF TRIBUTE AND SYMPATHY

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we have learned with deep emotion of the death of General de Gaulle, one of the great figures of our time. I want to render homage to his genius as a soldier, and to the outstanding qualities of a statesman who, in his own lifetime, became an historical figure.

Even before the outbreak of the World War in 1939, Charles de Gaulle had shown an extraordinary understanding of the dimensions of modern war. But the defeat and occupation of France brought out in him, during long and hard years, the courage and pride of the patriot in exile, and the patience and authority of the politician. During the war he embodied for millions of men the hope of liberation; single-handed, so to speak, he sought to preserve, and afterwards sustain, the permanence of France, which owes to him the fact of having found once again its high place in the concert of nations.

Mr. Speaker, the departure of Charles de Gaulle calls up everywhere a great surge of memories. A great man has just died. To the French people and Government, I express our profound sympathy.

[*English*]

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I join with the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) in his eloquent words concerning General de Gaulle. I knew the General very well. I met him on a number of occasions. One of my treasured memories will be that a few days ago I received from him a volume of his memoirs inscribed with a personal message, the acknowledgement of which he will never receive.

• (2:10 p.m.)

He was one of those personalities who are above age, who lived in his day and generation and made a contribution not only to freedom in his own time but for all mankind. He was, as the Prime Minister said, a prophet in the years between 1935 and 1939—a prophet without honour in his own country. Indomitable, incorruptible, inflexible—he stood for what he believed. In the dark days of war there were many who were pessimists when France was down, he was never one of them. He stood and in the clarion words of freedom predicted over and over again that victory would ultimately come.

Everyone, however great, is entitled to make mistakes. Many will recall his words in this country in 1967. This is no occasion to weigh those words. The moving finger writes and, having writ, moves on. But whatever mistakes he made he will always be remembered in the eternal books of history and will always have an overwhelming credit in those books.

With the approach of Remembrance Day I recall November 1958, when he asked me whether I would be willing to go to Verdun on November 11, Remembrance Day, and be in the saluting stand as the legions of France moved past. It was in the battle of Verdun that he was wounded. It was there, in the saddest charnel place in all the world, where some 700,000 Frenchmen and Germans met their deaths in support of those things for which they stood. The General said he himself could not be present because of his memories of those days of the Battle of Verdun. As I walked over that battlefield I could not but recall the awfulness of what took place during those dark years when he gave his dedication to devoting the rest of his life for peace for all time.

I recall him in Ottawa in 1960. He spoke in the most feeling terms of Canada's sacrifice. He was with Churchill, when freedom was under siege, when for a period of a year and a half we in the Commonwealth and France were alone. He never lost faith.

I remember him as an orator, a model for orators. Beset by blindness he would have read over to him a speech that was prepared by himself, and he would deliver it as it was written in the ringing words of freedom. The last of the titans of the second world war have now departed. He is the last of them. His memory will live for all time.

[*Translation*]

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the New Democratic Party, I wish to express our grief on the occasion of the passing of General de Gaulle. It is true that his relations with Canada were at times marred by his intervention in the rather delicate question of our national unity. However, he will remain a very famous man. As commander of the French resistance forces and leader of France during the Algerian crisis he ranks high among the great patriots in world's history.

He had an incredible moral fortitude and a very remarkable literary talent. His autobiography sheds light on an era in which he played a predominant part.

It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that even after his retirement as President of France, his influence remained and will probably diminish very slowly after his death.

Tribute to Late General de Gaulle

Some of us may have wondered about his preoccupation with grandeur, may have disagreed with him on some aspects of his social philosophy and may have worried about his nuclear policy, but we cannot deny that he was an outstanding statesman, whose devotion to France and French culture was unlimited.

We join with the Prime Minister in offering Mrs. de Gaulle and the French people our most sincere sympathy.

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, as the previous speakers, I would like to say a few words on behalf of the members of the Ralliement créditiste, and pay tribute to a man whose name will go down in history, since Charles de Gaulle has left his mark as the champion of democracy during the last world war, while working without respite for the recovery and stabilization of France seriously affected by that war.

The military strategists consider that General de Gaulle was probably one of the greatest thinkers of the French army, when he devised even before the war the setting up of a highly armoured and motorized army. His plans were brushed aside and France was caught off guard by the German invasion.

Instead of accepting defeat, on June 16, 1940, he left for London where on June 18, he called on the French to go on fighting with Great Britain.

Thus, he gave the people of France new hope, brought to his side what was left of the colonial French army, and free French forces fought with Canadian and British troops until victory, when he was acclaimed as a liberator first in Bayeux then in Paris.

De Gaulle was not merely a military man but also a great statesman, probably the one who did most to rebuild France's world prestige that had been diminished by the weakness and the divisions of its governments.

Once more, he saved France from disaster. Following the events in Algeria and the threat of a civil war in 1958, the French people called upon him, and the General agreed to form a government.

He prepared a reform of institutions and at the next elections, he was given a great majority. Elected president of the Republic by 78 per cent of the voters in France and overseas, he governed according to the spirit of the Constitution and left a definite mark on French politics. He solved the Algerian problem, gave France a striking force, and kept his distance with regard to NATO.

De Gaulle was a controversial figure and will doubtless be for years to come because the Memoirs he has written and which have yet to be published in full reveal new aspects of the man.

I have just read this tribute: the Memoirs of de Gaulle will go down in history and be compared to Caesar's Commentaries on the Gallic war.

We therefore join the Prime Minister and all hon. members in mourning the death of this great Frenchman.

[Mr. Lewis.]

• (2:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

HOUSE OF COMMONS

PRESENCE IN SPEAKER'S GALLERY OF PRIME MINISTER OF GHANA, OTHER MINISTERS AND OFFICIALS

Mr. Speaker: May I bring to the attention of the House the presence in the Speaker's Gallery of a number of distinguished guests. We are delighted to have with us for a few moments the Prime Minister of Ghana, the Right Hon. Dr. Kofi Busia, and Mrs. Busia. The Prime Minister is accompanied by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Tourism, the Hon. R. A. Quarshie, and the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Hon. Victor Owusu, as well as a group of senior officials of the government. We welcome these distinguished visitors to Canada's House of Commons. I am sure that hon. members would want me to express their particular gratification that under Dr. Busia's leadership Ghana has returned to parliamentary rule and continues to play a leading role in the life of the Commonwealth of Nations.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

* * *

ELECTION EXPENSES

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask unanimous consent of the House to name the members of the Special Committee on Election Expenses. If I have unanimous consent I should like to move, seconded by Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale):

That members of the Special Committee on Election Expenses be Messrs. Breau, Brewin, Chappell, Cullen, Deachman, Forest, Forrestall, Howe, Laflamme, Laprise, McKinley and Ouellet.

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion proposed by the President of the Privy Council. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

CONTROL OF PUBLISHING INDUSTRY—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 43 there is provision whereby a motion may be accepted by unanimous consent if it relates to a matter of urgent and pressing necessity that has previously been explained by the mover. It is one of the few mechanisms that Parliament has available to it to deal with matters in a special way because normally Parlia-

ment has cumbersome arrangements for dealing with urgent problems. The sale or proposed sale of Ryerson Press to the McGraw-Hill Company of the United States has brought into very sharp focus the fact that we are perilously close to complete domination by foreign industrial and economic interests. What I propose by way of motion is to permit a parliamentary committee to examine this matter.

I might add as an aside that the request for unanimity also encompasses with it the idea that we do not seek to have any debate upon this matter if that is also unanimously accepted. Therefore I should like to move, seconded by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) but with a companion and honorary seconder, the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald):

That the Standing Committee on Finance, Trade and Economic Affairs be authorized to inquire into the steps which may be necessary to maintain Canadian control of the publishing industry and to permit the said publishing industry to enhance and develop its position and that the said committee report its findings and recommendations on or before December 15, 1970.

Mr. Speaker: The House has heard the motion proposed by the hon. member for Skeena. The motion requires the unanimous consent of the House. Is there such unanimity?

Some hon. Members: Yes.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: There is not unanimity. Therefore, under the provisions of Standing Order 43 the motion cannot be put at this time.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

NATIONAL SECURITY

EXAMINATION OF POLICE METHODS OF INQUIRY AND SURVEILLANCE

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address a question to the Prime Minister. When the present crisis is over, which we hope will be very soon, is it the intention of the government to examine carefully the methods of inquiry and surveillance which have been employed by our national police force and the other police forces with which it co-operates in respect of national cases such as the Cross case to ensure that they are the most up to date and the most effective known to modern police forces, in view of the fact that the greatest manhunt in peacetime history, backed by the widest possible powers, unfortunately has not been able in a period of one month to return Mr. Cross safe and sound to his family or to apprehend his kidnappers?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this type of review has been under way in the federal government as a result of the report last year of the

Royal Commission on the matter of security. At that time we did introduce certain changes in the structure of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and since then on a continuing basis we as a cabinet have been examining the question of security. But the comments of the hon. member are well taken. We will continue this examination to see if there is some way to have a more efficient police force which would perhaps in the future dispense with the need to have recourse to such extraordinary measures as the War Measures Act. This being said, I think we do owe a vote of thanks to the police for the work they have done. That they should not have been a little more efficient is perhaps a reflection of the kind of society in which they and we live, a society which is not accustomed to dealing with terrorism and subversion of an underground kind.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Hees: I thank the Prime Minister for his answer.

CONTROL OF RESALE OF ARMY SURPLUS AUTOMATIC WEAPONS

Hon. George Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Supply and Services. Could he advise the House what steps have been taken or are planned for the near future to control the resale of army surplus automatic weapons in view of the ease with which these weapons can be purchased in Canada as described in the evidence of Mr. Bernard Lortie last Saturday?

Hon. James Richardson (Minister of Supply and Services): Mr. Speaker, I will be pleased to take that suggestion under consideration and report back to the House if any changes are contemplated.

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Perhaps I might be permitted a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday I asked the Minister of Justice if the particular section of the Criminal Code in reference to prohibited and restricted weapons had been proclaimed. I wonder whether the Prime Minister or one of his ministers, because of the importance of this matter and because these sales are still going on, could make a statement to the effect that this regulation has been passed and that these are now prohibited and restricted weapons?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, the minister took notice of the question yesterday. He is not in the House today and I suggest it would be proper to wait for him to give the answer.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): I wonder whether the Minister of National Defence would take note of certain advertisements in "Armed Forces Review" which is very close to being a government publication? In recent months it has carried advertisements close to its editorial page, or in any event in a prominent place, for the sale of revolvers, .38 Enfields, Italian automatic pistols, shotguns, ammunition, and offering free

catalogues, in fact, the whole bit in a publication that is so close to our Canadian Armed Forces as to be indistinguishable.

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, first I should make it perfectly clear that "Armed Forces Review" is not an official publication.

As to the marketing of, for example, .303 Enfield rifles, the hon. member will recognize that they are not prohibited by the changes in the law, and it seems to me that there can be no objection to them on that ground. Parliament faced this question a year or so ago and decided not to outlaw them. It may well be that it should have, but there has been no change in the law in that regard.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): I want to ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Supply and Services. Would he be prepared to place a moratorium on the disposal of such automatic and semi-automatic weapons until a review of the whole situation has been made?

Mr. Richardson: No, Mr. Speaker, I have indicated that the situation is being closely examined. Until I report back I would not contemplate a moratorium.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

MEASURES TO ALLEVIATE FORECAST WINTER UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. David Lewis (York South): Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the Minister of Finance arising out of the unemployment situation in the country. May we expect from him or someone else in the government shortly, within days or weeks a statement of some new policies or new programs to deal with the situation?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, as we have new policies to bring forward to Parliament, we will do it in the ordinary manner.

Mr. Lewis: I am not asking the Minister of Finance to do it in an extraordinary manner. I am asking him to tell the House whether we may expect such an announcement within days or weeks so as to deal with the winter unemployment situation.

Mr. Benson: My hon. friend will just have to wait and see.

Mr. Lewis: Can the minister inform the House whether any special attention is being paid, if some programs are being worked out, to the situation in the province of Quebec and the particular need to deal with unemployment in that province?

Mr. Benson: The matter of unemployment is a matter of concern to the government, and our economic policy and programs are continuously under review. I hope that if we do bring forward some additional programs my hon. friend will vote in favour of increased taxes in order to finance them.

[Mr. Forrestall.]

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, we will wait to see what the program will be. I think the minister's answer requires another question, namely, whether he is being hypothetical about his programs or whether we may expect such a program before Christmas?

Mr. Speaker: It seems to me the hon. member is now reiterating the original question asked of the minister.

SUGGESTED REPEGGING OF CANADIAN DOLLAR

Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Among these programs that the minister is considering, is he giving consideration to repegging the Canadian dollar before the Canadian automobile parts industry goes out of business altogether?

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): I do not think there is any danger of that at all. If my hon. friend will take a look at the export of automobile parts under the automotive trade agreement he will find that in spite of his party's opposition to it it has been and continues to be of great benefit to Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Hees (Prince Edward-Hastings): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby.

Mr. Hees:—let me point out that the automobile pact was started by our government when we were in power.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby.

Mr. Hees: You can bet your sweet life it was.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

HOUSING

USE OF URBAN RENEWAL PROJECTS TO ALLEVIATE UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): I have a question for the Minister without Portfolio responsible for housing. Following the decision of the Conservative government in Ontario to go ahead now with deferred programs in order to meet the rising unemployment, can the minister inform the House to whether or not his department has decided to go ahead with urban renewal projects during the coming winter months which had been deferred earlier?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): The urban renewal projects which were authorized for implementation during the past year will proceed but additional ones will not be funded in the immediate future.

QUEBEC—SPECIAL MEASURES TO ALLEVIATE UNEMPLOYMENT AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Mr. John Gilbert (Broadview): I should like to ask the minister in charge of housing whether he intends to bring forth any special measures to deal with housing problems in Quebec so that the unemployment situation there may be alleviated as well as the social problems?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): We have in fact accelerated investment in housing in Quebec during the past several months. Some of the evidence is showing up in the housing starts statistics for October, and there will undoubtedly be a continuation of this kind of activity in that province.

[*Later:*]

INCREASE IN AMOUNT FOR URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): I have a supplementary question for the minister in charge of housing. In view of the bleak picture shown in the rising unemployment figures and in the light of the fact that the minister has indicated that $25 million will be projected yearly for the next five years toward the urban renewal program, is the minister reconsidering this position at this time in order to help to alleviate the unemployment situation and increase housing starts?

Hon. Robert K. Andras (Minister without Portfolio): This year we will have invested through CMHC slightly in excess of a billion dollars in commitments for housing. The suggestion that urban renewal is the best or the only method of providing relief from urban decay or, in fact, providing employment, is one which I do not necessarily accept.

Mr. Alexander: I appreciate the minister's answer but in effect he has not answered my question. I was wondering whether the minister intends to increase the amounts allowed for urban renewal.

Mr. Andras: I think I answered that question in my reply to a question put by an hon. member earlier.

* * *

[*Translation*]

NATIONAL SECURITY

WAR MEASURES ACT—PAYMENT BY QUEBEC FOR SERVICES OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister.

Since the Quebec government has just requested that the Armed Forces remain on duty for another month, could the Prime Minister say whether final agreement has been reached between the two governments as to who will foot the bill for the stay of the Armed Forces in Quebec?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): No, Mr. Speaker, this question has not yet been finalized.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*English*]

TRANSPORT

URBAN RAILWAY LINE RELOCATION POLICY—PROJECTS TO ALLEVIATE UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. John Burton (Regina East): My question is directed to the Minister of Transport. Could the minister indicate when the government's policy with respect to urban rail line relocation will be made public, and could he also indicate whether such announcement will be followed by projects that would be of assistance in overcoming the current unemployment problems?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): I believe the House knows that last week an announcement was made of a three-way study under way in the city of Winnipeg with the co-operation of the government of Manitoba and the government of the city of Winnipeg with a view to making this a pilot project to determine the best means of dealing with these problems which exist in many parts of the country. I have no idea at the moment how long this study will take, although I have asked for an answer as quickly as possible. I hope that the recommendations will be such that we will be able to get under way with the project very quickly after the report is received.

* * *

POLLUTION

OTTAWA RIVER—AGREEMENT WITH ONTARIO AND QUEBEC

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. Has an agreement been entered into by the federal government and the provinces of Ontario and Quebec on a plan to control pollution in the Ottawa river?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): The ministers in charge of the water pollution questions and environmental management from the provinces of Quebec and Ontario attended a meeting here yesterday at which we reached an agreement to the effect that on the completion of the Quebec-Ontario study of the Ottawa River which will be completed early in the new year we will proceed to enter into a joint water quality management agreement pursuant to the terms of the Canada Water Act.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, I ask my supplementary question in view of the fact that members of this House for at least as long as I have been here, some 12 years, have frequently asked questions about this particular subject of the Ottawa River. Therefore I ask the minister why he did not make his statement in the House today rather than make it outside the House at a press conference?

Mr. Greene: Mr. Speaker, my counterpart ministers from the provinces were here yesterday and it seemed important that they join in the announcement as this is a provincial-federal agreement. When the actual agreement is entered into at the time the study is completed it will, of course, be tabled in the House and announced in the House in the normal manner.

Mr. Aiken: Then I assume from the ministers answer that there was no agreement entered into yesterday at all, and that this was just a P.R. job.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

EXTENT OF STUDY OF OTTAWA RIVER

Mr. Arnold Peters (Timiskaming): May I ask the minister how extensive the survey will be in Lake Timiskaming, the headwater area for the Ottawa River?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I believe the study is a comprehensive one. I will take note of the question and answer the hon. member more completely, but I am aware it goes from the headwaters right to where the Ottawa River flows into the St. Lawrence, so the water quality management area will be a complete one for the Ottawa River.

[*Translation*]

DISCUSSION OF CONTAMINATION OF WATERS FLOWING INTO JAMES BAY

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources.

Could he tell us if during his talks with his counterparts in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario there was any mention of polluted waters flowing into James Bay and threatening fishing in those regions?

Hon. J. J. Greene (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): No, Mr. Speaker. We only talked about the Ottawa river.

* * *

[*English*]

INFORMATION CANADA

AVAILABILITY OF DIGEST OF RESPONSES TO GOVERNMENT ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Prime Minister because of the over-all responsibility involved. Will the Prime Minister assure the House that the newly announced so-called digest of responses to government announcements will be made available to the House at the same time as it is made available to government departments?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I am not sure what the hon. member is talking about, Mr. Speaker. I will take the question as notice.

Mr. Bell: When the Prime Minister checks into this newly announced so-called digest, will he make certain that those responses which may be unfavourable to the government, such as *Le Devoir,* are also included?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member is now making a suggestion which he must presume will be taken into account.

[Mr. Greene.]

GRAIN

INTERNATIONAL GRAINS ARRANGEMENT—RESULTS OF MEETING ON RENEWAL

Mr. R. R. Southam (Qu'Appelle-Moose Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the minister responsible for the Canadian Wheat Board. In view of the great importance to Canadian grain markets and pricing, is the minister in a position to report to the House, under motions, the results of the meeting just concluded in London in connection with the International Grains Arrangement?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I think it would be unnecessary to do it on motions. Agreement was reached at that meeting to hold a negotiating meeting in January.

Mr. Southam: Can the minister indicate in a more optimistic vein whether any agreement on floor pricing will be reached before next year?

Mr. Lang: This is the object of the negotiating meeting, to determine whether or not there is the possibility of an international arrangement. The meeting of the World Wheat Council which has just ended was intended to decide whether or not negotiations would in fact take place, and this was agreed upon.

PRESENCE OF RUSTY BEETLE IN WHEAT SHIPMENTS—NUMBER OF COMPLAINTS—REJECTION OF CARGOS

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, further to the questions asked yesterday about insect infestation in shipments of Canadian grain, can the minister responsible for the Wheat Board advise the House as to the number of complaints received from overseas customers in regard to insect infestation in shipments of wheat from Canada, and if there have been any rejections of cargos of Canadian grain?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can add anything to the information given to the House on this subject yesterday by my colleague the Minister of Agriculture.

* * *

AIR TANSPORT

PROPOSED TRAVEL TAXES—APPLICATION TO DOMESTIC FLIGHTS

Mr. Charles H. Thomas (Moncton): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transport. In light of the announcement that Canada is one of the countries proposing new air travel taxes, which appear to be endangering the international air fare agreement, will the minister assure the House that these new charges or any other new charges will not apply to the cost of domestic air travel?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely complex issue. I do not believe I could do justice to it in a reply of this sort. I will take the question as notice and see if I can prepare something comprehensive for the hon. member.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

PROPOSED COLLECTIVE BARGAINING RIGHTS FOR ARMED FORCES MEMBERS

Mr. Andrew Brewin (Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Defence. Has he received representations from the Public Service Alliance in favour of changes in the Public Service Staff Relations Act so as to permit collective bargaining on behalf of members of the Canadian Armed Forces, and will he give favourable consideration to this request?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, I have read news accounts of this particular initiative but as far as I know I have not received such representations.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of supplementary questions which I think should be asked at this time. Can the minister give some assurance not only to the House but to members of the Canadian Armed Forces that their views will be assessed before any decision is taken by the government in response to the Public Service Alliance request?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): At the moment as far as I know, Mr. Speaker, we have no such examination under way.

Mr. Forrestall: I direct another supplementary question to the right hon. Prime Minister. Has he had a chance to review the letter sent to him by the President of the Public Service Alliance, and can he indicate whether he has convened any meetings of his colleagues on the subject matter of that letter?

Mr. Barney Danson (Parliamentary Secretary to Prime Minister): As a supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Do I understand the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister wants to ask a supplementary?

Mr. Danson: My supplementary is to the Minister of National Defence. I wonder whether giving the Armed Forces collective bargaining rights would increase their strike capacity?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, I attempted to ask the right hon. Prime Minister a question but apparently he is engaged on some other matter so I will direct a supplementary question to the Minister of National Defence. Would he give consideration to giving those Members of Parliament who have Canadian Forces bases in their constituencies the right to seek out the views of members of the Armed Forces on the question of their unionization from outside?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): As far as I know no member of this House is under any inhibition in speaking to members of the Armed Forces.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Donald MacInnis (Cape Breton-East Richmond): Since the Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister has asked a supplementary question of the Minister of National Defence about the strike right of the Armed Forces, was he reflecting on the one that has just taken place recently in Quebec?

Mr. Trudeau: Explain.

Mr. MacInnis: See me after hours.

* * *

HUMAN RIGHTS

EFFECT OF QUEBEC BILL ON DOCTORS' CIVIL LIBERTIES

Mr. P. B. Rynard (Simcoe North): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Justice. Has the Governor in Council, acting under the authority of the War Measures Act, authorized the government of the province of Quebec to issue and enforce criminal measures against medical specialists of that province which permit trial and conviction in absentia, presumption of guilt without plea, and forfeiture of their property?

Mr. Speaker: I have some serious doubt about this question. I wonder if it might be rephrased to make it acceptable from a procedural standpoint, although I doubt whether that is possible.

Mr. Rynard: Then I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if there has been any consultation on this matter?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, that particular legislation, so far as the Department of Justice is concerned, lies within provincial jurisdiction. I do not know if there has been other consultation.

Mr. Rynard: Since Bill 41 will have the effect of regulating the conduct and behaviour of the individual, would the minister not refer this matter to the Supreme Court of Canada for a ruling?

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): In connection with Bill 41 and also those measures which have been taken to stop the movement of eggs and broilers from one province to another, both of which orders are unconstitutional within the concept of confederation, has the government given any consideration to the disallowance of the legislation passed by the legislature of Quebec which denies to doctors the right to leave that province?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): No, Sir.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Justice. Has he considered whether Bill 41 passed by the legislature of Quebec contravenes the Canadian Bill of Rights? I ask that because it stipulates that fines between $5,000 and $50,000 per day will be levied against those who comment in such a manner as to influence any doctor to leave the province or to be absent from his practice.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I have not reviewed the bill from that point of view.

Inquiries of the Ministry

INDUSTRY

PLANS TO ESTABLISH CORPORATION TO ASSIST PUBLISHERS

Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister as the leader of the government. Inasmuch as we have a Canadian Film Development Corporation to assist in the development of the film-making industry in Canada, has the government, either by itself or in conjunction with the provinces, any plans to establish a similar corporation for publishing?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have not heard of any.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

DISPOSITION OF CAMP IPPERWASH PROPERTY

Mr. Jack Cullen (Sarnia-Lambton): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of National Defence. Will the minister assure the Indians of Stanley Point that when the Camp Ipperwash property is no longer required by the Department of National Defence it will be returned to the Indians and not transferred to the province of Ontario?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, the government does not at the moment intend to give up this training facility on Lake Huron. I might indicate to the House and the hon. member that there is a fairly substantial quantity of unexploded ammunition on the grounds of Camp Ipperwash. That being so, I am not sure whether he would want me to transfer it to the Indians or to the province of Ontario.

* * *

HIGHWAYS

CONSTRUCTION OF CORRIDOR ROAD BETWEEN NEW BRUNSWICK AND QUEBEC

Mr. Robert C. Coates (Cumberland-Colchester North): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Prime Minister. Since the voters of the state of Maine have indicated that they are unwilling to undertake the full responsibility for constructing a corridor road between the provinces of New Brunswick and Quebec, will the Prime Minister given consideration to initiating discussions between the government of Canada and the governments of the United States and Maine to determine if it might be possible to develop this transportation link that would be of such tremendous value to the Atlantic area?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would have to ascertain first what the will of the Atlantic provinces is in this regard. I understand that they are not completely united in their desire to build this road.

[Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton).]

Mr. Coates: Will the Prime Minister consult with the governments of the four Atlantic provinces to determine whether they wish such an initiative to be taken by the federal government?

Mr. Trudeau: Mr. Speaker, in my periodic meetings with the Atlantic premiers this question frequently comes up. I am sure it will come up again in our subsequent meetings.

* * *

TRANSPORT

STATIONING OF ICEBREAKER, "ALEXANDER HENRY"

Mr. P. V. Noble (Grey-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Transport. In view of the fact that navigation can be opened up in Georgian Bay and Lake Huron eight to ten days before Lake Superior, is it the intention of the government to winter the icebreaker *Alexander Henry* in Owen Sound or Collingwood?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I would think that this question ought to be placed on the order paper or discussed at the time of adjournment if there is urgency.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

AVAILABILITY OF WEAPONS—PASSING OF ORDER IN COUNCIL

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Justice and to thank him for breaking the roster system and coming here today. I wonder if he would answer the question I asked yesterday about restricted and prohibited weapons and about an Order in Council?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I understand that there were earlier questions on this subject. I should like to review them. Also, I have not had the opportunity to complete the investigation as I promised the hon. member I would. I will do that tomorrow or Thursday.

Mr. Woolliams: If the minister is going to check on this matter I just want to tell him that there were no answers. The Prime Minister just passed the matter over to him.

* * *

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS

NON-PAYMENT OF MINIMUM WAGE—DISCUSSION BY MINISTER OF TRANSPORT WITH PRESIDENT

Mr. David Orlikow (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport. In view of the decision of his colleague, the Minister of Labour, to prosecute the CNR because of its failure to pay its hotel employees the federal minimum wage, could

the Minister of Transport discuss this question with the president of the CNR since it is, to say the least, peculiar to have a government department prosecuting a Crown corporation?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's question is in the form of an argument. I wonder whether it is in order. Perhaps the minister might be allowed to reply briefly.

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, I hope it will be appreciated that I am not falling back on a stock reply. The matter is before the courts and under the circumstances it would not be appropriate for me to refer to it at this time.

* * *

NORTHERN AFFAIRS

EFFECT OF GAS WELL BLOWOUT ON PANARCTIC DRILLING PROGRAM AND ECOLOGY—SAFETY MEASURES

Mr. R. J. Orange (Northwest Territories): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development but in his absence I will direct it to his Parliamentary Secretary. I wonder if the minister will make a statement on the effect of the future drilling program of Panarctic as a result of the gas well blowout on King Christian Island. I should also like to ask the Parliamentary Secretary to bring this question to the minister's attention: what steps are being taken to cap this blowout and to alleviate the concern relating to the effect of this blowout on the ecology of that particular area of King Christian Island?

Mr. Judd Buchanan (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to bring this observation to the attention of the minister.

Mr. Orange: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, in the minister's statement, if he makes one, could he indicate the cause of the blowout and what safety measures are required by the drilling companies in the high Arctic to ensure that there are no future blowouts such as the one which lasted a full year?

* * *

MANPOWER

ATLANTIC PROVINCES—SPECIAL TRAINING PROGRAM TO ALLEVIATE UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Does the minister intend to institute a special manpower training program over and above the program already announced in order to meet the anticipated excessively high rate of unemployment in the Atlantic province this winter?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, as has already been announced, some additional training programs have been instituted to make courses available, especially in those areas where unemployment is high. We are at the same time examining the extent to which facilities are available for the courses which now can be provided.

Mr. McGrath: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister would be prepared to discuss with his colleague, the Minister of National Defence, whether armories and other national defence facilities could be made available for special manpower training programs this winter to meet the high unemployment?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I certainly would be glad to talk about almost anything with my colleague. But I think that in large measure the hon. member should know that the provision of these courses basically falls within the responsibility of the provincial governments in the areas concerned. So it might be more fruitful if I discussed this matter with them.

[*Later:*]

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Will the minister make a statement on motions on the disposition of his department's share of the $60 million mentioned in the contribution of the Minister of Finance to the debate on the Speech from the Throne?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, it has been my intention to make a statement, perhaps not on motions, in regard to this disposition. I will see about doing so at an early date.

[*Later:*]

Mr. McGrath: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I refer the matter I raised in my question to ten o'clock so the Minister of Manpower and Immigration will have an opportunity to make that statement.

* * *

[*Translation*]

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

QUEBEC—ACTION TO ALLEVIATE UNEMPLOYMENT

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary to the right hon. Prime Minister.

In view of the statement made last Friday by the premier of the province of Quebec, would the right hon. Prime Minister be willing to tell the House if the Quebec premier made him a request for greater financial aid to fight unemployment in the province of Quebec?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the premier of the province of Quebec knows that we have held discussions on a practically continuous basis for several months to arrive at granting supplementary substantial aids in the province of Quebec.

Effectively, it was after these discussions that we increased considerably assistance to low cost housing, regional development and construction of technical schools.

This involves a series of continuous programs, Mr. Speaker, which are continuously increasing in numbers.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*English*]

FISHERIES

DEPLETION OF MARINE RESOURCES—DISCUSSIONS WITH SOVIET UNION

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry. Can the minister say if he has succeeded in arranging talks with the Soviet Union concerning the depletion of our marine resources? If so, when will these meetings take place?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, no meetings are scheduled at the moment.

* * *

MANPOWER

ASSISTANCE TO CONSOLIDATED MINING EMPLOYEES TRANSFERRING TO NEW JOBS

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): I have a question for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. Some time ago I asked the minister about the position of employees at the potash plant of Consolidated Mining and Smelting near Saskatoon, and whether these employees would receive assistance under manpower when they transferred to new jobs. Can the minister inform the House whether or not arrangements have been made to give such assistance to these employees?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): There are several types of assistance available, Mr. Speaker. There is the type which can be offered by the Department of Manpower and Immigration under its rules and which is, of course, being offered to them. To my knowledge, no agreement has been reached with the company under another head of the manpower facilities.

Mr. Gleave: I did not ask the minister if he had worked out an agreement with Consolidated, I asked whether arrangements had been made to give assistance to these employees when moving, which comes under the manpower program?

Mr. Lang: As I indicated to the hon. member, the rules are certainly being applied. Such assistance as is possible under the rules is being made available to them.

* * *

SCIENCE

INQUIRY AS TO ANNOUNCEMENT OF POLICY

Mr. Louis-Roland Comeau (South Western Nova): I have a question for the President of the Treasury Board. In light of the conclusion of the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council that a broadened economic base for the Maritimes will substantially depend upon technology and innovation, can the minister inform the House when a science policy for Canada will be announced?

[Mr. Trudeau.]

Hon. C. M. Drury (President of the Treasury Board): I hesitate to give a definite date, Mr. Speaker. I hope there will be a statement later on.

Mr. Comeau: In light of the APEC report, can the minister say whether science policy will directly encompass regional strategies for technology and innovation?

Mr. Drury: This will be dealt with in a peripheral way, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

GRAIN

WHEAT—ESTIMATED ACREAGE TO BE SEEDED NEXT SPRING

Mr. J. A. Horner (Crowfoot): I wish to direct a question to the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. I understand that when the minister was in western Canada last week he advised the farmers that they could grow more wheat. Would the minister give the House the benefit of his wisdom and inform us the number of acres the western farmers can seed to wheat next spring?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): I did that not long ago, Mr. Speaker, when tabling the proposals for next year. If the hon. member reads through the proposals he will see that at the back there is a table indicating a possible acreage system.

PRESENCE OF RUSTY BEETLE IN WHEAT SHIPMENTS—SOURCE OF CARGOS

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that inspections were made of the grain shipped to various countries, and which is reported to have rusty beetles, has it been determined whether these cargos were from grain held at terminal elevators or from grain at country elevators which was trans-shipped?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): I will look into that, Mr. Speaker. To the extent we are able to determine that, I will advise the hon. member when the information is available.

* * *

TRADE

POSSIBLE BRITISH ENTRY INTO EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY—CANADIAN CONTINGENCY PLANS

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): My question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. It is in connection with the remarks the minister made to the effect there are serious risks that the eventual membership of Britain in the European Economic Community will lead to discriminatory arrangements that will affect Canada. Is the minister or members of his department making

contingency plans against this eventuality? If so, when will he be in a position to announce these contingency plans?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I do not know what is meant by risks. If the hon. member is asking whether we are having discussions with the EEC or with the government of the United Kingdom looking for ways and means by which the damaging effect on Canadian trade of the enlargement of the community could be remedied the answer is yes, we are doing that. It is difficult to predict five, six or seven years in advance what will need to be done to accommodate ourselves to this event.

Mr. Saltsman: A supplementary question. I appreciate the discussions being carried on with members of the EEC. However, in view of the serious effects Britains membership in the community will have on Canadian trade, is the minister discussing contingency plans or programs on which Canada might embark in the event these programs do not meet with success?

Mr. Pepin: We will do that as much as possible.

* * *

TRANSPORT

NOVA SCOTIA—ACTION TO ENSURE CONTINUATION OF CNR SHORT LINE SERVICE

Mr. H. Russell MacEwan (Central Nova): My question is for the Minister of Transport. In view of the importance of rail transportation to the government's regional development policies and employment in the Atlantic area, can the minister, who reports to Parliament for the Canadian National Railways, ensure that no action is being taken by the CNR to discontinue rail service on the short line in the province of Nova Scotia?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): I will be glad to bring the representations of the hon. member to the attention of the CNR. I believe I will be discussing the whole matter with them next week.

REDUCTIONS IN RAILWAY SERVICE—REFERENCE TO COMMITTEE

Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw): I have a question for the Minister of Transport. In view of the drastic reduction of rail transportation in this country, will the minister be kind enough to refer this entire subject, including the National Transportation Act as it now exists, to the Standing Committee on Transport and Communications?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): No, Mr. Speaker, not as such. Of course, there will be adequate opportunity for the appropriate committee to deal with this subject when dealing with the CNR estimates and in various other ways.

Inquiries of the Ministry

[*Translation*]

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

CANADIAN REPRESENTATION AT FUNERAL OF GENERAL DE GAULLE

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I want to direct to the Prime Minister.

I want to know whether the Prime Minister intends to represent Canada personally at General de Gaulle's funeral as President Nixon said he would represent the United States?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we are waiting for directions from France as to the level at which representations will be requested and only then shall I take a decision.

* * *

[*English*]

VETERANS AFFAIRS

INTRODUCTION OF PENSION LEGISLATION

Mr. Murray McBride (Lanark-Renfew-Carleton): I wish to direct my question to the President of the Privy Council. In view of the fact that we are on the eve of November 11, is the minister in a position to advise the House when the veterans' pension legislation will be introduced?

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Hon. Allan J. MacEachen (President of the Privy Council): It had been our hope to introduce this legislation in the House before November 11, Mr. Speaker. We will have it very soon.

STATUS OF VETERANS HOSPITALS—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT

Mr. J. P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): A supplementary question to the Minister of Veterans Affairs. Shortly after November 11, will the minister make a statement on motions as to the status of veterans' hospitals in Canada, particularly those in Saint John and Halifax?

Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs): No, Mr. Speaker, that will not be necessary.

Mr. Nowlan: A supplementary question. Perhaps the minister did not get the full purport of my question. I ask if we can expect a statement. It must be necessary because some changes are contemplated. These changes have been in the air for the last several months, if not years.

Mr. Dubé: When there are changes, Mr. Speaker, they will be announced in the proper way.

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask the Minister of Veterans Affairs if there is any reason why he cannot file notice of the legislation this afternoon so the country will know about it tomorrow?

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Dubé: The country can now take notice that legislation will be introduced very soon, Mr. Speaker.

• (3:10 p.m.)

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PUBLIC ORDER (TEMPORARY MEASURES) ACT, 1970

PROVISION OF EMERGENCY POWERS FOR PRESERVATION OF PUBLIC ORDER

The House resumed from Monday, November 9, consideration in committee of Bill C-181, to provide temporary emergency powers for the Preservation of Public Order in Canada—Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)—Mr. Laniel in the chair.

The Deputy Chairman: When the committee rose last evening we were studying clause three of the bill.

On clause 3—*Unlawful Association.*

[*Translation*]

I want to remind hon. members that towards the end of last night's sitting the hon. member for Matane informed the committee of a proposed amendment which is in itself a new drafting of the French version of clause 3, which does not change its substance.

The Chair has some reservations about the amendment and would be prepared, at this stage, to hear the hon. member for Matane and allow him to set forth his motives for submitting the amendment.

Mr. De Bané: Mr. Chairman, I think that in Beauchesne's, in citation 400 or thereabout, it is stated that an amendment may be moved providing it does not alter the substance of the clause; that is plain common sense.

If a word is missing in a text and that, through this fact, it becomes impossible to enforce the law, one can move an amendment in order to add the missing word or letter, and this should not preclude a member from moving later a substantive amendment.

I tried to demonstrate that the French translation, while correct, was not in keeping with the spirit of the French language, then later, I moved a substantive amendment. I believe the two are quite compatible. We must start with the amendment dealing with the translation, then, I shall move another one dealing with the substance.

Then I think that if I am allowed to suggest to the House that there is a word missing in a sub-clause, this does not affect my right to introduce an amendment to that sub-clause.

[Mr. Dubé.]

[*English*]

Mr. Woolliams: Does the Minister of Justice agree that this amendment merely relates to a change in the translation, in which case every reasonable member of the committee would surely agree to it? If that is all the amendment put forward by the illustrious hon. member is about, we could surely agree to it and get it over with.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, as I said yesterday evening, perhaps the hon. member is not satisfied with the translation. This translation was examined on two or three occasions. Perhaps it is not as polished as the hon. member would like it to be, but I feel that, legally, it is correct.

Mr. De Bané: Mr. Chairman, if I may reply to the Minister of Justice, I shall say two things. The first one is that the bill—

[*English*]

I will try to say it in English. Quebec's problem is not a problem of language. As a French Canadian, I do not fight to say "cheval" instead of "horse". It is not a problem of language, it is a problem of culture. It is not a problem of poverty, it is a problem of dignity.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. De Bané: While, as the Minister of Justice says, the French text is correct, I say we do not write that way in French. The laws which are made in the Province of Quebec are not written in that way. I have myself tried to put this into the French language because, in fact, this special law is so largely applicable to French speaking Canadians. I have prepared a translation of the whole bill and I have given it to the Minister of Justice. I am putting forward, without reference to the substance of the clauses, a better translation and one which has been checked by a specialist in these matters. While I agree that the translation made by the translation bureau is correct, it is not really correct French, because translation into any language is more than words—it is a way of saying something.

Mr. Deachman: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

An hon. Member: He is already speaking on a point of order.

Mr. Deachman: We have enough people in this House who speak English, but we do not speak as if we were writing a government bill. We speak English, but we would certainly expect to find different language used in writing a government bill.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I might bring to the attention of the hon. member for Matane and of the committee generally, the fact that we are not dealing at this stage with a translation. The French text and the English text are both official here and are original texts. If an hon. member wishes a text to be changed he should, in the opinion of the Chair, present an amendment to change an original text. If the committee attempts to

become some kind of linguistic assembly with regard to interpretation or translation, I think we shall be here for a long time on all our legislation. This is the opinion of the Chair. If the hon. member for Matane wishes to put an amendment to change part of the wording, the Chair will be ready to accept it but, when we come to a clause of a bill, and he wishes to substitute one text for another, I think it would be very difficult to accept.

[*Translation*]

At this stage, I would remind the hon. member for Matane that according to Beauchesne, and I quote:

It is irregular to propose to leave out all the words from "That" to the end of a clause in order to substitute other words, as such an amendment is in the nature of a new clause.

According to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Form, the hon. member for Matane may vote against clause 3 which is under consideration and if the clause is not adopted, then he may propose a new French version of clause 3.

At page 551 of the 17th edition of May's Parliamentary Rules and Forms—and I am making an attempt at translating the text into French—one can read:

Furthermore, an amedment may not be moved . . . to substitute in effect a new draft for an existing clause.

[*English*]

The English wording of May's 17th edition at the bottom of page 550 and the top of page 551 reads as follows:

Furthermore, an amendment may not be moved . . . to substitute in effect a new draft for an existing clause.

[*Translation*]

If I take these two reference as a guide it seems to me that at present the Chair cannot accept the amendment of the member for Matane as it is formulated now.

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Chairman, I am in complete agreement with what you just said. Last night, I listened closely to the statement of the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané), and I came to the conclusion that here in Ottawa, we had nothing left to envy the Quebec National Assembly: we now have our "Jean-Noël".

I agree with the hon. member for Vancouver-Quadra (Mr. Deachman), who says that if we accept the French version proposed by the hon. member for Matane, we will have to reconsider the English version of the same clause.

At any rate, Mr. Chairman, whether clause 3 is worded in the jargon of the law or in excellent French, as stated by the hon. member for Matane, the fact remains that before the courts, we will witness unending quibblings by lawyers concerning the interpretation of this clause 3.

But right now, Mr. Chairman, I think that we are losing valuable time and that we should decide immediately on the matter.

• (3:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Chairman, I feel that the matter being raised here is one of some importance, particularly in view of the fact that the bill has direct and specific application to a problem that lies within the borders of the province of Quebec. Although the bill is a national statute, and obviously has application to the whole country, presumably the legislation will be read and understood primarily by the French-speaking people of this country.

If there is any danger at all that the French text is in fact a literal translation of the language used in the first instance in an English statute, then I think the minister has a very real responsibility, not only to the French-speaking people of the country but also to his own government and to this Parliament, to make sure that the text does not give the impression, as the hon. member for Matane has suggested, that the legislation is a sort of colonial statute. There is as much in the spirit of the law as in the letter of the law, and in dealing with the sensitive issue with which this House has been seized over the past few weeks I find it remarkable that the minister would not offer the benefit of the doubt to a member of this House whose mother tongue is, in fact, French.

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The Chair does not feel that we are discussing the whole problem of translation but that we are discussing it in relation to a specific amendment. I do not think this is the time to question a decision of the minister. We are discussing the rules of the House, not addressing ourselves to the decision of the minister to accept such an amendment.

The basis for the decision of the Chair at this stage is that the amendments presented to the committee on the different clauses of the bill are not, in the opinion of the Chair, to be regarded as translations but are to be dealt with on the basis of their substance. It is for the members of the committee to decide whether they accept the substance or want to change some part of the amendment. It is difficult for the Chair to accept the argument that one text should be substituted for another text because linguistically it is better.

I do not think the Chair can entertain the other argument made by the hon. member as to the application of the bill to one province or another province. Some hon. members from that particular province are accepting the bill. We could have a debate that would move quite a distance from the subject before the committee at the present time.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Chairman, on a question of privilege, I very much resent the degree to which the Chair takes a debating position on a matter of substance.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. The Chair also takes exception to the argument advanced by the hon. member and would ask the hon. member to revert to his argument on the amendment.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Chairman, I am fully prepared to discuss the substance of this amendment, not only for its own sake but also because I am fully aware, as are all hon. members, that these amendments are being put forward on each clause, so to speak, because in

the view of the hon. member for Matane the translation does not effectively state the content of the clause in the French language. This is why, through you, Mr. Chairman, I am suggesting to the minister that he give serious consideration to the rewording of the text so that we will not produce a text that will have some counter-productive effects in its application.

I feel that there is an opportunity, during the early stages of this legislation, for the minister to make a clarifying statement in order that we do not have to face this question continually throughout the passage of the bill. I am asking for this kind of assistance in order to facilitate the passage of the bill, not to delay it. As the matter stands now, we are being forced to repeat this debate on each and every clause of the bill, which I suggest would be wasteful of the time of the committee. I believe the points raised by the hon. member for Matane to be well taken, and I ask the minister to give them very serious consideration.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, may I just reply to two great authorities on the French language, the hon. member for Matane and the hon. member from Prince Edward Island. I want to explain to them, as I have to the members of the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs who have been made aware of the drafting process, that for the last three or four years there has been no such thing as a literal translation from one language to another language in the preparation of bills, either from French to English or from English to French. The policy memorandum is prepared in each of the two official languages, and they are both quite separate. One is prepared in the English language by a common law lawyer, the other in the French language by a civil lawyer from Quebec. The two versions are not prepared for literal comparison; each version grasps the concept that it is wished to insert into the bill. That being so, translations are not literal one from the other.

Secondly, I have heard no criticism from the attorney general of the province of Quebec, who has primary responsibility for administering the bill in the French language. He has had a copy of it ever since the bill received first reading.

I can only say again to the hon. member from Prince Edward Island and to the hon. member for Matane, who moved the amendment, that those charged with the responsibility for administering the bill have had an opportunity to review the legislation and are satisfied that, within the limits of human frailty and the literary boundaries of both languages, the bill does in fact do what it attempts to do.

Mr. De Bané: Mr. Chairman, I am ready to wager that this text was written in English only, and I would say that there is indisputable evidence of it, especially if the situation has not improved since I left the Department of Justice.

What I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, since there is a debate on a procedural point, is that, according to Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, citation 408, and I quote:

> The Committee can so change the provisions of the bill that when it is reported to the House it is in substance a bill other than that which was referred. A Committee can negative every clause and substitute new clauses, *if relevant to the bill as read a second time.*

So, once again, Mr. Chairman, the wording of my amendment, and I say this in all modesty, appears to me to be more French, if I may express it thus, and a closer translation of the official version. I had no intention, when I presented my amendment, to change the English version.

In any case, I would not want to delay unduly the proceedings of the House. If such is your decision, Mr. Chairman, I will only read the texts I have proposed, without tabling them, and I will be satisfied with making substantive amendments.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Chairman: Considering the last remarks of the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané), he does not intend to move his amendment. Therefore—

Mr. De Bané: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, but I said "If such is your decision".

The Deputy Chairman: I must point out at this stage that the Chair feels that the amendment tabled has not yet been put to the House and cannot be accepted as an amendment to the French version of clause 3.

If the hon. member for Matane wishes to put his amendment in another form, if he asks the House to substitute certain words after such and such a line, or the fourth word of a given line, I do feel the committee would not refuse him the right to do so; but he must base himself on the interpretation and substance. But he cannot do it, as he apparently intends to do now or later for several other clauses, on the basis of the translation. Then, if he moves an amendment to correct some lines or parts of a clause, the Chair has no other choice but to accept his suggestion.

Mr. Asselin: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

You are overlooking an important point of the Standing Orders. When an amendment to a legislation has been put forward by a member, it no longer belongs to the member but to the House. Even if the member wished to withdraw his amendment, Mr. Chairman, he would have to ask unanimous consent of the House. Otherwise, we would have to vote on it.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I must point out to the hon. member for Charlevoix that the amendment has never been put. It has not been presented to the House, but only tabled for the sole purpose of allowing members to read it beforehand. This somewhat complicates our procedure. It has been done as a result of an understand-

ing among the parties, in order to facilitate consideration of the proposed amendments. The present one has not yet been moved as such.

Mr. De Bané: Mr. Chairman, I should like to move, if I am allowed to, the following amendment. In line 2 of clause 3, I move that the words "appelé le Front de Libération du Québec" and the following words be replaced by the following ones:

... qui s'appelle Front de Libération du Québec, ou tout groupe ou association lui succédant, ainsi que tout groupe ou toute association qui préconise de recourir à la force ou au crime pour réaliser au Canada un changement de régime politique identique ou analogue à celui que préconise ledit Front de Libération du Québec, ou pour y contribuer, sont déclarés être des associations illégales.

• (3:30 p.m.)

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, once again the hon. member is changing the French text. I suggest that the committee should not accept the amendment.

Mr. De Bané: This is word for word what was said yesterday.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. At any rate, I must point out to the Minister of Justice that the Chair still allowed the hon. member to move an emendment to change the wording because, according to the rules of the House, he is allowed to change some words.

I must read at once the member's motion. It is moved by the hon. member for Matane that all the words following "association" which is found in clause 3 of the bill now under consideration be replaced by the following words:

—known as Front de Libération du Québec and any successor group or successor association of the said Front de Libération du Québec, or any group or persons or association that advocates the use of force or the commission of crime as a means of or as an aid in accomplishing the same or substantially the same governmental change within Canada as that advocated by the said Front de Libération du Québec, are declared to be unlawful associations.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, I do not object to your courtesy towards the hon. member who has just moved a third French version of his amendment. However, I think that we should turn down this third version as we did the second and the first.

Mr. De Bané: I rise on a question of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

What I have just heard is totally and completely invalidated by yesterday's *Hansard*. What I did, Mr. Chairman, was to move a change in clause 2 (d) which says that "the unlawful association" means "an unlawful association". I suggested that the definition contained in clause 3 should appear in clause 2 which already contains the definitions. Last night, I moved another definition. The Chair asked me not to read the whole definition but to start after the first three or four words, which I have just done.

The Deputy Chairman: However, the Chair should point out to the hon. member for Matane that the point raised was not a question of privilege but rather an exchange between the hon. member and the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Lachance: Mr. Chairman, we must recognize that an amendment is before the House and that we will have to vote on it. It is hard for me, at this time, to reach a decision on this matter. I wish to ask the Minister of Justice whether this amendment allows the legislation to reach its aim. Indeed, if the new wording is actually good, I do not see why we would not vote for it.

I wish the Minister of Justice would tell us whether the aims of the legislation will actually be realized by the new definition or if the previous one would be more appropriate?

[*English*]

Mr. Skoberg: If I understood correctly, Mr. Chairman, the question was asked of the Minister of Justice. I am wondering whether the Minister of Justice has enough consideration for the House to at least acknowledge the questions asked of him in order that we may have the opportunity to assess the merits of the question.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, I have already answered that question on two occasions. The difficulty here is that the hon. member for Matane does not understand the relationship of Section 3 of the bill to the second preamble, since it must be interpreted in accordance with the second preamble. Taken together, the texts in both English and French as they now read incorporates, in the opinion of those who advised me on those matters, the purpose of the bill.

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Deputy Chairman: Is the Committee ready for the question? All those in favour will please rise. All those opposed will please rise.

Amendment (Mr. De Bané) negatived: yeas, 10; nays 44.

• (3:40 p.m.)

The Deputy Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Shall clause 3 carry? The hon. member for Matane.

[*Translation*]

Mr. De Bané: I should like to remind Your Honour that I have moved a second amendment which reads as follows:

That the words: ... that advocates the use ... be deleted in line 6—

—as well as the following words, and that they be replaced by the following words:

"Designated or described in an order of the Governor General in Council".

Mr. Chairman, allow me to say a few words about the meaning of this amendment.

Since the first amendment which I moved has not been carried, I refer to the wording which is proposed to us.

One can read on line 5 the following words:

—or any group of persons or association that advocates the use of force or the commission of crime as a means of or as an aid in accomplishing the same or substantially the same governmental change within Canada as that advocated by the said Front de Libération du Québec—

The French wording is as follows: "...identique ou à peu près identique..."; the English wording reads:

[*English*]

"The same or substantially the same". As I was quoting yesterday from Webster's Third International Dictionary, "substantial" means the most important part related to something. Then, the question arises, what is the most important part of the FLQ.

[*Translation*]

In reading the preamble, one finds that the legislation is aimed at the FLQ, while in section 3, one finds that three types of associations are singled out: The FLQ, its successors or any other group with the same or substantially the same views.

I tried yesterday to demonstrate how difficult it is to know which criteria should be used in determining whether an association is aiming at the same goals as the FLQ. First of all, what are the FLQ's objectives? To say that it is the independence of Quebec is absolutely wrong. To say that it is the welfare of the workers is utterly false. To say that they have been written in a formal document is also false. The content of the FLQ's manifestoes changes daily.

In view of the power given to the peace officers to arrest on mere suspicion an individual falling into one of those three categories, it is desirable to limit the scope of this bill. This is why I move that each association be mentioned in an order in council. Faulty as it might be, this procedure will enable us at least to debate the government's decision. Otherwise, we will hear from the court, after several months of proceedings, that an individual already arrested and detained without bail, was actually a member of an unlawful association provided for by this bill.

[*English*]

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman—

The Deputy Chairman: Order. The Chair will put the motion first.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) moves to replace that part of clause 3 beginning on line 6 with the words:

—"that advocates"—

—up to the end of the clause by the words:

—"designated or described in an order of the governor general in council".

[Mr. De Bané.]

[*English*]

It is my interpretation that the hon. member for Matane wishes to replace all the words after the word "association" on line 6 by the following words: I shall read his amendment as it is in French.

[*Translation*]

—"designated or described in an order of the governor general in council".

The hon. member for Calgary North. Did you want to get up on this?

[*English*]

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say something, not only on the amendment but also on the clause. I wish to refer for a few moments to the royal commission on security because we have heard government spokesmen make frequent reference to the responsibility of the Attorney General of the province of Quebec. I should have thought the government at least would have followed the recommendations of the royal commission on security, particularly since the report was published in 1969. Not only do I wish to refer to the report because of the interpretations, but also in order to bring to the attention of members of the committee, the fact that it has been suggested the government might have taken some action as long as two years ago. I wish to read a paragraph which I believe answers any argument that the government acted in time when there was a crisis. This paragraph deals with unlawful associations. It deals first of all with the administration of justice generally and reads:

However, if there is any evidence of an intention to engage in subversive or seditious activities, or if there is any suggestion of foreign influence, it seems to us inescapable that the federal government has a clear duty to take such security measures as are necessary to protect the integrity of the federation. At the very least it must take adequate steps to inform itself of any such threats, and to collect full information about the intentions and capabilities of individuals or movements whose object is to destroy the federation by subversive or seditious methods.

Here, in paragraph 22, is the part I think we should remember.

Although the more moderate elements of the Quebec separatist movement have up till now been conducting a largely political campaign, it appears to us that there is in certain quarters a tendency to resort to activities that could well be regarded as seditious.

That was written two years ago by the commission which investigated security in Canada. It said two years ago that this problem, the FLQ and its seditious activities, existed. Then, all of a sudden on Friday, at four o'clock in the morning, the government moves and says there is a crisis when this situation existed before.

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please. It is the opinion of the Chair that the hon. member for Calgary North is discussing the whole problem and is not relating his remarks to the amendment we have before us which is quite specific. The amendment is an attempt to define associations other than the FLQ that would be designated

by the Governor in Council. So, I think the hon. member's remarks are a little removed from that aspect.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, in his amendment my friend asks for a definition of the FLQ. I do not know what the FLQ is. I do not think the Minister of Justice can define it, and yet we are legislating on it. I should like someone to stand up in the House and define it. Nobody can define it. This is the point I am trying to make. Perhaps the royal commission on security defined it in paragraph 22. This may at least make his amendment sound, or make the clause sound or unsound. I should like to finish the few lines in question.

—it appears to us that there is in certain quarters a tendency to resort to activities that could well be regarded as seditious.

Listen to this:

What is more, there is no doubt about communist and Trotskyist interest and involvement in the movement. Both groups have established "autonomous" Quebec organizations as somewhat transparent attempts to exploit separatist sentiment; members of both have achieved positions of influence in at least some of the separatist groups and agencies, helped by the often bitter factionalism within the movement itself. For these reasons alone it seems to us essential that the Canadian security authorities should pay close attention to the development of these particular elements—

I am sure at that time the Commission was dealing with the FLQ.

• (3:50 p.m.)

Then paragraph 23 of the report reads:

Foreign involvement is more difficult to establish with any certainty.

However, it is clear that there is evidence to this effect, and it is time the federal government moved. They have not moved for two years. They cannot explain today what the FLQ is but we will have to vote on it. We may have to go along with the government, but I would like the Minister of Justice or one of his law officers to tell me what the definition of the FLQ is. I do not know it nor does anyone in the Committee. What does it mean? Does it mean communism? As I understand it, it is any group or association that suggests that crime should be the means of change or that violence should be the means of change. That, as I understand, is the amendment to clause 3. Does this just apply to the FLQ, and what is the FLQ? Is it an association that stands for the two things I have mentioned, or is it something more than that? If a court can convict a person for belonging to the FLQ, can communists also be convicted, if that is what communism stands for? I am not here to define communism. I think this is a most ambiguous clause and I can see why the hon. member is concerned about its interpretation.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Speaking to the amendment of the hon. member for Matane, I said earlier that the Committee should read clause 3 together with the second paragraph of the preamble. Clause 3 reads:

The group of persons or association known as Le Front de Libération du Québec and any successor group or successor association of the said Le Front de Libération du Québec, or any group of persons or association that advocates the use of force or the commission of crime as a means of or as an aid in accomplishing the same or substantially the same governmental change within Canada as that advocated by the said Le Front de Libération du Québec, is declared to be an unlawful association.

The second paragraph of the preamble reads:

And Whereas the public order in Canada continues to be endangered by elements of the group of persons or association known as Le Front de Libération du Québec who advocate the use of force or the commission of crime as means of or as an aid in accomplishing governmental change within Canada with respect to the province of Quebec or its relationship to Canada—

On reading those two together, one sees that the clause makes an unlawful association of the FLQ or of any successor or substitute organization or of any other association having substantially the same purpose and using substantially the same means, namely, attempting governmental change in Canada by aid of force or by the commission of crime with respect to Quebec or its relationship to Canada. Those are the perimeters of the definition. They are more narrowly drawn than they were under current regulations to make it precise that this is the situation we are trying to meet.

The hon. member for Matane suggests that we eliminate the words that begin with:

[*Translation*]

—"that advocates"—

[*English*]

which would mean in English the elimination of the words:

—that advocates the use of force or the commission of crime as a means of or as an aid in accomplishing the same or substantially the same governmental change within Canada as that advocated by the said Le Front de Libération du Québec—

He wants to substitute:

[*Translation*]

—designated or described in an order of the Governor General in council.

[*English*]

In other words, he wants to say that the FLQ or any other organization decreed by the Governor in Council is declared to be an unlawful association. This would be rendering illegal any association, no matter what it was, decreed by the Governor in Council. I do not think anybody in the House, except for the hon. member for Matane, would allow a crime to be created unilaterally by the Governor in Council or the cabinet.

For that reason, there is no way we can accept that amendment.

Mr. Woolliams: Would the minister answer one question before the hon. member for York South rises to speak? I hold in my hand a document by Mr. Elmer A. Driedger, Q.C., B.A., LL.B., assistant deputy minister and parliamentary counsel to the Department of Justice. At page 94 of his book "The Composition of Legislation" he sets out very clearly that a preamble can be used as a guide but cannot be used to interpret a section or sections of the act. Is the minister suggesting—and I am not

dealing with the point he made in reference to the amendment—that the preamble should be used to interpret the section of the act and must be read with that section so that it can be interpreted? If he is, one of the officers of the Crown disagrees with him.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I can cite other statements of Mr. Driedger which bear particularly on the point, and which would substantiate the contention that the preamble is part of the bill. It is a well known rule of statutory construction that a preamble may be referred to to give meaning to any provision in the bill. If, at some later stage in the proceedings, the hon. member wants me to produce authorities to that effect in the United Kingdom, in Canada and in the United States, I would be pleased to do so.

Mr. Lewis: This is obviously one of the crucial clauses of the bill, and I want to say a few words on it if I may. First I want to express—

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please. Is the hon. member speaking to the amendment?

Mr. Lewis: I assure you, Mr. Chairman, that I am aware of the amendment and will speak to it. First, I want to express my doubts as to the value of making any organization unlawful, although, as I said in my remarks the other day, in my view this is a criminal conspiracy and against the law even now. But perhaps the minister could make some change to clause 3 that would make some of us less unhappy with the wording which now appears to go beyond what the minister wanted. Although obviously what the minister said with regard to the preamble is relevant, I wonder why he should leave it in doubt so someone will have to argue with reference to the preamble.

I cannot see how it is possible to accept the amendment of the hon. member for Matane. If I understand it, it means that the government will have the right to designate organizations as unlawful, against which there would be no appeal. No one dragged into court under that provision would be able to argue that the organization he belongs to is not unlawful, as he might if he were dragged in under this rather broadly worded provision. Under this provision he would at least have the right to argue that under the proper interpretation of the clause, the organization of which he is a member is not unlawful. If you give the government the legislative right to designate a list of organizations as being unlawful—I have not had a great experience in criminal law—but it seems to me to be simple logic that once the government has done that there is no argument about it. No one can argue as to whether or not the organization is unlawful if the government has so designated it.

I cannot think of any less desirable power to place in the hands of the government than this kind of power. Therefore, much as I sympathize with what the hon. member for Matane is trying to accomplish, I suggest to him with great respect that this proposal is a bad one and that it does the opposite of what he intends it to do. I believe that Parliament cannot give that sort of power to the government.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

Now, if I may, I should like to turn to the Minister of Justice and ask him through you, Mr. Chairman, the following question in order to avoid any misunderstanding. As I will have occasion to say perhaps two or three times in this committee, and I do not intend to speak long now or at any other time, does he not agree that the difficulty about a bill restricting people's rights is that, in addition to any problem of the legal effect of the bill, there is the very real problem of the psychological effect of the bill, or the inhibitory effect it has on people's behaviour, the fear it arouses as to whether one can do this, that or the other thing? The fewer provisions you have in a bill such as this inhibiting people from doing perfectly proper things, the better the bill is. Therefore I wonder why, instead of leaving the interpretation to argument based on the second paragraph in the preamble, the Minister of Justice could not give consideration to placing those words right in this clause? May I just finish, Mr. Chairman, because that will take less time than for you to rise and tell me to sit down?

• (4:00 p.m.)

The Deputy Chairman: The Chair feels that the hon. member is out of order. The point he is making now could be made after the committee has decided on the amendment. There may be other hon. members who want to speak for or against the amendment. It is for that reason the Chair has interrupted the hon. member.

Mr. Lewis: I must admit you are right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I pay tribute to the hon. member for Matane for attempting to deal with a very difficult problem in clause 3, although I do not agree with the method he has chosen. His amendment would give a wide power to this or any other government, and I do not think that would be wise. However, in presenting the amendment, he has brought forward a basic point to which the Minister of Justice did not respond when it was originally brought forward by the hon. member for Calgary North and referred to by the hon. member for York South. There is no substantive definition of FLQ, and using the preamble to do this is a debatable method. That is one of the weaknesses in this kind of legislation, or in the steps being taken by the government to outlaw the FLQ. I realize that is the substance of clause 3, and I will speak to that when we are dealing with the clause itself.

[*Translation*]

Mr. De Bané: Mr. Chairman, I only want to clear up a matter.

Obviously, it is complete nonsense to introduce a bill asking us to authorize the Governor General in Council to decree what associations are unlawful.

In its present form, the clause in question does not make sense. What I want to point out is that we are now experiencing a situation in which the government can, even today, if it so desires, pass orders in council.

[*English*]

While we are debating here this afternoon, the government has power, by virtue of the War Measures Act, to

designate a lot of associations illegal by Order in Council. What I am suggesting now is that what the government can do by virtue of the War Measures Act be put in this law, which is to be in effect for a few months. What I am saying is that it should not be left to the court to decide whether somebody who has been arrested, who has been detained without bail because he is not entitled to it, is a member of an illegal association or not. Hon. members should remember that the Governor in Council already has the power to declare the association of which he is a member illegal. When the government decided the FLQ was illegal, it did so by virtue of an Order in Council passed during the night. Suppose that tomorrow people from Newfoundland were to kidnap a minister of the Crown, a federal minister whose riding is in B.C. Would their organization be similar or substantially similar to the FLQ?

The government might proclaim the War Measures Act a number of times and declare associations illegal by Order in Council. The government has this power already, and so I am saying, put it in the law which is to be in effect for three months. If the government decided one of the parties, especially the opposition, was illegal, then the government would fall before the opposition. We would have a debate in Canada about that decision.

Mr. Brewin: I wonder if I may ask the hon. member if that is not precisely one of the reasons we are hoping to get rid of the War Measures Act, because it does give such sweeping powers which now are taken away by this bill. However, his amendment would restore that power to the government, would restore that right to declare any organization in Canada illegal?

Mr. De Bané: If I may answer through you, Mr. Chairman, if we pass this bill it will be effective for three months, but the other measure is there permanently.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Chairman: The hon. members have heard the amendment moved by the hon. member for Matane. Those in favour of the amendment will please rise. Those opposed will please rise.

Amendment (Mr. De Bané) negatived: Yeas, 1; nays, 55.

[*English*]

The Deputy Chairman: Shall clause 3 carry?

Mr. Alexander: May I ask the minister a question with particular reference to the answer that he just gave to the hon. member for Calgary North. I believe the minister indicated that he is placing great stress on the preamble in order to define the FLQ. Because of the ambiguity of this particular procedure, leaving the committee in a very peculiar position, I would like to refer the minister to Driedger on "The Composition of Legislation" at page 94 where we find the following:

If a preamble is intended to have legal effect—

I stop there. I think this is the minister's intention.

—it would perhaps be better to insert in the act itself a section that will produce that effect;

Could the minister indicate why he found it unnecessary to include within the definition clause the second statement of the preamble?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, I am sure members of the committee appreciate that this was a very difficult section to draft, both in the regulations and now in the bill, because the FLQ does not have a corporate charter, nor does it set forth its objects and purposes in the way that the purposes and objects of an association are usually set out. I put the question that hon. members are now putting to me to those who advise me, who happen to be among the best legislation drafters in the country. They assured me that the best way to state the purposes, in so far as they can be rendered precise enough to deal with the organization we are trying to combat, but also general enough to deal with any attempt by that organization to disperse, or regroup under another name, or operate through allied organizations having the same purposes and using the same means, was to use the words that are chosen here.

The words in the preamble are left in the preamble to apply evenly throughout the act because the preamble applies throughout the act. If they were incorporated in this clause, then there would be an unevenness which would not achieve the result we are trying to achieve. I can assure hon. members that I, personally, went over this point very carefully with those who are charged with advising me, who are the successors of Mr. Driedger.

Mr. Alexander: But you cannot discount it.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I am not discounting it, but I can read you other passages from Driedger to support what I am saying. I may add he is now retained by the Department of Justice in the Chair of Legislation Drafting that we set up last year in the University of Ottawa. I can assure hon. members that the results we have attempted to achieve will be achieved by the way the bill is now constructed. We rang the changes on the various ways so that this could be done.

• (4:10 p.m.)

First of all, as the regulations were drafted, they gave rise to a situation, as hon. members know, where attorneys general across the country might well have looked at words such as "having as its aim and purpose the overthrow of the government by violence, crime or force," and drawn certain broad conclusions. We had to indicate that the governmental change within Canada was to be accomplished by groups such as Le Front de Libération du Québec. The key words are, "governmental change within Canada". Those words are interpreted by that part of the preamble which reads, "... governmental change within Canada with respect to the province of Quebec or its relationship to Canada". As I say, those words are found in the preamble. It will depend on judicial construction. Of course, we can never be sure how they will be construed. Nevertheless, on the basis of the rules of statutory interpretation that have been given to me, I am assured that the purpose of the bill will be achieved.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I listened to the minister very carefully, and I have not the slightest doubt that he has given this very careful attention and is no more desirous than anybody else of widening the ambit of the law. But he has not persuaded me that it would not be of value to incorporate the words to which he referred in the second paragraph of the preamble in clause 3.

As the minister was speaking, I glanced through the bill quickly. I think I am not wrong in suggesting that every clause of the bill bears some relationship to the unlawful association, directly or indirectly. Therefore, the definition of unlawful association governs the entire bill, in my submission. I ask the minister, in what way would it harm the bill if clause 3 were to incorporate the words he read in the following way, so that the clause would read, ". . any group of persons or association that advocates the use of force or the commission of crime as a means of or as an aid in accomplishing the same or substantially the same governmental change with respect to the province of Quebec or its relationship to Canada . . ? Why could we not take out the words, "within Canada"? In themselves the words, "within Canada", add very little.

I have not written out my proposed amendment. If you will give me a moment, Mr. Chairman, I can write out my amendment, which would read that clause 3 shall be amended by deleting the words "within Canada" on line 10 of page 3, and substituting therefor, "with respect to the province of Quebec or its relationship to Canada." I beg your pardon. We should delete the words on lines 10, 11 and 12, beginning with "within Canada as that advocated by the said Le Front de Libération du Québec" and substituting the words I indicated. I will write out my amendment, if I may.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, perhaps we could stand the clause and go back to it when the hon. member has had time to finish his drafting. When you are dealing with this type of organization, drafting a bill is not easy as some hon. members might suggest.

Mr. Baldwin: That is what the Supreme Court says.

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): Before clause 3 carries, Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak on it.

Some hon. Members: It is to stand.

The Chairman: Is that agreed?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Clause stands.

On clause 4—*Offence and punishment.*

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I wish to move an amendment to subclause (c) of clause 4 of the bill. I wish to say a few words in introduction. In my remarks last Thursday, I said I was not quite certain whether this bill was any longer necessary. The report of the evidence of Bernard Lortie, as my colleague, the hon. member for Timiskaming pointed out quite properly last night, indicates that there appears not to be the kind of organized plan that some people in Canada thought there was. In any case, if Parliament is to give to the police forces extended powers, which this bill seeks to do, I suggest that those extended powers should be carefully limited to those that are absolutely essential to accomplish the purposes which the bill appears to have.

We should not go one iota beyond the most essential powers needed for the purposes of the bill.

I find the words, "communicates statements on behalf of" in subclause (c) very disturbing. The other day the minister dealt with this. He said that in his view those words mean that there would have to be an element of agency on behalf of the unlawful association before a person could be said to have committed an offence by communicating whatever he may have communicated. He gave us an example. I ought to look up *Hansard* to get his exact words. Perhaps he will forgive me for not having them; I have not had the time to look them up. I think he said that you must decide whether the journalist permitted himself to be used as an agent of the unlawful association or whether he was merely reporting something that was news about the unlawful association. I think that is the kind of statement the minister made. Why should anybody be put in that position? Why should you include language in the bill which makes a reporter doubt whether he has authority to exercise the freedom of the press? That is what we are talking about here. Why should those words be included, unless they are absolutely essential. Why should you have words in this bill, unless they are absolutely essential, that create censorship, whether the minister intended it that way or not.

There have been quite a few instances of this sort of thing flowing from the regulations under the War Measures Act. As I remember it, this clause is word for word the same as a similar clause in the regulations. As a result of that subsection in the act, a number of newspapers were interfered with by the RCMP. The editors of those papers wondered whether they should publish the manifesto of the FLQ as information for students at the university or whether they could publish certain comments with respect to the situation in Quebec. The RCMP went into the editorial offices of student newspapers and into the printing shop where those student newspapers were being printed, looked over the material, and said, "No, you cannot put that in; you can only put that in." According to my information, and I assure you it is accurate, in some cases they said, "You can print it, but not this paragraph and not this sentence". If that is not censorship, I should like to know what is. And by whom is there censorship? Not by the Minister of Justice and not by the Attorney General; it is exercised by the police. This will continue to happen.

As the minister may know, an association of journalists in Quebec met the other day and expressed concern about this particular wording in subclause (c). They had already experienced, they said—and I am merely referring to what they said—an interference with what they considered their right and duty as journalists to give information to the Canadian people. We have had examples of this kind of thing with radio stations and television stations. No matter how much the minister or anybody else may deny it, I have not any doubt in my mind

that there has been interference and censorship of news that has come over the air and on the screen. If I thought that this power was necessary, if I thought that the purpose of the bill could not be served without these words, perhaps my attitude would be different. But it would require an awful lot of facts, as well as much argument, to persuade me that these words are necessary. What ought to be prohibited in this bill is communication by representatives or purported representatives of the unlawful association. Their work of communicating is clearly unlawful.

• (4:20 p.m.)

I repeat what I said earlier with respect to clause 3. It is not only what the legal effect may be, it is the moral inhibiting effect of a clause like this on reporters, people in universities, teachers and professors. They will constantly be asking themselves whether they can do this or that or whether it is against the law. As has been stated in many stories, publishers and printers are likely to seek advice from their lawyers. The lawyers are likely to reply that they are not quite sure, they have some doubt and therefore it is better to cut that portion. That is always safe advice for a lawyer to give his client.

The inhibiting effect of the words, "communicates on behalf of" is extremely dangerous. It is the same kind of idea to which we are objecting, and will be objecting, in a number of amendments which we will move, not for the purpose of weakening the essential thrust of the bill, but cutting out the unnecessary interference with civil liberties and rights which are not essential to the fight against the terrorists organization known as Le Front de Liberation du Québec. I therefore, move:

That clause 4(c) of Bill C-181 be amended by deleting therefrom the words "on behalf of or" so that the subclause shall read as follows:

(c) communicates statements as a representative or professed representative of the unlawful association.

Mr. Hogarth: Mr. Chairman—

The Chairman: Order, please. The Chair will put the motion. The hon. member for York South moves:

That clause 4(c) of Bill C-181 be amended by deleting therefrom the words "on behalf of or" so that the subclause shall read as follows:

(c) communicates statements as a representative or professed representative of the unlawful association.

Mr. Hogarth: Will the hon. member for York South permit a question? At what university did the Royal Canadian Mounted Police exercise surveillance over the student newspaper?

Mr. Lewis: At the moment I cannot—my memory is—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Lewis: Just take it easy. My memory is either the printers of the Carleton newspaper or that of some other university. I will find that out for the hon. member. I assure him that what I said is accurate, even though I cannot give him the name of the university at the moment.

Mr. Orlikow: May I be permitted to add to that, Mr. Chairman? The Ottawa newspapers, radio and television stations were very explicit that the issue of the Carleton University newspaper which carried the FLQ manifesto was not printed until after the RCMP were called in by the printer. I express no view of whether they should or should not have printed the manifesto. The RCMP instructed that there should be a paragraph printed on the front page making it clear that the manifesto was printed only as information and did not express the views of the editorial staff.

An hon. Member: What is wrong with that?

Mr. Orlikow: It may be that we are living in a time when censorship is necessary. I suggest to the hon. member who asked "What is wrong with that?" that if we are to have censors, it should be understood who they will be. The censor should be the Minister of Justice. I am not being critical of the RCMP, but in my view police officers are not competent by their education, training and experience to be censors of sedition, pornography or anything else. I am opposed to censorship, but if we must have censorship, it must be done by properly qualified people who have been designated by specific legislation. In answer to the question asked by the hon. member for New Westminster, in the case of the Carleton University newspaper the RCMP gave instructions as to what had to be added before something could be printed. I say that is censorship.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Do you have first-hand knowledge of that?

Mr. Hogarth: The hon. member for Don Valley and I happened to be at Carleton University on that day. We were advised by students closely connected with the newspaper that the printer, who is not in the university, was advised by his solicitor to have the RCMP look at the newspaper before being published. I want to make clear that the RCMP did not walk in just to look at the newspaper.

Mr. Lewis: I was at the same meeting. I think the hon. member is correct on those details. However, it remains true that the printer, publisher or someone was concerned about it because of the wording of the regulations under the War Measures Act, which is the same wording as in this bill. I submit we ought not to create the kind of situation where a publisher or printer is afraid of what may be published and, therefore, calls in the police for advice. For the purpose of this bill, that is completely unnecessary and undesirable.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, I think that hon. members might concede that the purpose of clause 4(c) which makes it an offence to "communicate statements on behalf of"—and I will leave those words in abeyance for the moment—"or as a representative or professed representative of the unlawful association", if

this bill is to be accepted, is a relevant offence. Anything that deliberately extends the seditious conspiracy is a part of the offence. These words are found in the definition of sedition, the communication of words. There will always be a situation where a line must be drawn. This will have to be drawn in every individual case on the basis of individual facts as to what is legitimate reporting of news and fair comment on the one hand, and participation in the seditious conspiracy on the other. That is always a question of judgment. There is no way we can codify this to anticipate all arguments that will arise. That is what the courts are for. There is no way the members of this committee will be able completely to resolve the problem.

The drafting attempts to separate fair comment and reporting of the news from statements that may be made by way of an agency relationship on behalf of the FLQ or any other "unlawful association". The word "representative" is used. That implies an agency relationship or professed relationship, he who is speaking professedly on behalf of someone else. The idea of representative implies an agency situation. If the word "representative" was the only word, I submit that the agency relationship would have to be proved as well, namely not only that the person acted as an agent but had authority to act as an agent.

Mr. Lewis: You also have the words "professed representative".

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): This is why the words "on behalf of" are used in addition, so that ratification by him who authorized the agency would not have to be proved. Obviously, that is beyond proof. These words "on behalf of" or "pour" in French are quite indicative of objective analysis and absolve the Crown from proving the ratification of the agency relation. I said yesterday, in answer to questions put on a point of order by the hon. member for Calgary North, that there is nothing in this bill which constitutes censorship. The legal advisers who report to me gave an opinion to that effect to the CBC who requested it. The reason we gave an opinion to the CBC is that we have a lawyer-client relationship with that corporation, it being a Crown corporation; we do not give legal opinions usually, but the corporation sought one. The hon. member says he is interested not only in the legal aspects of this, but in the moral aspects of it; a climate of fear has been set up, so he says. I wonder whether he could really explain to the committee how the withdrawal of the words "on behalf of" would change that climate, whatever it is, and I do not intend to concede that argument to him. It really would not affect the moral situation at all.

• (4:30 p.m.)

Faced with the extraordinary situation which confronts us, the FLQ, and the extraordinary remedy we are seeking to apply to it as precisely as we can, without casting the net too wide but casting it wide enough to immobilize the conspiracy we are attempting to immobilize, there is in this bill and in the regulations, some flexibility. We think we have probably profited from the experience we have had over the last two or three weeks. We have had the flexibility I mentioned in the speech I made supporting the proclamation of the War Measures Act. We are dealing now with regulations which one can amend, and which we are now, in effect, amending by this bill, on the basis of the experience we have gained and we think we are as precise as we can be.

I do not believe the withdrawal of the words "on behalf of" would cure the situation to which the hon. member for York South referred in his argument. I believe it is incumbent upon, sometimes in difficult circumstance, a newspaperman who may come into possession of an FLQ communique to ponder what he should do with it. He is free to publish it. There is nothing in this bill which says he cannot do so, but he has an obligation, probably, to give it to the police first in order not to put himself in a position where he is obstructing justice under the terms of the present provisions of the Criminal Code.

There is the question of how he responds. When, for instance, in connection with the photographs of Mr. Cross over last weekend, several photographs were sent to Quebec newspapers, they sought out the Attorney General of Quebec. After one of those photographs had been sent to the Associated Press in New York, and that photograph was published, the Attorney General said "Publish the photographs". I think what the Attorney General of Quebec is trying to do is get a bit of lead time on these communiques so that immediate publication will not impede or obstruct the legitimate investigation of sources of the FLQ. The legal effect here is as precise as we can make it. We want to impede communication only in so far as that communication may represent an agency or representative aspect. In order not to have to prove the agency as a complete concept, in which event we would have to seek out and prove the ratification by a principal, the words "on behalf of" are added to make it perfectly clear with what we are dealing. That was the mental process we went through.

Mr. Lewis: I am glad to hear there was one.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Thank you. I understand the difficulty, but I do not think the difficulty to which the hon. member addressed himself would be resolved by the omission of these words, and the effectiveness of the provision would be weakened by their elimination.

Mr. Baldwin: I have listened with great care to what the minister has said. I think that he has given us, unconsciously, the real reason for the inclusion of the words "on behalf of". I still believe this is a form of indirect censorship. The minister may shake his head. He may not think so. But he has indicated that people in the position of the newspapermen in Montreal, in order to make sure that they would not be caught by the terms of this clause, would be obliged to go to the authorities and ask for permission to do certain things. This is an indirect form of censorship. I believe this is what the provision is meant to ensure; it certainly is the result.

We support the amendment. We would have moved a similar amendment ourselves but we knew the hon. member for York South had put one down. The argument advanced by the minister would be fascinating if put forward before an appellate division, especially if the minister were arguing on behalf of the Crown that the words "on behalf of" were wide enough to catch people who communicated statements when they could not be proved beyond reasonable doubt to be representatives of the association. But there are two aspects of the bill which ought to be taken into account when evaluating the minister's statement.

It is not a question under this legislation of facing a charge, getting out on bail and then having a fine academic argument in a case where both the accused and the Crown are represented by counsel. In clause 9, we see what can happen to a person or an individual who is charged with communicating statements on behalf of an association. He can be picked up and detained for the period provided in the legislation. This takes him out of this fine, academic consideration of what the law is and whether or not he can be convicted. The second point is that in normal circumstances one could get into a fine academic argument concerning the burden of proof, *mens rea*, the necessity of an offence being proved beyond reasonable doubt, and the weight of evidence. But there is in this legislation an evidential clause which provides that communication "on behalf of" is assumed to be an offence though there is an opportunity for an accused person to prove his innocence. Clause 8 makes this provision beyond any shadow of a doubt. It reads:

> In any prosecution for an offence under this Act, evidence that any person, either before or after the coming into force of this Act... communicated statements on behalf of or as a representative or professed representative of the unlawful association... is, in the absence of evidence to the contrary proof that he is a member of the association.

So, there are two retroactive aspects to this bill. I understand that this may be necessary. This is extraordinary legislation and I recognize it as such, but when we come to consider the amendment before us, provisions of the type to which I have drawn attention must be taken into account. Obviously, the government did take these things into account, because when we look at the regulations which were promulgated under the War Measures Act we find precisely the same wording as to the definition of the offence in clause four. But when we come to the question of the evidential aspect, it appears that the government had second thoughts because the words "on behalf of, or" are omitted and we find in 8(c) of the regulations under the War Measures Act the words "communicated statements of the unlawful association as a representative or professed representative of the unlawful association." The words "on behalf of, or" are omitted.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): That was an oversight. Those words are caught in 4(c) of the present regulations. That is a regulation similar to the subsection of the bill we are now bringing in.

Mr. Baldwin: I know that as far as putting the burden on the accused to prove himself innocent is concerned, those words were omitted from clause 8. The minister says that this was an oversight. I would hate to think that an oversight of that character would be introduced into legislation of this kind, with the effect that it might have.

• (4:40 p.m.)

I therefore suggest, on those two grounds alone, that since we are dealing here with people who are not associated or connected with the unlawful association or the FLQ, the minister should relent and accept the very useful amendment introduced by the hon. member for York South.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, before the hon. member for York South and the hon. member for Winnipeg North escape, I wanted to inform them that I recall either having read in *Hansard* or heard the Solicitor General deny that the RCMP had been censoring or attempting to censor student newspapers. May I say I have been advised by the RCMP that student newspapers across Canada are not being censored by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

Application of the powers contained in the War Measures Act has been restricted by the RCMP to the activities of the Front de Liberation du Quebec. In the event that a publisher questions the RCMP as to the legality of printing matter involving the War Measures Act, the publisher's attention is drawn to section 4, along with the suggestion that he discuss the question with his solicitors. No university student newspaper editors were warned that action would be taken against them if they distributed newspapers.

That is the information I have from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and it is my recollection that the Solicitor General said something to that effect in the House.

May I suggest to hon. members that statements of the kind they made in the House are statements for which they ought to take responsibility. If there is evidence of censorship and they make that statement, then they have a duty both to the House and to this committee to disclose the details of the censorship and where it occurred.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the minister a question arising out of the statement he made. Is the Minister of Justice saying that the RCMP have informed him that they did not look over any editions of university newspapers; that on no occasion did they tell either the publishers or the editors of newspapers that certain texts must be eliminated or certain paragraphs or sentences added, or should be added, before the material is published?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, I have made perfectly clear what the RCMP instructions were to their own people and what their advice was to me. If the

hon. gentleman has evidence to the contrary, I would be grateful to have it, and I think the committee would too.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

The Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, I would be very happy to follow up the matter. I was one of those who asked the Solicitor General that question, and he made the denial to which the Minister of Justice alluded. I put the question down for discussion at ten o'clock, and I have been attempting to get in touch with the university newspaper editors who have been mentioned. Let me assure the minister that I will get the information, and if the information is incorrect I shall say so. If the information is as alleged, then let me also inform the minister that he has not been given the full story by the RCMP.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I am suggesting to the hon. member that before he alleges something he take some responsibility for his statement and do his checking before-hand.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Chairman, I alleged nothing when I asked my question; I simply asked the minister about it. So far as taking responsibility is concerned, this question was discussed in some considerable detail on radio and television programs, including the CBC Ottawa. I suggest to the minister that he should not be so touchy. If he thinks I am wrong, then either he or the RCMP should long ago—this matter occurred several weeks ago—have been in touch with the CBC in Ottawa so that some correction could have been made. If the minister or the RCMP have not been in touch with CBC television in Ottawa, then I suggest it is because there is a good deal more to the story than the minister has told.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Chairman, I have sympathy for what the minister is trying to do with these three or four contentious words, but for the reasons advanced by the hon. member for Peace River, as well as by the mover, I think I would have to support the amendment.

However, there may be a way out, and I suggest to the minister that perhaps my wording would commend itself to him. It seems to me the minister is trying to cover those people who fall short of being representatives or professed representatives of the Front de Libération du Québec. For example, they may be the sort of people who stand on street corners and try to muscle their way into the organization by being apostles for it yet do not know anyone in the FLQ with whom they can join up. In other words, they could be people who are preaching for a cause but are also putting forth the message of the FLQ and in that sense, though not a representative of the FLQ, giving it help.

It has also been very well argued that there is the danger that the minister is looking here for an intentional act but that the words "on behalf of or" can be taken in another way. Let me give a very obvious example taken from this miserable history of events leading up to this bill, namely when Radio Canada broadcast the FLQ manifesto as part of the bargaining going on at the time. This manifesto was broadcast because it was in the public interest to do so. It might also have saved somebody's life; at least that was the hope at the time. The fact was that while the broadcast was being made in the public interest, and while the newspapers were publishing it also in the public interest, the wish of the FLQ for publicity was also being met. In that sense, statements were being communicated on behalf of the FLQ. There was no criminal intent, no *mens rea*; nevertheless it served the purpose of the FLQ, though their own intention was to serve some other purpose.

Therefore, I suggest that instead of using words like "on behalf of or" some thought be given to using the words "with the intention of promoting the interests of", which I think is what the minister has in mind. Although I would support the amendment, it unfortunately leaves a vacuum in the type of behaviour at which the minister is aiming. Perhaps the simplest course, having advanced my argument, is to present an amendment along the lines I have suggested after we have voted on this particular amendment.

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Chairman, after listening to this discussion, it becomes obvious that the supporters of this amendment are using the language to which they object to object to the policy—if it is a policy—of censorship or indirect censorship by the RCMP. I myself do not think the language is as objectionable as the practice to which they have referred. Perhaps the Minister of Justice would indicate that the RCMP have no authority at all to give legal opinions, which could be construed as a form of censorship or indirect censorship. Surely, it would be most objectionable for lawyers in Canada to direct their clients to the RCMP for legal advice. Certainly, this is not done in connection with any other matters. It strikes me as most improper for the RCMP to hold themselves forward or to be held forward as experts on the law.

• (4:50 p.m.)

As a matter of administration, the RCMP and all government officials should be told that they have no business whatsoever giving legal advice to members of the public. It can quite rightly be construed as a form of censorship, direct or indirect. I wonder if the minister could assure us that there is or will be a directive issued to law officers under the jurisdiction of the government to the effect that they are not to give legal opinions.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Certainly, I will confirm that, Mr. Chairman. The advice I received from the RCMP is quite the opposite. When they are faced with this problem they refer the particular publisher or printer to his own lawyer. I think it would be inappropriate that a lawyer, in reverse, should refer his client to the RCMP. The RCMP are not in the business of giving legal advice as hon. members know. When they get it and follow it, they get it from the Department of Justice.

Mr. Baldwin: That is why there are so many acquittals.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Chairman, I should like to take a few moments to express my views on the amendment before the House. This bill applies to an organization that is rather difficult to define.

We are not here attacking a co-operative, a credit union, the Bar or the College of Physicians, for instance. The FLQists, as far as I know, do not have membership cards. It is therefore difficult for those who are responsible for applying the law to identify the members of the FLQ or those who strive to achieve its aims.

Mr. Chairman, that is why the following words were inserted in clause 4 (c):

—on behalf of or—

If those words were not included in the clause, some people could work for the FLQ without being liable to prosecution, since they would not be or profess to be members of the FLQ. Here, Mr. Chairman, some claim it is censorship. But I wonder if a different yardstick is not applied to the same thing.

I recall that not so long ago the House passed a legislation against hate propaganda and hon. members will remember whom was attacked by the so-called hate propaganda.

In such cases, censorship can be allowed. But if publishing texts, information orders or instructions such as those that were given between October 5 and 15 is forbidden, it is said that censorship is applied and that it should not be.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that some distinctions must be made. For example, if the RCMP forbids a university newspaper to publish the FLQ manifesto, as some of our large newspapers did, that could perhaps be considered as censorship, but if the board of the university prohibits the management of a university newspaper from publishing that text, I think that it will no longer be the same kind of censorship. Then, an organization which can allow or prevent the publication of such and such a thing is involved.

Mr. Chairman, in our Canadian universities and junior colleges, the publication of quite inflammatory articles has in the past been allowed and as far as I know, we have never heard protests from those who object to clause 4(c).

In my opinion, clause 4 (c) should be passed as such and I intend to support it.

[*English*]

The Deputy Chairman: Order. Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. Lewis) negatived: yeas, 17; nays, 41.

The Deputy Chairman: I declare the amendment lost. Shall clause 4 carry? It is my duty to interrupt proceedings in order to proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Chairman, before you leave the chair I shall make a proposition which you can carry forward when you go to the chair. I should like to ask the committee, when they become the House, if they would be prepared to give up private members' hour—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Baldwin: —provided we agree to sit long enough tonight to end all questions put in the House.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Progress reported.

* * *

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles); Finance, suggested interim income tax changes to assist pensioners; the hon. member for Frontenac-Lennox and Addington (Mr. Alkenbrack); Eganville, progress toward new federal building; the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett); Industry, Trade and Commerce, European common market and Canada's agricultural products, discussion at congress.

It being five o'clock the House will now proceed.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

USE OF PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR FOR GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, may I now formally put my suggestion forward as the representative of the official opposition.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member for Peace River would withdraw the condition that we must finish tonight. Certainly, members in this party want to finish as early as possible. Yet at the same time, we intend to make what we regard to be serious arguments on serious amendments. If we have this hour now, it may be that we would finish tonight. However, I believe it would be unwise and undesirable from our point of view to make such a commitment.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. Baldwin: With the type of flexibility we will display when we form the government, I am prepared to accept that condition.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent that the private members' hour will be dispensed with under the conditions outlined and agreed between the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) and the hon. member for Oshawa Whitby (Mr. Broadbent)?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The committee will resume.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

PUBLIC ORDER (TEMPORARY MEASURES) ACT, 1970

PROVISION OF EMERGENCY POWERS FOR PRESERVATION OF PUBLIC ORDER

The House resumed consideration in committee of Bill C-181, to provide temporary emergency powers for the preservation of public order in Canada—Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton)—Mr. Honey in the chair.

The Chairman: The committee is now on clause 4. Shall clause 4 carry?

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Chairman, I made the argument before, so I shall simply read my amendment which I hope will find favour. I am sorry I do not have a French translation. It would involve replacing one French word "pour" by several but if my amendment should carry in English presumably the law officers of the Crown would draft the French version. My amendment is:

That clause 4(c) be amended by deleting the words "on behalf of or" and replacing them with the words "with the intention of promoting the interests of".

The purpose of the amendment, very briefly, is to show that the element of intent is clear.

The Chairman: Order. I shall put the amendment. It is moved by Mr. McCleave that clause 4(c) be amended by deleting the words "on behalf of or" and replacing them with the words "with the intention of promoting the interests of". Is the House ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

The Chairman: The question is on the amendment. Those members in favour of the amendment will please rise. Those members opposed to the amendment will please rise.

Amendment (Mr. McCleave) negatived: yeas, 14; nays, 41.

The Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Mr. McCleave: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I think there was a vote on the other side in favour of the amendment that was not counted.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Chairman, I wish to move two amendments to clause 4. I will start with the first one and when it has been decided upon, I will move the second one. I move that paragraph (g) of clause 4 be struck out and replaced by clause 4A which reads as follows:

A person who advocates, promotes or engages in the use of force or the commission of crime as a means of or as an aid in accomplishing the same or substantially the same governmental change within Canada as that advocated by the unlawful association, is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to life imprisonment.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker.]

Mr. Chairman, I move this amendment because we are dealing with an organization whose avowed purpose, according to its manifesto and all sorts of indications given to the Canadian public and to the government, was to overthrow, by force, the government of Canada.

So, Mr. Chairman, as this is an organization that advocates means that are not accepted in the free world, in Canada, we must take drastic measures to bring the revolutionaries to reason and to give cause for reflection to those who might be tempted to imitate or support them.

Mr. Chairman, that is why I propose that the wording of clause 4 be made a little more stringent, as a deterrent for those who would use violence to achieve their purposes.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Abitibi (Mr. Laprise) moved:

That subclause (g) of clause 4 be deleted and replaced by the following:

A person who advocates, promotes or engages in the use of force or the commission of crime as a means of or as an aid in accomplishing the same or substantially the same governmental change within Canada as that advocated by the unlawful association,

is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to life imprisonment.

Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Chairman, I only want to say that this subclause should become clause 4A.

The Deputy Chairman: For clarification purposes, the hon. member for Abitibi tells me that his amendment is only designed to delete subclause (g) of clause 4 and to replace it with clause 4A which will read exactly as the amendment I put earlier.

Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, I would like to reply briefly to the hon. member. The five year period with regard to the offences mentioned in clause 4 is the same as the one provided under the War Measures Act. According to section 4 of the latter, a term of imprisonment not exceeding five years may be imposed for violations of the regulations.

I believe that in this case, it is not logical for us to attempt to weaken the legislation altogether, any more than to substitute the five year penalty for life imprisonment.

Therefore, a person who comes under clause 4 (g) to which is related the amendment moved by the hon. member, may at the same time come under the provisions of the Criminal Code dealing with sedition and be liable to a maximum penalty of 14 years.

Thus, the Crown would be free to choose between clause 4 (g) of this bill or the provisions of the Criminal Code. That is why the five year penalty provided in clause 4 (g), compared to that of 14 years under the Criminal Code for sedition, is a little more consistent with the 14 year penalty provided in the Criminal Code

than with the life imprisonment suggested in the amendment moved by the hon. member.

For these two reasons, I feel I must recommend to the committee that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. Laprise: Not being a lawyer, I find it difficult to follow the hon. minister. He suggests that when it comes to convicting those who are found guilty under clause 4—if I understood him correctly—it will be possible to use either Bill C-181 or some other existing provisions in the Criminal Code.

• (5:10 p.m.)

I wonder who will decide whether the five or the 14 year penalty will be imposed. I imagine that the Crown Attorney will call for a penalty of 14 years in certain cases, and that the defence attorney would rather be in favour of the five year penalty. You would certainly see, as we have seen before, unending battles between equally qualified lawyers.

This is why, in my opinion, the bill under study should be as specific as possible in order to avoid any controversy. This act should be strict enough and clear enough that those who would have to enforce it, or those who would intend to break it, know what to expect.

The Deputy Chairman: Is the House ready for the question? Hon. members have heard the text of the amendment put forward by the hon. member for Abitibi. Will those in favour please rise. Will those opposed please rise.

[*English*]

Amendment (Mr. Laprise) negatived: Yeas, 3; Nays, 45.

The Deputy Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

[*Translation*]

Mr. De Bané: Mr. Speaker, one of my colleagues was asking me why I voted in favour of the amendment. I did so because I feel that subclause (*g*) of Clause 4—

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I must point out to the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) that no comment is permitted on a vote taken in the House.

Mr. De Bané: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a statement which is one of the most important I will make during the debate. I submit that it is absolutely essential to add on line 14 the words "without justification or legitimate excuse for which the burden of proof is on him."

It will be replied that the adjunction of these words is not essential to prevent such offenses from being, in legal terms, offenses of strict responsibility. For my part, I submit that this argument is false legally, and I will explain.

First of all I wish to refer to page 454 of the first addendum to the treatise written by one of our most prominent authorities on criminal law, Mr. Justice Lagarde, and published in 1967. In this particular instance, I find an explanation of the concept of strict responsibility, or the *actus reus* without the *mens rea*. I quote:

> Strict responsibility or absolute responsibility obtains whenever the legislation makes an offence of the mere occurrence of an action or omission, i.e. the mere occurrence of an "actus reus" irrespective of the "mens rea".

The most common example is this: When you go through a red light, whether intentionally or inadvertantly so as not to miss the train or the plane, you still commit an offence.

What is important is not the intention.

And I continue to quote Mr. Justice Irénée Lagarde:

> 1. We can say that there is strict liability when
>
> (a) the statute which creates the offence indicates that there is absolute liability in express and formal terms, OR
>
> (b) after consideration of the object and the subject of the legislation concerned, one reaches the conclusion that there is a necessary implication.
>
> 2. Necessary implication:
>
> The word "implication" means that a notion gives rise to another, either under the guise of a necessary effect, or by experimental liaison.
>
> Generally, there is a strict liability offence by way of necessary implication in case of minor offences, punishable under summary conviction and which are classified under the general title of public welfare offences. These offences are related mainly, but not exhaustively
>
> (i) to provincial laws on alcoholic beverages, hunting and fishing, traffic regulations and stocks and shares;
>
> (ii) to federal laws on food and drugs, weights and measures, temperance in Canada and regulations under the War Measures Act.

One might wonder whether the opinion of Mr. Justice Lagarde when he says that offences to regulations under the War Measures Act are strict liability offences, is the personal opinion of a magistrate or whether it is based on judgments previously delivered.

In view of the authority of Mr. Justice Lagarde who, in Quebec, is the highest authority at the moment in criminal law and who, incidentally, is the only French-speaking authority, it would be ridiculous to suppose that his opinion is not based on judgments previously delivered by the Courts.

Doubtless this is the reason why at page 466 of the first supplement of his "Droit pénal canadien" published in 1967, Mr. Justice Lagarde refers to two rather recent rulings. He deals first with the case Rex vs Duquette (76 C.C.C. 304, Quebec) when one of Duquette's employees sold codeine without prescription. According to the judge, "such sale was made by the employee in the discharge of his duties but against instructions received. This is a strict liability offence which makes the employer responsible for his employee's action".

Mr. Justice Legarde summarizes the judgment in the case of Rex vs Rhyno, (1945,83 C.C.C., 186) in the following way:

> The sale of gasoline without coupons constitutes a strict liability offence. The service station operator is guilty by proxy of the offence perpetrated by his employee in the discharge of his duties.

This means that if Mr. Justice Lagarde refers to two important court orders, one from Quebec and the other from the Nova Scotia court of appeal, we must come to conclusion that the regulations proclaimed under the War Measures Act are strict liability offences. And since Bill C-181, except for a few alterations, is a mere carbon copy of the regulations proclaimed on October 16 last under the War Measures Act, in the legislation before us it is obviously a strict liability offence.

The regulations did not provide for sentences exceeding five years because the War Measures Act so prescribes. And while this legislation could have gone further, the existing provisions have been retained.

• (5:20 p.m.)

This means that under the very provisions of clauses 4, 5 or 6 of the bill, one might not even wonder about the intellectual apport of the accused, that is to say, his criminal intention or *mens rea,* since the very commission of the act laid down in the legislation requires that he be found guilty by the court and, consequently condemned to a penalty, the length of which is again to be determined by the court, within the stipulated limits.

Doubtless, in some cases, we see ridiculous sentences because the president of the court, perhaps feeling guilty for being unable to acquit the accused because of the law, considers it fair to impose minimal penalties such as an hour in prison or a 50-cent fine. This clause does not provide such penalties. It will probably be a matter of what Pope, a renowned authority in criminal law, called centuries ago, "pious perjuries."

Therefore, I hope I have demonstrated that it is wrong to argue that clause 4, as it now stands, is not a clause of strict responsibility.

Is it possible to imagine that a judge would give different interpretations of section 4 of the regulations and section 4 of the legislation, when a comparative study would reveal to him that the Governor in council and the legislator used the same words, and that even if section 4 of the regulations provided for the maximum penalty under the War Measures Act, the legislator conformed to the point of providing the same sentence, what he was not required to do.

Clause 14 of the bill states that sections 4, 5 and 6 of the regulations are deemed to be found in sections 4, 5 and 6 of the act.

Once again, jurisprudence is consistent. In the field of regulations promulgated under the War Measures Act, the *mens rea* is useless. I refer to the jurisprudence from which I have quoted a few cases.

Can one imagine the legislator in a field as important as that of public order and in legislation directly proceeding once again from the regulations under the War Measures Act deciding that the interpretation of the text should be different from that of the regulations?

Finally, if my proposed addition is useless, how come that section 395 of the Criminal Code provides that it is an undictable offense liable to imprisonment for 14 years

[Mr. De Bané.]

to utter or offer to utter counterfeit money without lawful justification or excuse?

Secondly, section 366 provides that it is an offence to intimidate a person by "threats...or other injury" wrongfully and without lawful authority.

Thirdly, section 352 provides that it is an offence to dispose of an instrument designed to forge a trade mark and subsection (2) of the same section provides that no person shall be convicted of an offence where he proves that he acted in good faith.

Fourthly, section 269 of the Criminal Code provides that committing theft is to take fraudulently and without colour of right.

Section 46 reads as follows:

(1) Every one who commits treason who in Canada

(e) without lawful authority communicates or makes available to an agent of a state other than...

Section 86 of the omnibus bill reads:

—everyone who, without lawful excuse, points at another a firearm—

Another example from the omnibus bill, is to be found in subsection (2) of section 223 of the Criminal Code, as follows:

"Every one who, without reasonable excuse, fails or refuses to provide a sample of his breath—"

Section 224 makes it a strict liability offence to drive a car for a person whose breath contains a percentage of alcohol higher than .08 according to the breath analyser test.

I suggest then that it is necessary to add the following: "without lawful justification or excuse, the onus of which lies on that person" to line 16 of clause 4, so that the indicted person may be able to defend himself.

Besides, what is the present situation? Nobody seems to know exactly about certain subsections of section 4 of these regulations.

• (5:30 p.m.)

So, the papers refuse to publish the communiques they receive from the kidnappers of Mr. James Cross and, to crown it all, Saturday night the Quebec police provide all information media not only with the said photos of the hostage, but also with copies of the statement added by the FLQ which reads as follows:

"James Richard Cross learning politics, following the barbarous attitude of Mr. Trudeau—"

And to add to the affront, once again, there appears the signature of Mr. Cross. And it is the Quebec police that distributes such things, and I hope that I have proved that this is a case of strict and objective responsibility, such are the absurd results which could obtain.

First, the spy and the newspaperman could not, except in violation of subclause (a) profess to be members of an unlawful association.

Second, the information media could not transmit such statements, and to this I would agree. Further, anyone

receiving a statement from the FLQ to the effect that they are completely willing to surrender and to release Mr. Cross would not have the right to communicate it.

Third, a citizen would not be able, without infringing subclause (e) and particularly the words:

"to anyone for the benefit of the unlawful association"

to supply funds for the services of a lawyer.

I therefore suggest that the following words be added to line 14:

without justification or legitimate excuse, the burden of the proof bearing on him.

I should like also to point out an apparent incoherency in the sentence. Indeed, clause 4 stipulates that the maximum penalty is five years for a person who resorts to the use of force, is a member of the FLQ, communicates information to the FLQ or advocates the use of force to attain the aims of the FLQ.

Clause 6 says that such a person is liable to a fine of five thousand dollars and to imprisonment for a term of five years. Since clause 4 specifies a maximum term of five years and clause 6 mentions a term of five years and a $5,000 fine, there is an apparent incoherence between the two clauses.

As far as I am concerned, I think both clauses 4 and 6 should provide the same penalty, and I quote:

—is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to a fine of not more than five thousand dollars or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years or to both.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I think we should add to clause 4 two subclauses to cover the offence defined in clause 6, because clause 5 deals with an accomplice after the fact while clause 6 deals with another offence which should be included in clause 4 under subclause (h) which could read as follows:

An owner or lessee of any building, room, premises or other place or a person having the charge or the surveillance of any building, who knowingly permits therein any meeting of persons who violate one of the preceding paragraphs.

And as in clause 8—

The Deputy Chairman: Order. Merely to assist the hon. member, I still feel he should limit his remarks to clause 4, which is now before us. I do not believe that it can be helpful, at the present stage, to put forward amendments to clauses 6 and 8.

I will point out to the hon. member that the Chair does not have in hand the text of the amendment to clause 4.

Mr. De Bané: Mr. Chairman, I would not want to discuss clause 6 before we get to it. However, it seems strange to me that clause 4 should list offenses, clause 5 deal with accomplices after the fact while clause 6 goes back to deal with persons who would encourage the FLQ or other unlawful associations to meet on their premises, or allow them to do so.

And that is why I said that it might be advisable to add clause 6 to the enumeration of offences already mentioned in clause 4. Subclause *h*) should be added to clause 4 and would read as follows:

takes part or is present at a meeting of members of the unlawful association

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that subclauses b) to g) read as follows:

b) fait ou déclare faire office de dirigeant d'une association illégale,

c) communique des déclarations, soit au nom de l'association illégale, soit à titre de représentant réel ou déclaré de cette dernière,

d) appuie l'association illégale, préconise ou encourage le recours à des moyens illégaux pour la réalisation des desseins ou la mise en œuvre des principes ou lignes de conduite d'un telle association,

e) fournit une contribution quelconque, sous forme de cotisations ou autrement, à l'association illégale ou à qui que ce soit à l'avantage d'une telle association,

f) sollicite des souscriptions ou contributions au profit de l'association illégale, ou

g) préconise, encourage ou pratique le recours à la force ou au crime comme moyen de réaliser ou contribuer à réaliser au Canada un changement de régime politique identique ou analogue à celui que préconise l'association illégale.

I want to say that I would support subclause (c) were it to be amended in such a way as to read "en faveur" instead of "pour le compte de". May I point out that the legislation read "pour le compte de" and in the press release issued by the department, it was "en faveur de". Here the word "pour" is used. The translation as it now stands is slightly ambiguous, I think. It should read instead, in subclause (c):

communique des déclarations, soit au nom de l'association illégale, soit à titre de représentant réel ou déclaré de cette dernière.

So I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, copies of all the amendments I propose.

• (5:40 p.m.)

The Deputy Chairman: Order. It is not easy for the Chair to find its way among the amendments. First of all, I should suggest to the hon. member that he cannot introduce alternate amendments to the House.

I believe that the Chair should now put the question on a series of amendments or an omnibus amendment. Thereafter, if the hon. member feels that the substance of his alternate amendments is not somewhat similar to the former amendments, he can introduce another amendment.

The hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) moves that the last three lines of clause 4 be deleted and replaced by the following:

is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to a fine of not more than five thousand dollars or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years, or to both.

The hon. member for Matane also moves the addition of the following phase at line 14 of clause 4:

"without justification or legitimate excuse, the burden of the proof bearing on him".

Besides, the hon. member—

Mr. Lewis: Which subclause?

The Deputy Chairman: Line 14, page 3. The first line of subclause 4 ends with the word "who" and the hon. member requests the addition of the following words:

"without justification or legitimate excuse, the burden of proof bearing on him".

Further, in subclause (b)

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

I should like to make some remarks on subclause 4. Two amendments have just been introduced. However, they seem to me somewhat dissimilar. I would be inclined to support the first amendment, which I quote:

Is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to a fine of not more than $5,000 or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years—

—while I object to the second one, which adds to the text so that it reads as follows:

without lawful justification or excuse, the onus of which lies on that person.

I cannot see how anyone could justify his membership in the unlawful association, or act as an officer of this unlawful association or violate any other of the subclauses of this clause.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether we should not vote separately on these amendments.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. The Chair agrees with the point raised by the hon. member for Abitibi to the effect that the committee will proceed by stages, voting separately on each of the amendments. Therefore, I now read the first amendment moved by the hon. member for Matane, to strike out the first three lines of clause 4 and to substitute the following words:

Is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to a fine of not more than $5,000 or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years or to both, anyone

Is the House ready for the question? I recognize the hon. member for Matane.

Mr. De Bané: I have moved this amendment because of the maximum sentence provided by clause 6 when someone permits at his place a meeting of the FLQ. This is the maximum sentence provided in clause 6. Clause 4 provides a lesser maximum sentence for anyone who uses force to overthrow the government than that provided in clause 6. This is an obvious inconsistency.

[*English*]

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I do not want to go into this matter in too much detail. Clause 6 mentions the maximum because of the effect of section 622 of the Criminal Code. Those who compare the clause with this section of the Criminal Code will realize that there is a dinstinction.

The Deputy Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. De Bané) negatived; Yeas, 3; nays, 40.

The Deputy Chairman: I declare the amendment lost. I will now put the second amendment of the hon. member for Matane.

[*Translation*]

The hon. members have heard the amendment moved by the hon. member for Matane. Will those in favour please rise. Will those opposed please rise.

Amendment (Mr. De Bané) negatived: yeas 3; nays 40.

It is moved by Mr. De Bané that line 16 of clause 4 of Bill C-181 be amended by adding, after the word "who", the following words:

—without lawful justification or excuse, the onus of which lies on that person.

Mr. De Bané: Mr. Chairman, I would like to answer to the hon. member who asked me a while ago how one could have a lawful excuse or justification. There is under our law two kinds of offences: for the first one to carry an indictment, there must be an intent apart from the action, and for the other, the mere fact of committing an action, regardless of the intent, is enough to have the accused convicted.

In the second case, the action is sufficient to have the accused convicted, no intent being required.

I gave a while ago the example of going through a red light. Whether the person does it intentionally or by accident or because he was in a hurry, he has gone through a red light and is quilty *ipso facto*.

This is what we call strict liability. And for most of the crimes provided for in the Criminal Code, apart from committing the action, there must be a criminal intent. And I have quoted about ten sections under which even treason or the traffic in counterfeit money is a crime without lawful excuse or justification, the onus of which lies on the person who committed the act.

Therefore, in addition to committing the offence, one must have the intention of doing so. I have quoted some cases which demonstrate that this bill is creating strict responsibility offences. Fortunately those who legislate are not those who interpret the laws. This is indeed the basis of democracy. According to jurisprudence, the war measures regulations must be interpreted as creating offences of strict responsibility.

I gave the example of the employee who sold gasoline without coupon and without his employer's permission. The judge ruled that this was an offence against public order.

Clause 14 of this legislation states that sections 4, 5 and 6 of the Regulations under the War Measures Act are supposed to be reproduced here. Therefore the judge will interpret them as creating offences of strict responsibility.

I will give some examples of crimes which, in my humble opinion, are cases of "strict responsibility".

Subclause (*e*) mentions a person who "contributes anything as dues or otherwise to the unlawful association or to anyone for the benefit of the unlawful association".

Any lawyer that would give his time and that of his employees to defend an unlawful association would be guilty, in my opinion, unless were added the words "without legitimate excuse, the proof of which is incumbent on him" or, for example, in subclause (*a*), "if a police spy admits he is a member to infiltrate an unlawful organization", in my opinion both are committing an offence.

In subclause (*b*): "acts or professes to act". The same would happen to a spy and I could take all the other cases.

This is why according to the provisions of subclause (*c*), in my opinion it is forbidden with or without police authorization to pass a communiqué. Jurisprudence is categorical on this point.

The War Measures Act regulations are drastic. We are not interested in the intent of the accused. For my part, I would suggest that the onus lie upon the Crown. Obviously, when we say "being a member", it is impossible to have lawful justification or excuse but in other cases, such as the one I mentioned earlier in connection with subclause (e), an attorney cannot work without a fee and I will attempt to prove that the wording of clause 5 leaves no doubt about that.

I have quoted quite a number of sections from the Criminal Code and even from the omnibus bill passed two years ago which provide that a person who, without lawful justification or excuse, refuses to submit to a breathalyzer test or a person who, without lawful excuse, threatens someone with a weapon commits an offence. Such a law is therefore necessary, otherwise—again, I may be mistaken, but I have taught law at university and I have talked with prominent legal experts and with teachers of criminal law—we have before us a case of "strict liability" under section 14 of this act and in the light of statute law.

• (5:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

The Deputy Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. De Bané) negatived: Yeas, 1; nays, 45.

The Deputy Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

[*Translation*]

Before submitting to the House the following amendment of the hon. member for Matane, I will take the liberty of asking him to say what he wants exactly. In the wording before me, a correction was made and I wonder if the hon. member wants to say "dirigeant d'une association illégale" or "dirigeant de l'association illégale"—

Mr. De Bané: —de l'association, Mr. Chairman.

The Deputy Chairman: If I understand the wording of the present act, I find that the amendment moved by the hon. member seems to be on all fours with it. Therefore I do not see how an amendment can be moved to a wording which is on all fours with subclause b).

Mr. De Bané: If you will allow me, Mr. Chairman, I submitted as a translation to subclause (b), not:

b) fait office ou déclare faire office—

—which is a translation of the English, but

b) fait ou déclare faire office—

The Deputy Chairman: It is moved by the hon. member for Matane to replace clause 4b) by the following:

b) fait ou déclare faire office de dirigeant de l'association illégale.

In short, the hon. member deletes the word "office", the second word of the subclause.

Mr. De Bané: Exactly, Mr. Chairman. My amendment reads as follows: change from (b) to (g) in the following manner according to the texts you have on hand.

[*English*]

The Deputy Chairman: Hon. members of the committee have heard the motion. Is it the wish of the committee that I repeat that amendment moved by the hon. member?

An hon. Member: Dispense.

The Deputy Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Chairman: Those members in favour of the amendment will please rise. Those members opposed to the amendment will please rise.

Amendment (Mr. De Bané) negatived: yeas 3, nays 40.

It is moved by the hon. member for Matane that clause 4(c) be amended as follows:

Mr. De Bané: The amendment being similar to the one that was moved, it is withdrawn.

[*English*]

An hon. Member: By unanimous consent.

The Deputy Chairman: The amendment has not yet been put to the committee, so I do not think there is need for unanimous consent. We shall pass on to the next amendment.

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Matane moves that clause 4(d) be amended by replacing it by the following text:

(*d*) supports the unlawful association, advocates, or encourages the use of unlawful means for accomplishing its aims, principles or policies,

Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. De Bané: Mr. Chairman, may I call it six o'clock?

The Deputy Chairman: It being six o'clock, I do now leave the chair until eight o'clock p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

[*English*]

AFTER RECESS

The committee resumed at 8 p.m.

The Deputy Chairman: Order. When the committee rose at six o'clock it was considering an amendment moved by the hon. member for Matane which reads as follows:

[*Translation*]

The hon. member for Matane moves that subclause (*d*) of clause 4 be amended to read as follows:

(*d*) supports the unlawful association, advocates or promotes the use of unlawful means for accomplishing the aims, principles or policies of such an association.

Is the House ready for the question?

[*English*]

Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

During the taking of the vote:

The Deputy Chairman: Order. It is known to all hon. members that it is not permitted to enter the House once a vote has been called.

Amendment (Mr. De Bané) negatived: Yeas, 0; nays, 31.

After the taking of the vote:

The Deputy Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order.

[Mr. De Bané.]

I merely wanted to draw your attention to Standing Order 12(2) and I quote:

When Mr. Speaker is putting a question, no member shall enter, walk out of or across the House or make any noise or disturbance.

I noticed all afternoon, Mr. Chairman, hon. members walking in or out at will during the taking of votes.

I thank you for having a moment ago called the House to order, even if the noise during the taking of the vote seemed to drown your voice. However, I would be grateful to you if you would point out again to the House the provisions of Standing Order 12.

The Deputy Chairman: The Chair, as stated by the hon. member, has dealt with the matter during the taking of the vote, but this does not prevent a member, if ever it occurs again from raising the matter again.

[*English*]

The committee will now consider another amendment moved by the hon. member for Matane.

Mr. Lewis: He is not here to move it.

Mr. Deachman: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether it would facilitate the work of the committee if we grouped these amendments together and then voted on them.

The Deputy Chairman: With regard to the point of order raised by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, it is very difficult for the Chair to put forward some kind of omnibus amendment on which the committee would vote, so the suggestion cannot be accepted. With regard to the other point that was raised, the committee has just voted on an amendment presented by the hon. member for Matane and moved by him before the adjournement. Since the hon. member for Matane has just come into the chamber I will put his amendment to the committee.

[*Translation*]

It is moved by the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) that subclause (e) of clause 4 be amended as follows:

(e) contributes anything as dues or otherwise to the unlawful association or to anyone for the benefit of such an association.

Is the house ready for the question?

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, what is the difference between the two clauses? What are we doing?

Mr. De Bané: I would answer that this is not the way I had moved the amendment. I had moved an amendment dealing with subclauses (b) to (g) of clause 4. Only a few words have been changed. At first I only read the translation.

With the unanimous consent of the House, Mr. Chairman, we could withdraw this amendment.

The Deputy Chairman: Does the hon. member for Matane have leave of the House to withdraw the amendment which I have just read and which is relevant to subclause (e) of clause 4?

[*English*]

Is there unanimous consent to allow the hon. member for Matane to withdraw his amendments to clause 4(e)?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Amendments (Mr. De Bané) withdrawn.

• (8:10 p.m.)

The Deputy Chairman: In view of the fact that the other amendments to clause 4(f) and clause 4(g) have not been presented to the committee, there is no need for unanimous consent to withdraw them. Is it agreed that the Chair will not put them?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

The Deputy Chairman: I have before me another amendment by the hon. member for Matane

[*Translation*]

who proposes to add a new provision to clause 4, reading as follows:

(*h*) or (*i*) takes part in or attends a meeting of members of the unlawful association.

Mr. De Bané: So, that amendment, Mr. Chairman, provides for the inclusion in clause 4 of the provisions of clause 6 because, as can be seen, clause 4 lists offences, clause 5 relates to complicity after the fact and, with clause 6 there is a reversion for the purpose of adding an offence that was omitted from clause 4.

So, I asked that clause 6 be incorporated in clause 4, since clause 5 which relates to complicity after the fact, deals with a subject altogether different from that of clause 6.

The Deputy Chairman: Is the House ready for the question?

[*English*]

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Chairman, before the vote is taken I must say that I cannot take part in it because I do not understand the amendment.

The Deputy Chairman: Was the point raised by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka a point of procedure? The Chair did not hear what the hon. member said.

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Chairman, I merely said that I did not understand the explanation and I could not, therefore, take part in the vote.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Chairman: It is moved by the hon. member for Matane that a new provision be added to clause 4, which would read as follows:

(*h*) takes part in or attends a meeting of members of the unlawful association.

[*English*]

Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. De Bané) negatived: Yeas, 1; nays, 50.

The Deputy Chairman: I declare the amendment lost. The Chair has before it an amendment by the Minister of Justice which reads as follows:

That Bill C-181 be amended by striking out line 39 on page 3 and substituting the following:

"Canada with respect to the province of Quebec or its relationship to Canada as that advocated by the"—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Béchard: Mr. Chairman, I regret to say that I disagree with you at this time, but we have not moved any amendment up to now.

So clause 3 has been allowed to stand.

The Deputy Chairman: The Chair must nevertheless point out to the Parliamentary Secretary that it has in hand an amendment dealing with line 36 on page 3. And if I am not mistaken, line 36 is in clause 4 and not in clause 3. So I shall require some explanation from the Parliamentary Secretary.

Mr. Béchard: Mr. Chairman, never to my knowledge have the Minister of Justice or myself officially moved an amendment to clause 3. It has simply been translated and this suggestion, which might be made later, was deferred for printing purposes only.

[*English*]

The Deputy Chairman: Order. The Chair was trying to make itself useful. Shall clause 4 carry?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Chairman, I have here an amendment I should like to move, seconded by the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. Godin).

Under clause 4, I propose to add subclause (a) which would read as follows:

4(*a*): A person who forcibly kidnaps one or more persons, confines them against their will, mutilates, tortures or injures them with the intent to kill or kills them, as a means of or as an aid in accomplishing the same governmental change within Canada as that advocated by the unlawful association, is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to capital punishment or life imprisonment.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier today in an another amendment, I want this bill to be stringent enough to give cause for reflection to those who have committed such crimes or intend to do so.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, for clarification purposes, is this the amendment covering clause 4(b)?

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Chairman, since the amendments moved previously have been rejected, this clause would then become clause 4(a).

The Deputy Chairman: If the Chair has understood it right, the hon. member for Abitibi means clause 4-A with a capital A to differentiate it from clause 4(a) with a small a?

Mr. Laprise: No, Mr. Chairman.

The Deputy Chairman: The hon. member for Abitibi moves that clause 4 be amended by adding the following:

4-A. A person who forcibly kidnaps one or more persons, confines them against their will, mutilates, tortures or injures them with intent to kill, or kills them, as a means of or as an aid in accomplishing the same governmental change within Canada as that advocated by the unlawful association, is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to capital punishment or life imprisonment.

Is the House ready to vote on the amendment?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, if I understand the proposed amendment correctly, it aims at creating a new offence involving the death penalty or life imprisonment for anybody who:

—forcibly kidnaps one or more persons, confines them against their will, mutilates, tortures or injures them with intent to kill or kills them, as a means of or as an aid in accomplishing a governmental change within Canada as that advocated by the unlawful association.

If I may make a short review of the Criminal Code, I note that kidnapping involves at present a maximum life sentence as stipulated in section 233.

The offence consisting in mutilating, torturing or injuring with the intent of taking life or killing is mentioned in clause 210 of the Criminal Code and it involves a maximum life sentence.

Finally, to kill a person is murder, and the death penalty will be imposed if the victim is a policeman or a prison guard on duty at the time of the murder.

The amendment proposed by the hon. member raises the question of capital punishment, and I believe that, according to the resolution passed by the House in December 1967, with its trial period of five years, the House should have the opportunity to discuss once again this quite important subject before December 29, 1972, under section 4(1), chapter 15, of the Statutes of Canada, 1967-68.

Under the circumstances, I believe that the best way to handle the death penalty is not to amend this legislation which is quite general, but to give the House the opportunity to reconsider the question of the death penalty before the limit set under the present act, i.e. December 29, 1972.

For this reason, I think it would be more advisable to consider the whole question in general terms and not under this legislation.

• (8:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I say to the Minister of Justice that I do not follow his logic. I think he is confusing the issue. The legislation we are dealing with is the Public Order (Temporary Measures) Act. It is legislation designed to take care of a particular crisis; therefore it does not fall under the Criminal Code or relate to the legislation passed three years ago that put aside capital punishment for a trial period of five years.

[The Deputy Chairman.]

If we were to accept the logic the minister is using, the whole of the temporary measures legislation would be null and void because it would supersede the Criminal Code, and the argument is not on that point. It would seem to me that we want to put some teeth into this legislation. It is a temporary piece of legislation. There is to be permanent legislation, as I understand it, before the end of April that will amend the Criminal Code, and therefore this amendment as it relates to the Public Order (Temporary Measures) Act is in my opinion valid.

I cannot accept the argument of the Minister of Justice because it does not relate to this situation. If it does, then everything we are doing here is out of order. I believe it is public opinion throughout the country and in this House that there should be teeth in this bill so that it will be a deterrent to those who commit the heinous crimes to which the legislation refers. I believe this amendment should have the support of the House.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Chairman, I must say that I have had some difficulty in attempting to follow the minister's argument. In introducing this amendment, I did not want to reopen the debate on capital punishment which started in 1967. As the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Thompson) just said we are now dealing with temporary legislation which will expire on April 30, 1971, and which applies only to one or several specific cases.

May I ask the minister what would happen if Mr. Pierre Laporte's murderers were discovered tomorrow morning; what would happen to them? Would they be given a medal for good behaviour or are they going to be punished as they deserve? This is what I want to know and what I would like the bill to be more specific about.

[*English*]

Mr. Horner: Mr. Chairman, I should like to speak briefly in favour of this amendment. I think the hon. member for Red Deer very correctly pointed out that this is a bill to provide temporary emergency powers for the preservation of public order in Canada. I emphasize the words "temporary emergency powers for the preservation of public order in Canada". There is no question in my mind about the need to have a strong deterrent in order to preserve public order at this time. This was the whole purpose of invoking the War Measures Act. The purpose was to create a deterrent and give the government the power necessary to deal with this emergency situation. There is no doubt in my mind that this amendment would create a deterrent in a society in which there is a great deal of unrest and concern.

In my estimation the Minister of Justice is very weak in referring to section 210 of the Criminal Code and suggesting that we have two degrees of murder, non-capital and capital, and that capital murder applies only to prison guards and policemen on duty. Every one of the 264 members of this House of Commons believes in his own mind that capital murder in respect of acts of treason or acts against the wishes of this or any other government in a lawful society, such as we have today in Canada, should involve the maximum penalty of death by hanging.

Mr. Deachman: I do not agree with that.

Mr. Horner: We have one member who does not agree. Now I see there are eight. I count eight hands up, Mr. Chairman.

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The Chair finds it very difficult to hear what the hon. member for Crowfoot is saying.

Mr. Horner: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I noticed a number of raised hands. Someone has accused me of not counting him, so there are nine.

An hon. Member: The hon. member cannot count.

Mr. Horner: Nine members out of perhaps 150 members here tonight.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Horner: The Minister of Justice jokes about this matter. Will he allow a free vote on this amendment? Will he stand up and say that members of his party can vote any way they like? Will he stand up and say that every member from the province of Quebec can vote the way his heart and mind dictates? He will not. He knows the party whip has things in hand. The minister laughs and jokes about this matter. It is a very serious matter today in Canada. We are confronted with acts of terrorism. We know that the War Measures Act was brought in because of an uprising within the country for the purpose of overthrowing the democratic rights of the people.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Because the record goes out to a great many people, I should like it recorded that I am not joking or laughing at the issue.

Mr. Horner: But the minister is laughing and joking at the amendment moved by an hon. friend to my extreme left. He is laughing and joking at this amendment.

• (8:30 p.m.)

An hon. Member: Tell the truth.

Mr. Horner: I am telling the truth right now. I wish that every member of the party of the hon. member who told me to tell the truth could vote truthfully according to his conscience and the wishes of his constituents.

An hon. Member: Come on, Jack.

Mr. Horner: But no, the whips are on. The Minister of Justice could not rise to speak when I asked him to. He shied away from that point because he knew that if he did not, this amendment would carry. There is not a member of Parliament in the House who does not agree with this amendment and who does not believe that most of his constituents agree with it.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Horner: There are not nine members out of the 150 here tonight who can say, "We disagree with this amendment". Everyone here knows that their constituents agree with this amendment.

Mr. Francis: We want to hear how your side votes on it.

Mr. Horner: Now we hear great comments from the hon. member for Ottawa West. Let him make his speech after I am through. I would like to see the name of everyone opposing this amendment on the record, because their constituents will long remember it. They will long remember the government that brought in the War Measures Act.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner: This is the government that said there is terrorism and there is an uprising that is going to overthrow democracy. But each and every one of them will be turning against his constituents in voting against this amendment; there is no question about that. The minister drags out the five-year trial ban on capital punishment that was put into effect in December of 1967. We know that on that particular date the whips were on. But that does not necessarily apply to this act, because the bill before us is to provide temporary emergency powers for the preservation of public order within Canada.

There is no question in my mind that 70 per cent, 80 per cent, 90 per cent of the people of Canada believe that if a person is prepared to commit treason, to kill and torture human beings, good, law abiding Canadian citizens, he should receive the maximum penalty of death. I leave it to the government to decide by what means capital punishment should be applied, whether it be by hanging, the gas chamber or whatsoever method may be decided upon.

There is no question in my mind that most of Canada wants this amendment accepted and that most members of the House want it accepted. It is a cowardly act of the government to try to slide this amendment under the carpet tonight by dragging out the Criminal Code and saying that capital punishment is on a five-year trial period, so this amendment does not apply. This is a temporary measure for the specific purpose of preserving public order in Canada.

There is no doubt in my mind that capital punishment is in fact a deterrent. The Minister of Justice was a great believer in the value of a deterrent when it came to introducing the breathalyzer test. He used the argument that a deterrent was very important for the purpose of safeguarding persons using public highways. Now he does not believe in the value of a deterrent. He would rather have soldiers standing at the corner of every street, guarding every public building in Montreal with loaded machine-guns in their hands and fingers on the trigger. Is that not a deterrent? You bet it is a deterrent—but it is one that affects every law abiding citizen as he walks by the soldier with his finger on the trigger.

This amendment would bring in an effective deterrent for anyone committing a murder or an act of treason in order to create public disorder in an emergency situation such as the one we are now experiencing.

Everyone who votes against this amendment will be duly recorded and will not be forgotten in the minds of the public or in the minds of the members of this House because, as the government has testified, this is an emergency situation which needs emergency action. I know some of my friends in the Socialist party to my left do not believe in capital punishment, but they accept there is an emergency situation in Canada today. At least, I believe they do. They also accept the fact that at this time the government must have some extraordinary powers. Therefore, maybe as a temporary measure they would support this amendment.

I conclude by saying that 80 per cent or 90 per cent of the people of Canada would vote in favour of this amendment. There is no doubt in my mind that the day will come when Members of Parliament will be elected to speak as their consciences dictate and to speak for their constituents. They will not be buying party favours by kow-towing to the wishes of the cabinet. Maybe we are five or ten years away from that day, but I say the day will come when this House will be directed by the consciences of the people who are elected and not by the wishes of the almighty party in power or the wishes of the almighty Minister of Justice who is afraid to stand up and say to his party, "You can have a free vote on this issue. Vote the way your conscience tells you".

An hon. Member: We are free to vote the way we want.

Mr. Horner: The day will come when members on this side of the House will register the true feelings of the people. When that day comes perhaps we will have less rioting in the streets, less turmoil in our society and perhaps more turmoil in this place where the feelings and wishes of the people are supposed to be voiced and reflected accurately. But today we are still under the thumb of the almighty party; the party must come before our country and we must vote the way the party dictates. That day is nearly ended. I agree with the youth of Canada who say it must be near its end.

The Minister of Justice will rue the day he did not rise and say to his people, "Vote the way your constituents want you to vote", because every person in Canada will be watching how Parliament votes on this emergency measure at this crucial time when public order must be restored within our country.

Mr. Hogarth: Before I make my point of order, Mr. Chairman, I want to make it abundantly clear that under no circumstances would I vote for the death penalty under this amendment or any other. Apart from that, it is abundantly clear that this amendment is entirely outside the scope of the bill. The bill deals entirely with le Front de Libération du Québec. Clauses 3 and 4 of the bill set forth the offences. The amendment which is proposed is actually an amendment to section 233 of the Criminal Code which deals with kidnapping. That being so, it appears to me that the amendment is completely outside the scope of the bill. It does not mention the FLQ.

Mr. Horner: It is too late. The Chairman ruled it in order.

[Mr. Horner]

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please. I must remind the hon. member that the Chair has already accepted the amendment. I also remind him that clause 4 of the bill is identified as relating to offences and punishment and that identification is not related only to the FLQ, although the bill might be. In any case, the Chair has already made the decision to put the motion, so it is before the committee. I recognize the hon. member for Greenwood.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Mr. Brewin: Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear that at least some members of the House are perfectly prepared to vote against this amendment out of conscience and not out of any coercion by their party. I think it is a delusion for anyone to believe that you get a better deterrent by putting in capital punishment. The way to handle this matter is to have efficient police forces and to alleviate the social conditions which have led to the problems that exist. Of course, people have forgotten that when petty crime in England and other countries was punished by capital punishment, crime was more prevalent than at any other time in the course of history. I suggest that the whole theory behind this amendment is an illusion and a delusion, and we should not support it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Asselin: Mr. Chairman, I must repeat what I have often said in the House in the last two years. In 1967, removing capital punishment was a disservice to the population. It was an error.

The first duty of members of Parliament is to protect society. During the last session, I said that considering the large increase of criminal offences in Quebec and in Canada, only one deterrent could prevent murder, namely capital punishment. I do not suggest a return to Middle Ages practices. One can be for or against deterrents.

I believe that—

Mr. Chairman, could hon. members be called to order?

The Deputy Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Asselin). It is rather difficult to hear his remarks. Perhaps the hon. members could allow him to complete them.

Mr. Asselin: Mr. Chairman, the death penalty was retained for the murder of prison guards and police officers. In addition, the cabinet, using its prerogative to grant free pardon, ignores the decisions of Parliament to commute death penalties, with the result that we now have in Quebec a considerable increase in the number of crimes, because those people—

Mr. Boulanger: That is not true.

Mr. Béchard: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member allow me a question?

Mr. Asselin: Certainly.

Mr. Béchard: Would the hon. member give one instance where the cabinet ignored the wishes of Parliament with regard to capital punishment?

Mr. Asselin: Mr. Chairman, the recollection of this example is not fresh in my mind. I remember a case where no recommendation for clemency was made to the court and where the sentence was commuted by the cabinet. If I am mistaken, it cannot be helped, but I shall send my notes on the subject to the hon. member who just asked the question.

Two categories of people only are protected against murder: jail guards and policemen. Not even the Prime Minister of Canada nor members of Parliament are protected against maniacs who could come to the House of Commons, throw a bomb and kill perhaps 50 or 60 members. That murderer would be sentenced to life imprisonment and knowing the conditions of parole, he would stay in jail for 10 or 12 years and then be set free in society.

Mr. Chairman, it is time that Parliament—and I repeat it—should protect society. If some people do not want to be eventually given capital punishment they need only comply with the laws of a society wishing to live in peace and in order. This amendment is justified and should be given consideration.

I also urge the Minister of Justice, as did the previous speaker, that when this amendment will be put, to be broadminded to ask the hon. members to vote according to their conscience.

At the present time the population of Quebec lives in terror and in fear. It is revealed by the economic situation prevailing in Quebec. I do not say that we must do it in retaliation but capital punishment should be given at least until April 1971 to those found guilty by a competent tribunal of kidnappings, sedition and murder of innocent people. But this means was used as an attempt to affect the decisions of legitimate governments.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this amendment is warranted. It must be objectively considered, not as advocating revenge, but as a parliamentary means to protect the society in which we are living. We have to get rid of people living on the fringe of laws established by society.

[*English*]

The Deputy Chairman: Again I must ask hon. members to refrain from carrying on private conversations in the chamber, because these make it very difficult for the Chair and other interested members to hear the speeches being made. I hope hon. members will heed this request.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lachance: Mr. Chairman, I must say I have much sympathy for the mover of this amendment.

When the House discussed the abolition of capital punishment a few years ago, I moved during the debate on second reading that the matter be referred to the committee on justice and legal affairs.

I spoke many times on the subject of capital punishment and my views are well known. I am not saying that I am in favour or against the abolition of capital punishment, but at that time, I was in favour of that legislation, specially as it concerns prisoners, who have rehabilitation problems.

Since this law is a temporary measure, I do not see why we should raise this problem at this stage, and I believe the hon. members will easily understand that if this amendment is accepted, in any event, it will lapse in a few months and become non operative.

Under the present circumstances, I do not think we should vote in favour of this amendment.

If the hon. member who moved this amendment believes that capital punishment must be meted out for similar crimes, he should move a separate legislation. As this bill is of a temporary nature. For this reason, Mr. Chairman, I do not think that this amendment should be approved now by the members of the House.

• (8:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, I will repeat briefly in English some of the things I said in French. At the moment kidnapping bears the maximum punishment of life imprisonment. Kidnapping includes confining a person against his will. That is pursuant to section 233 of the Criminal Code. Everyone who mutilates or wounds a person with intent to deprive that person of his life in effect attempts to commit murder, and that is punishable by life imprisonment. I draw to the committee's attention section 210. Of course, everyone who kills a person commits murder, and that carries with it the penalty of life imprisonment.

Mr. Horner: Will the minister permit a question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): When I have finished, Mr. Chairman, I shall answer the hon. member. Killing a person constitutes murder. Except in the case of the murder of a policeman or of a prison guard in the course of his duties, that offence constitutes non-capital murder punishable by life imprisonment.

We are dealing, therefore, with the three offences mentioned in the amendment of the hon. member, all of which already carry the penalty of life imprisonment. Now he wants to include the alternative of the death penalty. I suggest to him and to the other members of the committee that whatever their views are about capital punishment, this is no time for the House, within the context of a specific law of temporary duration to meet a specific purpose—as the hon. member for Lafontaine has said—to pronounce itself on the question of whether it will continue in force the abolition of the death penalty. That penalty was abolished three years ago.

I said earlier in French that the House will be given an opportunity in general terms to debate this issue fully before December, 1972. It will do so in general terms and the debate will apply to the full range of the Criminal Code. That is when the House ought to deal with the matter. I think it would be inappropriate for the House now, in dealing with this specific piece of legislation which is to last for a limited period of time, to consider

this matter. I say this in all seriousness. Whatever the views of hon. members may be about the death penalty, I urge the committee to reject this amendment because Parliament is not addressing itself to the general subject at the moment and I do not think these are the appropriate circumstances in which to deal with so fundamental a subject.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the minister a question? He intimated that he would answer me. Will he explain to the committee what is meant by the term "life imprisonment"? Is it not a fact that on the average life imprisonment in the past has meant about ten years' imprisonment, and not more? Could he just explain that term fully, so that we may understand it?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): It is a mandatory punishment—

Mr. Horner: Would the minister repeat that? I did not quite catch him.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): It is mandatory in the case of non-capital murder. The sentence can only be commuted or the prisoner can only be paroled, as I understand it, by Order in Council. It is not automatic. I feel I ought to mention, that the offence of treason, as set out in section 46 of the Criminal Code, I think, carries with it the death penalty.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Chairman, is it not correct to say that life imprisonment on the average in the past has meant a sentence of ten years' imprisonment or thereabouts?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): No.

Mr. Horner: Does the minister say it means more than ten years? I notice that he shakes his head negatively. His gesture will not appear on the record. I have described it for the record. Will he say whether life imprisonment means ten years, more than ten years, or less?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Before there is parole in the case of non-capital murder, an Order in Council has to be passed. Parole is not automatic.

Mr. Horner: But after what length of time, on the average, has the Order in Council been made effective in the past?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I cannot give the hon. gentleman that information.

Mr. Horner: I suggest that the period has been less than ten years.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I think the hon. gentleman is wrong.

Mr. Horner: Then why has the minister not said so before?

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please. The hon. member for Crowfoot was seeking the floor for the purpose of asking a question and not for the purpose of starting a debate.

[Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton).]

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong this discussion but I wish to say that I think the Minister of Justice is being just a little unfair when he insists that this amendment relates to a general, over-all debate on capital punishment. It does not. We undertook a little research during the general debate on capital punishment, and throughout 1966 and 1967, and learned that life imprisonment has meant a sentence of about eight years, five months and two days. That has been the average sentence over the last 30 or 40 years. The amendment seeks to deal with an emergency situation and it relates to the very essence of the bill we are now considering.

There is no attempt on our part to open up a general debate on capital punishment. We are merely trying to provide a deterrent and to enact adequate punishment for the crime we are considering in this crisis. The Minister of Justice refuted his own argument when he told us that treason is punishable by capital punishment. If his argument holds water, treason ought not to be included so far as capital punishment is concerned. The Minister of Justice tried to leave the impression that the amendment was endeavouring to reopen the whole debate on capital punishment. As I said, this amendment is merely to provide an adequate deterrent and an adequate punishment for the crimes we are considering in this temporary emergency measure. Let that be clear.

The Deputy Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Mr. Roy (Timmins): Mr. Chairman, almost from the beginning of the debate on this amendment I had made up my mind to vote in favour of it.

Mr. Peters: That is not surprising.

Mr. Roy (Timmins): But if I vote for the amendment—and I want to make sure my remarks are on record—it will not be because of the idiotic drivel spoken by the hon. member for Crowfoot. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, his remarks disgusted me to the extent that I almost wanted to vote against the amendment.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner: How often is the hon. member in the House? He is practically a stranger.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Chairman, since we are dealing with the question of penalty I wish to draw certain matters to the attention of the committee. One of the things that struck me throughout the entire tragic incident of the death of Mr. Laporte was that the police received very little information. I think the reason will become apparent when one analyses the Criminal Code.

The offences of capital murder and non-capital murder carry the same penalty of life imprisonment, and that is where the problem lies. We created the difficulty when we made certain changes in the Criminal Code of Canada. For instance, if a police officer asks a citizen to assist him in an arrest when there is a riot or violence, the person so asked must come to the aid of the police officer and if he fails to do so he is guilty of an indictable

offence. If, during the process of assisting the policeman the citizen is shot and killed, the consequences are as follows. If the accused is convicted, he will be liable to life imprisonment. On the other hand, if the police officer is killed, the accused, if convicted, will be sentenced to hang.

Therein lies the root of one of the great problems not only in Canada but in the United States. People do not wish to become involved. In Canada they do not become involved, largely because we pussy-footed on this issue when it was before Parliament. If one were to go to Montreal and to the very place where the crime against Mr. Laporte was committed, one would see that people do not want to become involved. The reason for that, in my opinion, is the great mistake that we made in the law when we said that a person convicted of killing a police officer will hang, but if he is convicted of killing a person who is helping the police officer he will not hang. To me that was a very great mistake. I believe the argument, however, is relevant.

We are now dealing with a very sensitive problem, the problem of the permissive society. There must be some indictment and perhaps some reproaches in respect of our permissive society. As I pointed out this afternoon when reading from the report of the Royal Commission on Security, the government two-years-ago knew the situation was as bad as it now is, yet they did nothing. Because they vacillated and procrastinated we are now in this mess.

• (9:00 p.m.)

I shall vote for the amendment. I believe it is right to do so because the law as it now stands is discriminatory. I believe that every member from the province of Quebec, if they vote according to their conscience, will vote for the amendment.

Mr. Broadbent: Mr. Chairman, there has been a lot of heat in this debate. There is little doubt that it is a most serious matter. One member who has really tried to deal with it in a factual way is the hon. member for Greenwood, who made a brief statement of fact to which there has been no reply. Those of us who are seriously concerned about dealing with terrorist activities must present some kind of evidence. The hon. member for Greenwood referred to the fact, and there is evidence to support this, that capital punishment is not a deterrent. There have been many studies in the past—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Broadbent: It would be appreciated if hon. members would listen. In the past capital punishment was not a deterrent. There are many stories about pickpockets being caught while witnessing executions of people convicted of pickpocketing.

If this has been the case in the past, what evidence do those in favour of capital punishment have to present to those of us who are prepared to listen? I emphasize that. If it can be shown that capital punishment will deter this kind of terroristic activity, I will be prepared to listen because it is a serious matter.

In terms of modern psychology, all available evidence is in the other direction. What type of person becomes involved in this kind of politics? There is the pathological type whom many psychiatrists say is looking for punishment, the man who is guilt-ridden. The more the punishment is increased, the more likely it is that he will enter into this kind of political activity. That argument cannot be dismissed. If members want to argue against it, they should provide evidence and not just an emotional, silly reaction.

The other type of person likely to become involved in such politics, although not pathological or sick none the less takes a very violent view of politics. Rightly or wrongly—and I think it is wrongly—some people believe that violence is essential for political change. If someone has that conviction, does anyone in this House seriously maintain that he will be deterred by capital punishment? My personal view is that the answer is no. A man who accepts violence as a legitimate form of politics will not be deterred by capital punishment. Because of these two basic facts, the pathological case on the one hand and the ideological commitment to violence on the other, I conclude that even on the ground of deterrence there is not a sound reason for a rational man accepting the reinstitution of capital punishment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Leblanc (Laurier): Mr. Chairman, at the time of the debate on the death penalty a few years ago. I was against such abolition. I was discussing a few minutes ago with the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Béchard) the problem we have most at heart, namely the problem of the FLQ in the province of Quebec. I feel we should reestablish capital penalty when there has been kidnapping and loss or life, or when the explosion of a bomb results in loss of life.

I will therefore vote in favour of the amendment put forward by my friends of the Ralliement créditiste, although I am not in full agreement with it. I am not prepared to give unqualified support to the minister's arguments because I was and still am against abolishing the death penalty although, in conformity with democratic principles, I had to yield to the views of the majority who voted for the measure.

Recently, I have been making inquiries in my riding about the identity card which the Quebec Attorney General wishes to make compulsory. He has adopted my idea and I appreciate it.

I have also made a survey about the death penalty and, once again, my electors are ready to support my stand that we should have retained capital punishment. It may not be the perfect remedy for all the ills that are now being felt in Quebec, but, in the circumstances, I believe that I shall have to vote against the government and for the amendment before us.

This is a temporary measure, of course, as indicated in the bill itself, and when the revoking of the amendment to the Criminal Code is introduced, then of course we will have an opportunity to develop our arguments further.

I wanted however to express my opinion on the existing problem tonight.

Mr. Boulanger: Mr. Chairman, I have been listening for some time to the views expressed by various members on the subject of the amendment and I think I may speak to it without reservation since I was one of those who voted for the abolishment of the death penalty.

I thus feel absolutely free about the issue, since at the time I voted to abolish the death penalty, I never suspected that exceptional circumstances would some day make me change my mind.

Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member for Crowfoot (Mr. Horner)—I would appreciate it if he would listen to me—and I wish he could understand my French just as well as he might understand my English.

[*English*]

I ask hon. members to listen carefully to what I have to say. I voted in favour of the abolition of the death penalty. Tonight I am prepared to vote against my own party, which will prove to those who have challenged the minister that this will be a free vote. That was the old story during the time of Mr. Diefenbaker and your gang, but today we are free. Since this means I can say what I think, I will say it.

• (9:10 p.m.)

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Horner: That is the best quote I have heard in a long time.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Chairman: Order. I should like the hon. members to bear in mind that the hon. member for Mercier has the floor.

[*English*]

Mr. Boulanger: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To make sure that what I have to say is exactly the answer you wanted, I am giving it now.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please. May I remind the hon. member for Mercier (Mr. Boulanger) that he must address himself to the Chair and not directly to the hon. member of Crowfoot (Mr. Horner). Moreover, he cannot call the member by his name, but must designate him as the member for such and such constituency.

Mr. Boulanger: Mr. Chairman, I thank you. For the third time I tell you that I am addressing myself to you. When I voted for the abolition of the death penalty, I never would had thought that one day I would have to reconsider my decision. It is not necessary that I make a speech or describe all the circumstances that have existed for more than a month. It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that if today a man is found guilty of treason, he can be hanged. Since we are ready to condemn to death a man who kills a policeman or a prison guard, I think that by adopting this temporary legislation today—because it is still a temporary legislation which will remain in force until the end of April 1971—we should inflict the same penalty on the person who, through a fanaticism that I am at a loss to explain, can kill one, two, three or four public men, Ministers of the Crown or other prominent figures.

I do not agree with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) and, in my opinion, the amendment moved, because of the temporary character of the legislation, should allow us to condemn the guilty persons to death. Therefore, I will vote in favour of the amendment.

Mr. Béchard: Mr. Chairman—

The Deputy Chairman: Order. Is the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice rising to put a question to the hon. member for Mercier?

Mr. Béchard: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Could the hon. member for Mercier tell me what will happen after April 31, 1971 to those who, on May 1st will kidnap a politician or someone else?

Mr. Boulanger: Mr. Chairman, I never thought that some day I would have the pleasure and the privilege of answering a question put by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice. His question however is quite hypothetical. If this legislation is of a temporary nature, I think that it is because if on the 1st of May, there is still an apprehended state of insurrection, we will again introduce the legislation which we know and we will deal with it in the House.

[*English*]

Mr. Aiken: I intend to vote against this amendment. I do not intend to vote against it for the reasons put forward by the Minister of Justice, nor because of my views on capital punishment. It is my belief that the government by its own acts and on its own responsibility has elevated the present situation into an unreasonable state of hysteria. The government has yet to give this House a full and true statement of the facts concerning the events of the last month. They have not been totally honest with us.

If we were to accept the position of the government that the situation in this country, particularly in the province of Quebec, is as bad as they say it is, we would have no alternative but to vote for the amendment; but I cannot accept that position or believe that the situation is as bad as the government says it is. I believe the government is being inconsistent in playing the situation up on one hand and playing it down on the other, and in these circumstances I cannot support the amendment.

Mr. Haidasz: Mr. Chairman, I rise only to ask the Minister of Justice for an explanation of the word "crime" in subclause (*g*) of clause 4. In particular, I would ask him to tell the committee whether the word "crime" includes murder and, hence, whether a murder committed by a member of the FLQ or of another similar group in Canada would be punishable only by a term of imprisonment not exceeding five years.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): We are talking hypothetically, because the hon. member put his question in abstract terms. If a murder were committed by a member of the FLQ the charge, obviously, would be murder, under the Criminal Code, rather than a charge under clause 4 of this bill. If a member of the FLQ were to kidnap somebody and the evidence were sufficient, he would be prosecuted for kidnapping for which the term is life imprisonment. The proceedings would not be under clause 4 of this bill.

If the victim was mutilated or tortured and death followed as a result, the person committing the offence would be prosecuted under the Criminal Code, which provides a life sentence as a maximum penalty. It is conceivable that if an attempt to overthrow the government were analagous to the crime of kidnapping or murder, the death penalty could result if a charge under section 46(1)(*d*) of the Criminal Code were sustained, that is, treason for which the penalty is death.

[*Translation*]

I take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to say to all my colleagues that this law is not aimed at raising the question of abolition or retention of capital punishment.

That question is raised by an amendment of an hon. member of the Ralliement créditiste. The House will have the opportunity before December 29, 1972 to make a permanent decision on the matter of capital punishment, and I submit to Your Honour that the time to discuss and to vote on abolition or retention of capital punishment is not during a debate on the passing of a provisional law.

The House of Commons has to be given the opportunity for a serious consideration of that very important question and must not try to deal with it now. I believe the question is much more important than that and it would be unfair either to the people of Canada or the people of Quebec to make a decision on so basic a question when the House has not at present the opportunity to make an exhaustive study of that question.

The opportunity will arise before December 29, 1972.

[*English*]

The Deputy Chairman: Order. Before I recognize the hon. member for Skeena perhaps the Chair should take a moment to remind the minister that the amendment before the committee permits hon. members to elaborate on the question of capital punishment, and the Chair has no alternative but to allow hon. members to do so if they wish.

• (9:20 p.m.)

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, it was interesting to notice the great attention that the Minister of Justice paid in his remarks not to all parts of the House but to one particular section of it.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I learned that from the right hon. member for Prince Albert.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I never saw the minister's face once. He was looking in the other direction, not at you, Mr. Chairman. Apart from that, I think the most telling argument presented to the committee so far in regard to the amendment before us was that made by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka. He levelled, I think quite properly, the accusation that the incendiary feeling which exists in the province of Quebec is to a large extent to be laid at the doorstep of this government, whose Minister of Regional Economic Expansion distorted the facts of the situation on more than one occasion for purely political reasons and inflamed feelings far in excess of those which one would have expected to be aroused. That is where the blame should lie.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I see hon. members opposite shaking their heads.

The Deputy Chairman: Order, please. May I remind hon. members that the hon. member for Skeena has the floor and should be allowed to make his speech as others have done up to this point.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): Mr. Chairman, I do not really mind the interruptions from members like the hon. member for Mercier, but I would point out that if they are entitled to interrupt they should not object when others interrupt them. That is only fair.

Apart from the fact that the government is to a large extent responsible for the feelings that exist in Quebec, I think we are approaching the question of capital punishment from entirely the wrong angle. There are those who feel we should look at the question whether or not there should be capital punishment from the point of view of vengefulness, from the point of view of exacting a toll from those individuals who commit this crime. They subscribe to the view that in our decision we should reflect the desire for revenge on behalf of those who have been injured.

This is not the function of a legislator. The function of a legislator is to try to look at things rationally and dispassionately and not let his heart rule his head. To do otherwise would mean that every time he considered something that was crucial or heinous to society, the Parliament of Canada would be expected to move hither and yon as emotions developed. We have known since long ago that acting out of revenge does not solve the situation or help matters one little bit. In terms of the force of the law we know that capital punishment, or the threat of it, is no more nor less a deterrent to the commission of the crime of murder than some other penalty; and the penalty we impose at the moment for this crime is life imprisonment.

With regard to those who kidnapped Mr. Laporte and Mr. Cross, whatever the punishment that would have been imposed upon them—I think the Minister of Justice said the sentence for kidnapping was life imprisonment and that the penalty facing those who committed the heinous murder of Mr. Laporte was life imprisonment or hanging, depending on how they were charged—they were not deterred in any way by any threatened penalty of capital punishment. I suggest it was not even a factor.

People who have criminal intent, or are psychotic or unbalanced, are not deterred one way or another by the threat of capital punishment. In their own deluded minds they feel that they must commit the crime, and when they do commit it they convince themselves that they can get away with it. They gamble. True, they gamble with somebody else's life, but they also gamble with their own. I suggest that in that sort of situation exacting revenge from those who committed the crime of murder against Mr. Laporte is not a reasoned course of action to take. We might just as well exact the same revenge in the case of an individual who murders as the result of some emotional, love situation that exists in a family.

A number of hon. members have indicated that they intend to vote for this amendment. I hope that when they do, they vote not on the basis of vengeance but on the basis of what they truly believe is the proper detterrent in our society to the commission of such an offence. I think it is true that you can equate life imprisonment with capital punishment as a sentence. But it is not correct to say that the National Parole Board can with impunity grant parole to a person after he has served six or seven years without looking at the merits of the case. What we as legislators have before us tonight is the question whether or not we are enacting a law that will be a true deterrent against the commission of this crime. As I say, we should not look at it from the point of view of revenge, of hanging all individuals who commit such crimes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Laprise: Mr. Chairman, I only want to recall what the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) said a moment ago, namely that we were opening a debate on the abolition of capital punishment. I think that the Minister of Justice can speak better French than he understands it since I told him earlier, and others understood, that we were not trying to deal with the whole subject of capital punishment, either its abolition or its reestablishment, but to deal with specific cases.

I asked him a question a moment ago which I will ask again in a much more direct manner.

I would ask him what would have happened if instead of kidnapping Pierre Laporte, the kidnappers had kidnapped and killed a police officer? It is likely that the amendment adopted on December 21, 1967, to section 202A of the Criminal Code would have applied. This section reads as follows:

> Murder is capital murder, in respect of any person, where such person by his own act caused or assisted in causing the death of
>
> (i) a police officer, police constable, constable, sheriff, deputy sheriff, sheriff's officer or other person employed for the preservation and maintenance of the public peace, acting in the course of his duties, or
>
> (ii) a warden, deputy warden, instructor, keeper, gaoler, guard or other officer or permanent employee of a prison, acting in the course of his duties.

So, Mr. Chairman, if the kidnappers had kidnapped the director of the Montreal police department or a simple police officer or a gaoler and had killed him, the law could have applied capital punishment. But as for the kidnappers of a Quebec minister they can only be arrested, deprived of some of their freedom, but given shelter, heat, good food at the expense of Canadian taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat that we are not trying to start a debate on the abolition or reestablishment of capital punishment but to deal with Bill C-181 which is temporary legislation.

• (9:30 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Deachman: Mr. Chairman, we are within half an hour of the closing of today's session. We are not in session of the House but are simply in committee. In the chamber tonight we have approximately 80 Members of Parliament, a little less than one-third of the total membership of the House of Commons, and we are discussing an amendment which would implement capital punishment through a clause of the single bill that is before us. A few moments ago this matter was smuggled onto the floor of the committee as a debate on capital punishment.

Mr. Thompson: It was not. I protest.

An hon. Member: That is not fair to the Chairman.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a question of privilege. When the hon. member imputes motives, as he is doing now, he is completely out of order. It was not an insidious way to enter into a debate on capital punishment; it was a legitimate—

Mr. Horner: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member for Vancouver Quadra said there are approximately 80 members in the chamber. In fact there are 50 members on this side, and as I look closely at the other side I see that there are well over 80 members in total. Therefore, that statement cannot go without challenge.

Mr. Deachman: If we were to introduce capital punishment through a clause in this bill, I feel sure we would be very ashamed of ourselves for toying with life and death.

Mr. Horner: They didn't toy with Laporte's life.

Mr. Deachman: Tomorrow, when we settled down to read our papers, we would find that we had...

Mr. Horner: They were teasing and torturing him.

Mr. Deachman: —passed a clause of great solemnity in this bill. I agree with those who have suggested that there is a place in this House of Commons for dealing with capital punishment, and that it is a matter which should be dealt with fairly soon. But members opposite, as well as members on this side of the House, would not want to see that subject dealt with, put into a statute and made the law of Canada as summarily as it would be if we were to pass it tonight. Many hon. members agree that this is a subject which should wait until the whole membership of the House is here and until Parliament has time to adequately reflect upon it. Surely, our task at the moment is not to address ourselves to bringing into

this House, just 20 minutes before the end of the day's sitting, a clause to reinstitute with capital punishment.

If a vote is taken on this amendment tonight, I hope it will be soundly defeated not only by those who do not agree with capital punishment but by those who believe that Parliament ought to consider the subject in a more serious way when all the members of the House are here.

Mr. Horner: Mr. Chairman, I should like to say a few words—

The Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Battle River.

Mr. Downey: Mr. Chairman, what prompted me to say a few words tonight was that some members suggested that those who supported the capital punishment area of this amendment were doing so because of emotion rather than fact. The question of deterrence was raised. I suggest that the whole basis of our legal system is deterrence. Consider fines and imprisonment. What are these, if they are not deterrents? When one takes a life, to hang is the maximum deterrent. In connection with the FLQ kidnapping of Mr. Laporte we see there was no deterrence after the kidnapping. At one point it did not matter one iota to them whether he was released or murdered, because the deterrent was the same.

The member for Charlevoix stated that the first object of the law is the protection of the citizenry, and I suggest this—is the principle as it was originally conceived. I have figures here relating to some countries wherein capital punishment has been abolished except for treason. In the Netherlands war criminals were executed as late as March, 1952. Norway executed 25 prisoners for treason, and Belgium executed some well into the 1950s. Britain and West Germany are experiencing strong support for the reintroduction of the death penalty.

The figures I have here indicate that the murder rate has gradually increased since the death penalty has been abolished. In 1966 there were 1.3 murders per 100,000 of the population. The rate goes up to 1.8 in 1968, and a little over 1.9 in 1969. I think there is adequate evidence that over the years the death penalty has been a deterrent.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Kaplan: Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in response to the remarks of the hon. member for Crowfoot. He indicated that he thought most of the people of Canada would favour the reintroduction of the death penalty. I must admit that I have received letters from people recommending that the death penalty be reintroduced and I have been to many public meetings, some in my own riding, where people have spoken out in favour of its reintroduction. But, Mr. Chairman, they are far from the majority.

In any event, I would oppose the reintroduction of the death penalty whether on a permanent or, as suggested by the hon. member for Red Deer, on a temporary basis. The supporters of the death penalty argue that those crimes which society finds the most revolting should be punished by a maximum penalty, death. The hon. member for Crowfoot said that he did not care whether it was death in the gas chamber or by hanging. He said he would leave that to the government—

An hon. Member: Good old Crowfoot!

Mr. Kaplan: —but the maximum punishment should be imposed. I ask hon. members opposite this question: If we are to introduce the maximum penalty that society can impose, why are they asking for the humane penalty of death by hanging or in the gas chamber? These are the two most humane methods of killing people. Would the logic of their position not dictate that they should be driven to imposing the most painful method of inflicting death? Why are they satisfied with hanging and the gas chamber? Why are they not talking about drawing and quartering people?

• (9:40 p.m.)

Mr. Horner: Why don't you say what they did to Laporte? Let the people know the truth about what they did to Laporte.

The Chairman: Order.

Mr. Kaplan: What I am trying to point out in asking these questions, which I hope are rhetorical because surely no member would advocate a death penalty of that nature, is that there is a logical fallacy in their argument. I think it shows how absurd the argument is when we take it to its logical conclusion. It shows that the whole argument is without merit and that the death penalty would serve no useful purpose whatsoever.

Mr. Gleave: Mr. Chairman, I tend to agree with the speakers who have said that this argument does not really belong in this discussion. We are discussing a measure which the government has chosen to bring before Parliament as an alternative to the War Measures Act. This amendment simply introduces a great deal of emotion which does not add to the discussion.

May I say, as has been said before, that this emotion-charged atmosphere is partially due to the government itself. When the Prime Minister of this country chooses to label those who oppose him as weak-kneed, bleeding hearts, what is he saying? Instead of using rational talk, he chooses to use the epithets of the intellectual gutter. I as a farmer would use the epithets of the gutter because I understand them and can use them very well. But the Prime Minister, having the advantage of more sophistication and so on, uses the epithets of the intellectual to label his opponents.

I am very much concerned about the hysteria and emotion that is evident in this Parliament rather than the rational approach we should attempt to take in meeting this most unfortunate situation. Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the type of penalty we use to deter really has no place in the measure we are now discussing.

Mr. Harkness: Mr. Chairman, I fail to see any logic or reason in reviving at this time the arguments we heard

ad nauseam three, four and five years ago in connection with the abolition of the death penalty. The chief reason there is no logic to it is that the death penalty exists in our law at the present time. It exists for treason and it exists in respect of the murder of a policeman, a penitentiary warden, and so on. Therefore, I find it difficult to understand why members should continue to argue about whether we should or should not have the death penalty. We have it now.

This amendment would merely extend the death penalty to the type of crime that has been committed by the FLQ and which may be again committed by members of the FLQ under the present rather difficult circumstances. It would seem to me that the reasonable thing to do is to stop arguing about whether or not we should have the death penalty, because we already have it for certain crimes. I think we should vote on this measure. I thought this bill was a matter of urgency which the government wanted to get through as quickly as possible.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Harkness: Certainly, the members of the official opposition are very anxious to get it through as quickly as possible. Therefore, I do not understand why we should take up so much time arguing about something which really has no application to the matter. I would hope we would have a vote on this amendment now and get on with the measure.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Chairman, I have tried for some time to get your attention. I have a few observations to make. The hon. member for Calgary Centre has said pretty much what I wanted to say. I am very opposed to the type of discussion I have listened to in the last hour or so. I am also very much opposed to the suggestions of gentlemen in this chamber who should know better, such as the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra, suggesting that this is not the proper place to discuss this question. Of course it is the proper place. Whether we are in committee or whether we are in the House, this is the place to discuss it and suggestions to the contrary are not fitting during a discussion of a matter so serious.

I cannot understand why in this chamber we cannot get on with the business before us in a much more efficient and orderly manner than we have in the last few days. The items we are considering were placed before us with some assurance, both quiet and spoken, by the government almost a week ago, but we are still debating this bill while other urgent matters are waiting on the sidelines. My suggestion is that we stop fooling around with a matter as serious as the sanctity of life, and get on with the amendment and the bill itself as well as the business of running this country.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Chairman, I shall speak briefly because I, too, would like to see this matter come to a vote. I think this whole discussion is misleading, in that we seem to be spending a great deal of time talking about deterrence when the real issue behind this legislation is detection. When the people concerned are not yet apprehended, I think we are putting the cart before the horse.

It strikes me that a discussion about reintroducing capital punishment is, in effect, a kind of counsel of despair. If this is the best way in which we can respond to the very serious situation and to what may exist in the minds of those who create terror, we really have not successfully entered the twentieth century. I think we have had ample experience to know that our system of social vengeance, instituted to its ultimate degree with capital and corporal punishment, has not been very successful. I suggest that all members in the committee should do their duty immediately and vote against the amendment.

• (9:50 p.m.)

Mr. Horner: I can assure you, Mr. Chairman, and the committee that I will not talk past ten o'clock. I now recognize the time as being seven minutes to ten o'clock. I assure you, Mr. Chairman, that I will allow this amendment to come to a vote tonight. I am prompted to speak again on this question because there has been much talk about vengeance, about the fact that those who moved the amendment and who spoke in favour of it are motivated by vengeance. I assure the committee that this feeling is not motivating me one bit. I am motivated by the fact that our whole system of justice is based upon the effectiveness of a deterrent. In fact, clause 3 of the bill outlaws a group of persons or association known as le Front de Libération du Québec or any successor group or successor association. So in a sense we are creating a deterrent against anybody joining the FLQ or for any group of FLQ members creating a new association with the same purpose in mind.

This bill in essence is a deterrent against anybody in the House of Commons or any citizen of Canada attending meetings of the FLQ. It is based on the principle of deterrence. I say that this amendment is also a deterrent against acts committed by the FLQ. What did the Prime Minister call these people? Did he say they were bleeding hearts? It seems to me, listening tonight to the bleeding hearts bleeding for the life of somebody who eradicates an honest, law abiding citizen of this country, that no sympathy can be felt for him. I have these bleeding hearts around me and they are also on the other side of the House. I am somewhat like the Prime Minister; I am not too sympathetic toward bleeding hearts.

Our whole system of justice is based upon the principle of deterrence. Once the members of an FLQ cell kidnap a person, it does not matter who he is, the punishment for them is life imprisonment, so the Minister of Justice tells us. If they release that person or if they take his life, the punishment is no greater: it is still life imprisonment; there is no additional deterrent. I hope that I live in a society which values human life and is prepared to so signify when we face a serious crisis. I agree with the hon. member for Skeena that the government has made all Canada aware of this crisis. We have to act upon it. The purpose of bringing in this bill was to deal with the crisis. It is a temporary measure, and we have to act upon it.

I urge all Quebec members to vote for this amendment. What will the people of the Labelle and Frontenac constituencies think when they vote in the by-election next Monday? What will they think of their federal government if it votes against this amendment at this time? The people in the province of Quebec know there is a crisis. They feel it far more than I do in western Canada, and they want a deterrent. Mr. Laporte's life meant something to them. They wanted him alive, not mutilated and quartered as the hon. member for Don Mills suggested. I want every member in the committee to weigh that issue when they vote. Do we need more, or less, deterrence? I say we need more deterrence in this crisis situation.

The Chairman: Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. Laprise) negatived: Yeas, 27; nays, 72.

The Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Progress reported.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

FINANCE—SUGGESTED INTERIM INCOME TAX CHANGES TO ASSIST PENSIONERS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, November 3, as recorded in *Hansard* at page 825, I put a question to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) in the following words:

—Having regard to the delay which is being experienced in bringing in over-all income tax changes, is the government giving consideration to an interim measure which would remove some of the anomalies and unfairness faced by persons whose only income is their pensions?

The reply of the minister, if I may paraphrase what he said, was to the effect that if any changes were to be made, they would be announced in the House in due course. That reply, of course, has been taped and computerized; we get it fairly often.

• (10:00 p.m.)

I am glad to see the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Mahoney) here tonight to answer my question, and I look hopefully for a helpful answer. I trust he will not spend any time telling me that we must not deal with this problem simply by raising the income tax exemption levels on the ground that that does more for the rich than it does for the poor. I trust he will not assume that some of us do not know that. I trust he will realize that we are aware of tax credits and of other ways in which a problem like this can be solved.

In my question on Tuesday, November 3, I referred to certain anomalies. May I indicate very briefly three such anomalies. First I mention the gross unfairness that is involved in giving to some of our old age pensioners a guaranteed income supplement, the purpose of which is to bring their income up to a certain level, and then turning around and taking some of that income away by taxing that bit of extra money. The Parliamentary Secretary can tell me that this applies in some cases and not in others. I am concerned about the cases where it does apply. I am concerned about retired persons who have their position improved on the one hand and downgraded on the other. This must be corrected.

A second anomaly relates to the fact that persons 70 years of age and over are allowed an extra $500 income tax exemption which does not apply any longer at age 65; at least, it does not apply to anyone between 65 and 70 who is in receipt of old age security during any month in any calendar year. I know the arguments for and against all this, but the anomaly I would like to point out to the Parliamentary Secretary is clear and straight forward. There are people between the ages of 65 and 70 who have nothing else but their pension income—people who are retired, who are out of the labour market—and yet because they are in that age bracket their exemption level, for single persons, is only $1,000. On the other hand there are people over 70 years of age who have income other than the old age pension, even people who have income from employment or income from investment. There are some in that age bracket who might have quite a lot of income and yet they are permitted an extra $500; in other words, a total $1,500 exemption so far as income tax is concerned. This I think is quite unfair, and it ought to be corrected.

I also think it is an anomaly, or a case of adding insult to injury, that pensioners, people who are on fixed incomes, have no opportunity to get an increase in their income to cope with the rising cost of living, and yet it is argued that because rules must have general application they cannot get an extra tax exemption or an extra tax credit. Precisely because their income position is fixed, precisely because they are denied some of the advantages that are available to those who are in the labour market, I think there is a case for different tax treatment of those people who are retired, those people who are on pensions only. I urge the government to give favourable consideration to this situation.

I know I repeat myself when I say to the Parliamentary Secretary: Don't come back and give me that line about the unfairness of raising income tax exemption levels because it does more for the rich than for the poor. It can be done by a system of tax credits. These pensioners of ours, our retired people, are having a terribly rough time today. They have to wait for white papers and legislation and for all the time it takes the government to deal with these matters. I think pensioners should benefit both ways. I have argued on previous occasions in favour of increasing the old age security pension to $150 a month, and I shall continue to do so. They should also benefit through whatever can be done in the matter of tax changes in their favour.

The government has talked about tax changes; it has talked about a $1,400 exemption level for single persons, and yet we are having to wait for that. That, in itself, will not do the trick. Time is running out. I urge that in the present session there be some specific tax arrangements for our retired people, and I am speaking particularly and precisely of those who are on pension income only. I urge that there be tax rebates, special tax treatment and tax arrangements that will give them a bit of justice instead of the unfairnesses and anomalies they now face. Mr. Speaker, the position of these people is desperate. For God's sake, I hope the government will do something about it soon.

Mr. P. M. Mahoney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I should like again to note with favour and approval the hon. member's traditional and continuing concern for those living on pensions and fixed incomes only. This concern, of course, is shared by the government and is one of the principal reasons why the government has been so determined to beat inflation. I think the hon. member is very well aware that a specific answer to his question must, in the tradition of this Parliament, await a budget speech or a minibudget.

The Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) recently had a lengthy meeting with a group of retired persons from Toronto who have designated themselves as "Pensioners Concerned" and who are launching a national campaign to bring the attention of the public to the situation of retired persons, the specific situation which the hon. member has so well articulated. This group was very eloquent in its appeal and during a 90 minute session with the minister explained the problems of retired persons without ignoring the revenue problems faced by the federal government or, indeed, any government.

The Minister of Finance is sympathetic to their views but questions whether the government can legislate more favourably toward lower-income retired persons than toward any other lower-income group. He noted the $500 deduction for persons over 70 years of age, something which the hon. member mentioned. While it is acknowledged that not all persons over 70 require this exemption because they are not all persons with low incomes, nevertheless I think it is a truism that the vast majority of people over that age are on fixed incomes, be they adequate or inadequate.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): That is sadly true, and most of them are inadequate.

Mr. Mahoney: Many persons and organizations have tried to divorce the issue of increased exemptions from the comprehensive issue of tax reform, but this is not possible. It may seem trite to mention, but the growing programs that the government now has under way cost money; and it is unrealistic to suggest that the government can get along with less total revenue and continue programs that are now in effect.

If pensioners are to be treated, aside from the special $500 deduction, no more generously than persons of any other age on low incomes, then one has to look at the cost to the treasury of $1 billion under the exemption increases proposed in the white paper. The cost of these proposals is to be paid for by the other tax reforms put forward in the white paper. The changes in the rates schedule which would place a slightly heavier tax on those in the upper middle and high income groups would raise an extra $1⅛ billion, approximately. Capital gains taxation and other changes in taxation of business would yield other revenues. There are other reforms, of course, which would cost the treasury money.

The hon. member urged action in the present session. The government intends to place tax legislation implementing reform before Parliament as soon as possible.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to advise the Parliamentary Secretary that his time has expired.

PUBLIC WORKS—EGANVILLE—PROGRESS TOWARD NEW FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. A. D. Alkenbrack (Frontenac-Lennox and Addington): Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday afternoon during the oral question period I asked the following question of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Laing) as reported at page 877 of *Hansard* for November 4:

> Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Public Works which I hope is in order because I gave him notice of it. What progress is being made by his department on the project for a new federal building in the town of Eganville?

Then, Mr. Speaker, you gave me permission because of the urgency of the situation to raise the matter at a future time of adjournment, which happens to be this evening. Last Wednesday the bulk of the questioning during the oral question period pertained to national and social security, mainly as a result of the unfortunate happenings in Quebec. These matters of national security were of such concern that the next day, November 5, the Ottawa *Journal* ran a lead editorial bemoaning the fact that at that time I asked a question about the need of a new federal post office in Eganville. I quote from the editorial:

• (10:10 p.m.)

> A Commons due to meet at 2.00 opened at 2.10 and spent until 3.02 fumbling along with the usual run of questions and motions, including a query about the need of a federal building in Eganville.

The Commons was not fumbling last Wednesday, Mr. Speaker. Why shouldn't I, as the federal representative for the village of Eganville, ask my question? There was a 40-minute open question period on that day. What was wrong with asking a question pertaining to the public service and economy of the community which I represent? I think in that part of the editorial the Ottawa *Journal* temporarily forgot about the importance of Ottawa valley towns, one of which is Eganville. Eganville, on the Bonnechere River, a tributary of the Ottawa River, is older than Ottawa. My records indicate that Eganville was founded in 1825. Bytown was founded in 1826, and Ottawa in 1854. Eganville, the surrounding community and Renfrew county have been supplying

Ottawa for many years with men, mines and materials. I wish to remind the Ottawa *Journal* of this fact. The world will not come to an end because of the happenings in the province of Quebec. Eganville and Canada will continue to march onward.

My question arises from the fact that more than two years ago the federal government purchased the old Eganville town hall from the corporation of the village with the intention of building a new post office on the site. The village corporation, reeve and council moved their offices to the old Eganville high school which was vacated some time ago by the local board of education as a result of the new Opeongo high school built by the county of Renfrew board of education.

The abandonment of the old town hall has resulted in the building going into a state of disrepair and neglect. The sooner the new post office is built, the better it will serve the needs of the community. When one stands and looks at the old building in its disarray and its broken windows, he is not encouraged when he is reminded that it is owned by the federal government. In fact, it would form part of a worth-while winter works program if the government did what it could this winter toward demolishing the old building and being ready to pour footings next spring for the new office. The reeve, council and people of the village are patiently waiting word from the government as to when construction will begin on the new post office, and I say to the minister through you, Mr. Speaker, the sooner the better.

Mr. P. M. Mahoney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, the Department of Public Works is presently planning to build a post office of approximately 2,500 square feet at Eganville. It is hoped that the more detailed planning for this post office can be proceeded with during the spring of 1971, provided sufficients funds are available for the project.

INDUSTRY, TRADE AND COMMERCE—EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET AND CANADA'S AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS—DISCUSSION AT CONGRESS

Mr. Thomas S. Barnett (Comox-Alberni): Mr. Speaker, the question I wish to discuss for a few minutes is properly noted at page 954 of *Hansard* as "Items involved in British reservation concerning application of the EEC common tariff". It arises from a supplementary question to one raised by the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose) on November 5. His question arose from a statement made by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) in which the minister said he had recently made a trip to Europe to establish, as he described it, optimum channels of communication with all the parties involved—United Kingdom, the members of the European community, the new applicants and all countries concerned with the process of *élargissement*.

The hon. member for Fraser Valley West asked the minister if he could tell the House what forest products were among 12 items which the British had identified as being sensitive in the framework of the United Kingdom economy—items in respect of which they had some reservation as they entered into discussions with members of the European Economic Community. This subject matter is of great concern to the important forest products producing areas of British Columbia and, understandably, members of that province are concerned about the effect the latest British move toward close association with Europe will have upon the export position.

The minister was apparently unable to answer the question from memory and he indulged in one of those rather delightful, inverted ministerial phrases which make many of us enjoy his presence in the House. Most ministers would not willingly admit that they were trying to dodge an issue, but the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce said:

> I was trying to dodge the issue because I am not sure which forest products were included.

Immediately afterward, some hon. members were shouting "Oh, oh" and I did not catch the minister's further reply. There was some amusement behind the scenes on the part of the members from British Columbia who sit on the same side of the House as the minister because the hon. member for Fraser Valley West and I were raising this question on November 5. I think they knew that some of us had had lunch with a delegation from the Council of Forest Industries which was in Ottawa. It was because I had knowledge of the presence of this delegation in Ottawa that I was surprised the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce did not, apparently, know the details concerning items which are of such great concern to a delegation which had come to Ottawa primarily to discuss this matter with the government as well as with some private members.

Therefore, I asked the minister whether, before attempting to make a statement in the House as suggested by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), he would visit our province and find out at first-hand just how important these products are to the economy of British Columbia in particular and, indeed, to Canada as a whole. I realize that the following day the minister did come into the House and state that plywood, wood pulp and newsprint are among the 12 sensitive items. I appreciate that he gave this information to the House on the next occasion we were sitting. I know, too, that he told us lumber was not included among the items which the British considered to be most sensitive, although he added there might be a possibility of rough-sawn lumber entering the European Economic Community free of duty when Britain joins it.

• (10:20 p.m.)

I should also like to say that not only the members of the Council of Forest Industries but also the people of British Columbia generally have good reason for concern about the impact of the British move toward Europe. As has often been said—indeed, it is almost trite in British Columbia—something like 50 cents of every dollar in the British Columbia economy arises from the harvesting and manufacture of our forest crops.

If I still have a minute or two I should like to say that it is particularly important that in its discussions and negotiations with European nations, the Canadian government should not lose sight of the importance of the lumber export market, even though the British do not regard it as a sensitive area.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. Bruce Howard (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, I think we are indebted to the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett) for raising this very important issue. It is a matter of concern to the government and certainly to the people and industry in British Columbia. Perhaps it is not surprising that the genial and very capable Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) would not have at his fingertips all 12 items about which the British are particularly concerned, when one notices that the list includes not only plywood, wood pulp and newsprint, with which the hon. member was concerned, but things like ferro-silicon, ferro-chrome and even the esoteric item of wattle extract.

British Columbia lumber products do enter the United Kingdom market tariff free at the present time. Under arrangements that are expected to be made if the United Kingdom succeeds in joining the European Economic Community, it is anticipated, as the hon. member stated, that rough-sawn lumber will continue to enter duty free. It is expected that wood pulp would carry a tariff of 3 per cent, newsprint 7 per cent and plywood 13 per cent. At the present time, countries that are members of the EEC are importing wood pulp and newsprint for their own needs on a tariff free basis.

The United Kingdom has given notice that it intends to ask for special arrangements to be made with regard to wood pulp, newsprint and plywood. The government is in very close contact with the United Kingdom and countries of the EEC in regard to these arrangements. The minister was recently in Europe developing previous contacts and the government is kept aware of these important developments.

The government is also very closely in touch with British Columbia lumber producers and marketers. Last week, as a matter of fact, the minister and I had a meeting with one of the lumber industry representatives who was in Ottawa, at which we discussed particular arrangements concerning the promotion of British Columbia plywood. It is hoped that something can be worked out which will have special reference to our need for developing and maintaining markets for British Columbia plywood in the European Economic Community, and at such time as—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Parliamentary Secretary's time has expired. Pursuant to Standing Order 2 (3), this House stands adjourned until Thursday, November 12, 1970, at two o'clock p.m.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10:26 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, November 12, 1970

The House met at 2 p.m.

[*Translation*]

PRIVILEGE

MR. ASSELIN—CORRECTION OF NEWSPAPER ARTICLE

Mr. Asselin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

Reporting on an address I delivered yesterday to members of Ottawa's Richelieu Club, the press quoted me as having said that resolving of constitutional problems should take place within two months.

I want to correct this error because, in fact, this is what I said: "If, within a few months, I would say two years at most, there is no sign of action in the constitutional domain—"

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this correction is to further clarify my position on the subject I was dealing with.

* * *

[*English*]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate to the effect that the Senate has passed Bill S-6, an Act to amend the Anti-Dumping Act, to which the concurrence of this House is desired.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

REFERENCE TO STANDING COMMITTEE, WITH AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT AND EVIDENCE ADDUCED

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions through the usual channels and there is general agreement and, hopefully, unanimous agreement, concerning the following motion:

That the Public Accounts for the year ended March 31, 1968 and the Auditor General's Report thereon and the evidence adduced in consideration thereof in the previous session be referred to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. Baldwin: The discussions have been fruitful. We agree.

Mr. Speaker: The discussions having been fruitful and hon. members having heard the motion proposed by the Minister of Agriculture, is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

TIME LIMIT ON SPEECHES ON OPPOSITION SUPPLY MOTION

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I report a second fruitful discussion. It has to do with the time limits on speeches in the debate which will take place later today on the motion that will be moved by my hon. friend from York South.

The agreement among the parties is that the mover of the motion and the principal speaker on behalf of the government shall each have 30 minutes, the principal speakers for the Official Opposition and the Ralliement des Créditistes 20 minutes, and all other speakers 15 minutes. It is also agreed that no speaker shall ask for an extension of time.

An hon. Member: Including you Stanley.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Agreed.

Mr. Baldwin: No one will get it, you mean.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the suggestion made by the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre. I understand there has been discussion on this subject to that effect. Is it so ordered?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

* * *

NATIONAL MUSEUMS

FINANCIAL ADMINISTRATION—REQUEST FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT TO MOVE MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Cliff Downey (Battle River): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43 I ask the unanimous consent of the House to present a motion on a matter of urgent and pressing necessity. It has to do with maladministration of the National Museums of Canada as evidenced by the prolonged absence of highly paid museums' officials from their offices while touring foreign countries at considerable public expense. There is also the matter of contracts let by the museums branch for publications as far back as 1967 which to my knowledge have not yet been delivered.

• (2:10 p.m.)

I should therefore like to move, seconded by the hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton (Mr. Scott):

That the Standing Committee on Public Accounts be authorized to inquire into the financial administration of the National Museums of Canada to determine whether all proper procedures are being followed and have been followed with respect to the expenditure of public funds.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. members have heard the motion proposed by the hon. member for Battle River.

[*Translation*]

The House knows that such a motion cannot be put without unanimous consent. I therefore ask the House if there is unanimous consent.

[*English*]

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry to advise the hon. member that there is no unanimity in favour of the submission of his motion. Therefore it cannot be put at this time.

Mr. Downey: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, may I impress upon hon. members that it would be much easier to facilitate an investigation by this means than by going through the ordinary process of questioning in the House.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member knows that that is not a point of order. It may be an argument in support of his motion, but it is not a point of order.

* * *

[*Translation*]

CUSTOMS TARIFF

CONTINUATION OF MEN'S AND BOYS' SHIRTS SURTAX ORDER

On the order: Government notices of motions:

November 10, 1970—*The Minister of Finance*:—That this House, pursuant to subsection (1c) of section 7 of the *Customs Tariff*, do approve that the *Men's and Boys' Shirts Surtax Order*, being Order in Council P.C. 1970-959 of 2 June 1970 made under subsection (1a) of section 7 of the said Act, continue to have force and effect until the 29th day of November, 1971.

Mr. Speaker: Pursuant to section 2 of Standing Order 21 this government notice of motion stands transferred to and ordered for consideration under government orders at the next sitting of the House.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[*English*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

UNEMPLOYMENT—BREAKDOWN OF PERIOD OF TIME IN DBS MONTHLY REPORT

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce who I believe reports to the House on behalf of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Why is it that for the second month in a row the monthly report of DBS on employment and unemployment has omitted any breakdown of the period of time of unemployment?

[Mr. Downey.]

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that the document published today—the press release—gives only part of the total picture. The procedure is that in a very few days another document—the main publication called "The Labour Force"—will come out giving further information, including data on duration of unemployment.

Mr. Stanfield: Then am I to understand that the minister is giving the assurance that this information will be forthcoming from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and circulated in the same manner within a matter of days?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member who asked that question last month, the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings, made the same point. On the following day I sent him a note of explanation and he seemed to be satisfied. The new system has been in operation since August.

Mr. Stanfield: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I asked the question a month ago and I received no information from the minister.

Mr. Pepin: Then I can only apologize to the hon. member. I'll correct myself immediately.

Mr. Stanfield: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Is the Leader of the Opposition rising on a further supplementary?

Mr. Stanfield: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

INTERIM CHANGES IN UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the Minister of Labour whether the government has decided to make any interim changes or arrangements in regard to unemployment insurance, for example, in the length of time required to qualify or in the benefits payable, to come into operation some time during the winter, as opposed to the more definitive proposals that are included in his white paper?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, may I assure the House that if the government had come to such a decision I would have announced it by now or perhaps held the announcement for the debate later this day. However, it is not my intention at the moment to recommend an increase in benefits this winter. What I am hoping is that we can accelerate the already rapid pace at which we are converting the white paper's proposals into proposed legislation. Above all else it is more important that we create jobs.

* * *

MANPOWER

SPECIAL PROGRAMS TO PROVIDE TRAINING INCENTIVES

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Manpower and Immigration whether any special manpower programs are

planned for this winter, aimed at effectively upgrading manpower resources by taking advantage of the slack in the economy to provide incentives to people to receive further training?

Mr. Speaker: I hope the minister will reply to the question briefly. It seems to me the matter is of such importance and so wide-ranging that perhaps it should be discussed by way of a statement on motions, but the minister might want to reply very briefly.

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Manpower and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, I can be very brief, indeed, because the question has been asked many times and has been answered in the House on several occasions by statements to the effect that additional programs in regard to upgrading and training have been made available and are being put into effect.

Mr. Lundrigan: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that Canadians across Canada are not aware of the changes in the programs to which the minister has referred, will he make a statement on motions to clarify the point so we will know what changes are contemplated?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I think that Canadians across the country are aware of the fact that additional money has been put into the program. Region by region, applicants are certainly aware of it. There has been no fundamental change in the program as such; rather, a far larger amount of money has been put into the program in order that the applicants who are applying may be accommodated. Therefore there is no difficulty in bringing this to the attention of people across the country.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

WAR MEASURES ACT—ARRESTS, RELEASES, CONTINUING DETENTIONS AND CHARGES

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the Minister of Justice. Would he be prepared to place on the table tomorrow a list of the persons who have been charged in the province of Quebec as a result of the recent situation there, together with a list of the offences with which they have been charged? Would he also indicate the number of persons who are still being detained without charge and the length of time these persons have been in detention?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, this would be a rather unusual procedure, but the charges are, of course, public and I will do the best I can to provide that information. The figures as of noon today are: Arrested, 447; released, 383; detained, 64, and 41 of the 64 have now been charged. I understand that four or five will be charged tomorrow and more will be released this afternoon.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, last week the minister indicated there were 43 persons for whom warrants of arrests had been issued. Since he made that statement, how many of that number have been apprehended?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I cannot give the hon. member that information, not because I do not want to but because I just do not have it on hand.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): May I ask the minister what amounts of arms, rifles, machine guns and explosives have been uncovered as a result of nearly four weeks of police investigation?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I may be able to find that information later in the afternoon.

* * *

[*Translation*]

HEALTH INSURANCE

QUEBEC—PAYMENT OF COST FOR INDIANS AND ESKIMOS ON RESERVES

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, I should like to put a question to the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

In view of the fact that, because of their status, Indians and Eskimos earning their living on reservations do not pay income tax, can the hon. minister tell us who will pay hospitalization costs of Quebec Indians and Eskimos who will have no medicare card?

[*English*]

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member is in fact asking for a legal opinion. As far as my information is concerned, if my memory serves me right I do not believe that any doctor who is in the plan in the province of Quebec can extra-bill.

* * *

AGRICULTURE

EXCLUSION OF HOGS FROM FARM PRODUCTS MARKETING AGENCIES BILL

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. In light of the submission by the Western Hog Growers Association requesting that the marketing of hogs be excluded from Bill C-176, can the minister indicate whether the government has reached a decision in this regard, and will consideration be given to their request to appear before the Standing Committee on Agriculture which is presently studying this bill?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, it is not up to the Minister of Agriculture to decide who shall appear before the Standing Committee on Agriculture. With regard to the substance of the question, however, I can say that inasmuch as there are several hog marketing commissions, agencies and so on set up under provincial marketing legislation at the present

time, it seems to me it would be inadvisable to exclude them from the co-ordinating action we hope will flow from the application of Bill C-176.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

QUEBEC—CONTROL AND DIRECTION OF INVESTIGATION OF CRIMINAL AND SEDITIOUS ACTIVITY—EFFICIENCY OF RCMP

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the Minister of Justice a question of which I gave him notice. Either just prior to the implementation of the War Measures Act or shortly thereafter in accordance with the Quebec Police Act, was the investigation of criminal and seditious activity placed under the control and direction of the Director-General of the Quebec Provincial Police, Mr. St. Pierre, and was all police force assistance basically under such direction and control?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for the courtesy he showed me by giving me notice of his question. My understanding is that pursuant to the authority of section 79 of the Quebec Police Act the Lieutenant Governor in Council of the province of Quebec ordered that the Director-General of the Quebec police force assume, under the authority of the provincial Attorney General, the command of municipal police forces. I do not know if every municipal police force in Quebec was affected by the order. The RCMP could not, of course, be brought within the terms of such order, but the force has been co-operating throughout with the provincial law enforcement authorities.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, in view of the minister's answer, were the RCMP—we have had some talk about the RCMP of late—merely asked to render their skilful and knowledgeable assistance to the Quebec Provincial Police? Is it not correct that the RCMP, throughout the world of police forces, are recognized as one of the finest trained forces with the latest and most up-to-date scientific equipment equal to, if not better than, any other national police force in the world?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member will appreciate that the question has not been put in the proper form. Perhaps it might be redrafted. If the hon. member wishes the minister to reply I suggest the question should be asked in other terms.

Mr. Woolliams: I agree with you, Mr. Speaker. I got carried away by my rhetoric. Let me put it this way. Would the Minister of Justice give us a report to the effect that the equipment, skill and training of the RCMP are equal to that of any other police force in the world?

Mr. Speaker: Again I would think that at this point the hon. member is asking the minister to express an opinion. I know it would be a very valuable opinion, but that is not what the Chair has to decide. I would think the question in those terms is not in order.

[Mr. Olson.]

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Prime Minister. It has to do with the uncertainty in the answer he gave the other day in connection with the police work. As one who has known the mounted police since the days of the Northwest Mounted Police, although I fully share the opinion of my hon. friend from Calgary North, I accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and I put this question to the Prime Minister. Would he clear up the implication that there was inefficiency on the part of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police so that this great body of men will not be under any shadow in the days ahead?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): I thank the right hon. gentleman for giving me the opportunity to do that, Mr. Speaker. I understand that as a result of my answer to the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings who asked me whether anything was going to be done to make the police more efficient there may have been some interpretation that I felt they had not been as efficient as they might have been. I am very happy to say, and I would have the House remember that in my answer I emphasized this, that the police deserve a very great vote of thanks for the way they have operated. This does not take away from my belief, and I believe that of the police themselves, that they are dealing with a new situation in Canada involving a form of terrorism which perhaps has been unknown heretofore and therefore they have not been as trained in the solution of that type of terrorism as we with hindsight might desire. This is in no way a criticism of them. I said it was our society which was unused to this kind of situation and that we had all been caught slightly off guard.

* * *

PENSIONS

OLD AGE SECURITY—ACTION ON INCREASE BEFORE CHRISTMAS

Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Prime Minister. In view of the right hon. gentleman's statement a short while ago that he thought old age pensioners might be able to get through the winter without an increase in their pensions, but that he hoped they would not have to, can he now say whether there will be an increase in the old age pension before Christmas?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, without agreeing with the premise of the question which is not exactly in the terms I put it, I can only say what the Minister of National Health and Welfare has been saying, namely, that in due course he will announce the government's policy on these matters.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): In view of current news stories about white papers and committee reports, may we have an assurance that action on this

matter will at least be started in the House of Commons before Christmas?

Mr. Diefenbaker: The Prime Minister is silent.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Was the Prime Minister not cogitating a reply?

Mr. Trudeau: The hon. member knows better than anyone else that I am not in a position to say what will happen.

* * *

WATER RESOURCES

ASSISTANCE FOR CONSERVATION PROJECTS

Mr. W. M. Howe (Wellington-Grey-Dufferin-Waterloo): I have a question for the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources who, according to the roster system, should be here today. However, I can probably put my question to his Parliamentary Secretary or to the acting minister. It has to do with the fact that since the coming into force of the Canada Water Act any assistance that was given previously to municipalities for conservation projects has been stopped by the government. In view of the fact that a tremendous number of conservation projects in Ontario, particularly along the Grand River, are being held up because there are no federal funds available, I would ask the minister to give favourable consideration to restoring the 37½ per cent assistance provided under the former Act.

Mr. Speaker: I suggest to the hon. member that this can hardly be termed a question. He is making a submission to the government and I suggest respectfully to him that he has to assume it will be considered.

* * *

VETERANS AFFAIRS

CLOSING OF LONDON, ENGLAND, OFFICE—MEETING IN UNITED KINGDOM

Mr. Jack Marshall (Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe): My question is for the Minister of Veterans Affairs. Would the minister advise the House whether he met with the national advisory council of the Canadian Veterans Association of the United Kingdom during his trip to England arising out of their concern about the closing of the DVA office in London, and what were the results of the meeting?

Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé (Minister of Veterans Affairs): Yes, I did meet with them. We had a very interesting discussion on the London office and I am sure that as a result of our meeting decisions will come forward which will be to their satisfaction and to the satisfaction of my department.

Mr. Marshall: Would the minister advise the House whether the department is still going ahead with the decision to close the office in March or whether, in view of the discussion which he had, the decision will be reconsidered?

Mr. Dubé: I always said the office would be gradually phased out. The office is not to be closed at present.

* * *

HEALTH

FAMILY PLANNING PROGRAM—AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare supplementary to a question I asked him some weeks ago. Will the minister make an early statement describing the projected birth control program which is being undertaken by his department?

An hon. Member: And how retroactive will it be?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): I think I indicated to the hon. member at that time that the government program in the family planning area was announced in some considerable detail. If the hon. member wants me to repeat it or send her a copy of the announcement setting out the details, I will be pleased to do so.

Mrs. MacInnis: I should like to know when and in what form this information will be made available to the public?

Mr. Munro: As was indicated, Mr. Speaker, a consultative service is set up in the department, and we indicated at the time that this was a matter of choice for individuals but that information would be supplied with respect to it. That information is being formulated now and we expect it will be available through organizations, with their co-operation, in the fairly near future.

* * *

[*Translation*]

UNITED NATIONS

REFUSAL OF ISRAEL TO RECOGNIZE JERUSALEM AS SEPARATE ENTITY

Mr. Gérard Laprise (Abitibi): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Prime Minister.

In view of the refusal by the Israeli government to accept the UN's recommendation to the effect that Jerusalem should be considered as an entity separate from the Israeli problem, does the Canadian government intend to ask his UN representative to protest once more against the confiscations and expropriations which the Arabs have to suffer?

* * *

[*English*]

AGRICULTURE

INTERPROVINCIAL MARKETING—REQUEST FOR REFERENCE TO SUPREME COURT

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture a question. In light

of the fact that there now seems to be some doubt that passage of Bill C-176 will deal with the problems of trade between provinces and as the litigation in the province of Quebec has not yet got to the Court of Appeal, or at least there has been no decision, will the minister not review with the Minister of Justice the question of obtaining, under section 55 of the Supreme Court Act, terms of reference from the Governor in Council so that the Supreme Court can deal with this very important matter?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that the passage of Bill C-176 will improve this situation. Since the question was based on the premise that it would not, I would not think the other part of it is applicable.

Mr. Baldwin: Will the minister not discuss this matter and have either himself or the Minister of Justice make a statement, particularly having in mind the widespread view that one reason no action is being taken is that it involves litigation in the province of Quebec?

Mr. Olson: The Minister of Justice and I have had many conversations and discussions about this matter. The hon. member may assume what conclusions we reached.

Mr. H. W. Danforth (Kent-Essex): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Agriculture, and I do this in all seriousness. Since there is some indication from governmental investigations of a provincial nature, and other investigations, that the broiler industry may in the main be under the control of a small number of companies that are in themselves part of larger industrial complexes, is this the influence behind the minister's decision not to refer this matter to the Supreme Court of Canada?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. That question is not in order.

* * *

HEALTH

POLYCHLORINATED BIPHENYLS AS FOOD AND ENVIRONMENTAL HAZARD

Mr. G. H. Aiken (Parry Sound-Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of National Health and Welfare. In view of the results of a survey by the Food and Drug Directorate indicating that polychlorinated biphenyls, known generally as PCBs, are becoming recognized as a food and environmental hazard, is the government taking any steps to reduce the volume of this contaminant in the environment?

Hon. John C. Munro (Minister of National Health and Welfare): Mr. Speaker, that whole matter is under consideration at the moment and I will be pleased to advise the House and the hon. member what the results of our deliberations are.

[Mr. Baldwin.]

Mr. Aiken: Have there been or are there at present interdepartmental discussions on this problem?

Mr. Munro: I cannot assure the hon. member on how far interdepartmental considerations have gone on but, as I say, I know the matter has been given considerable consideration within my own department.

* * *

THE CANADIAN ECONOMY

PUBLISHING INDUSTRY STUDY—TAKEOVER OF RYERSON PRESS BY UNITED STATES COMPANY

Mr. Max Saltsman (Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Has his department commenced a study of the publishing industry and, if so, when will that study be completed?

Hon. Jean-Luc Pepin (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, we have done that, and the study is now ready. It is being printed, and I presume that in the next three or four weeks I would be able to table it in the House.

Mr. Saltsman: In view of the seriousness of the fact that two of the major publishing companies in Canada are in danger of being absorbed by outside interests and as the study may not be completed in time to take any action, could the minister meet with his counterparts in the provincial governments and put a halt to sales of publishing companies until this study is completed?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, if the results of the study could be useful in the present discussions going on between Ryerson and the government of Ontario, I am quite sure we will find a way to communicate the information needed to the interested parties.

Mr. James A. McGrath (St. John's East): Mr. Speaker, can the minister tell the House whether or not he has received a submission from Ryerson Press or the government of Ontario with regard to the takeover of this company by American interests?

Mr. Pepin: Mr. Speaker, I was in correspondence with the Ryerson Press authorities about three, four or five months ago, but that correspondence was mainly of an informational nature. They wrote to me because they had heard that the study to which I have just referred was going on in my department and they wanted to contribute to it. They made us acquainted with the general difficulties that the company was experiencing, but there was no specific mention in their letter of the actual possibility that it was going to be taken over by U.S. interests or specific request for financial assistance. The man in question answered my letter in a very distinguished fashion, and contributed to our information. We wrote to each other—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps the minister and the hon. member would like to continue this conversation after the question period.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question and I am hoping for a little briefer answer. Is it correct for the House to infer from the minister's statement just now that if the government of Ontario does nothing to prohibit the takeover of Ryerson Press, the federal government does not intend to take action?

Mr. Speaker: I would point out that the hon. member's question as asked is hypothetical.

Mr. Broadbent: I will rephrase it, Mr. Speaker, in the following fashion. If the government of Ontario does not take specific action to stop the takeover of Ryerson Press, does the federal government at this time intend to take action?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member may have rephrased the question but it is still hypothetical.

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the minister. In view of the fact that the Premier of Ontario has indicated his intention of meeting McGraw-Hill and Ryerson Press representatives in the hope that the Ryerson Press operation can be kept in Canada, has the federal government had any contact with the Premier of Ontario to indicate that it would be prepared to give financial assistance, if that were necessary, in order to keep Ryerson Press in Canada?

Mr. Pepin: I can only say I have no money in my budget for that purpose.

Mr. Baldwin: That has never stopped you before.

* * *

PUBLIC SERVICE

REPORTED EMPLOYMENT OFFER TO FORMER LAPALME TRUCK DRIVERS

Mr. Robert Simpson (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Labour. In view of reports emanating from the minister's department to the effect that the government is prepared to provide employment for the 400 Lapalme truck drivers provided the CNTU gives up its demand that the union local be retained within the Public Service, can the minister say where these 400 jobs are available and how long will they be held in abeyance for the Lapalme drivers before they are offered to other unemployed people?

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I read the same report in the newspapers but it was not given by the Department of Labour. It was through another department of government. I think the hon. member will have to address his question to the appropriate minister.

Mr. Simpson: May I ask the minister if he would care to read the latest news release from the Department of Labour which carries this report?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. member for Mackenzie.

Inquiries of the Ministry

Mr. Mackasey: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, since this matter has been raised on half a dozen occasions I wish to point out that the particular bulletin to which the hon. gentleman refers is nothing more than a summary of reports from the various newspapers issued daily across Canada. The inference is that I, as Minister of Labour, should assert some form of censorship over the papers, which is something I refuse to do.

* * *

GRAIN

PRESENCE OF RUSTY BEETLE IN WHEAT SHIPMENTS

Mr. S. J. Korchinski (Mackenzie): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. The other day I asked him when he would be able to provide some information in regard to cargoes of grain found to be infested with rusty beetles. Since this may have an effect on potential world sales I wonder whether the minister is prepared to indicate to the House the amount of grain involved and whether negligence had occurred in inspections at the terminals?

Hon. H. A. Olson (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I told the hon. member a few days ago that I would try to get all the information I could on the subject but he will realize it may take a little time. However, I can assure him that we have sufficient quantities of good grain of many grades in Canada, free from rusty beetles, to supply all markets.

Mr. Korchinski: Could I ask the minister whether his department is conducting investigations out in the country on the possibility of beetles in grain, other than the investigations being conducted at the terminals?

Mr. Olson: Mr. Speaker, we are making as many checks as we can with the staff that we have available. I repeat what I suggested to the right hon. member for Prince Albert the other day, that the farmers themselves have some responsibility for the management of their farms and for checking the bins for beetles.

Mr. Diefenbaker: The farmer always has to pay under this government.

Mr. A. B. Douglas (Assiniboia): Will the minister take steps to see that the parties responsible for this infestation of export wheat are required to pay for the cost incurred instead of assessing all the cost to the farmers?

Mr. Olson: The costs of doing this will have to be considered. If this grain is in one of the commercial positions we will have to take that into consideration, but a full assessment has not been made yet.

Mr. McCleave: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice is trying to catch your eye. I merely rise to give you an opportunity to recognize him but if necessary I can ask a question.

Mr. A. P. Gleave (Saskatoon-Biggar): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Minister of Agriculture if he will make a

report to the House in due course on how it was possible for the infestation of this amount of grain while in transit to escape detection and arrive in export positions before it was detected?

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's question is debate or argument and in those terms I do not think it is acceptable.

The Minister of Justice has now caught my eye.

Mr. Baldwin: Better make it good.

* * *

NATIONAL SECURITY

WAR MEASURES ACT—DYNAMITE, ARMS AND AMMUNITION RECOVERED

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): I thank the hon. member for Halifax-East Hants.

Mr. McCleave: Just don't forget it.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): This is an example of the co-operation of Parliament, Mr. Speaker. Earlier in the afternoon the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands asked about seizures of dynamite. From a public statement made yesterday by Inspector Melançon of the Quebec Provincial Police it is my information that the number of weapons retrieved in the anti-terrorist raids since mid-October included a total of 116 offensive weapons, 2,976 rounds of ammunition and 2,609 sticks of dynamite. Inspector Melançon said that more than 1,800 sticks of dynamite remained unaccounted for out of the 4,500 stolen in the last several months.

AVAILABILITY OF WEAPONS—PASSING OF ORDER IN COUNCIL

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, when the minister is dealing with weapons and the amount of dynamite stolen, I wonder if he would answer my question with respect to restricted and prohibited weapons and advise whether there was a prior Order in Council passed with regard to section 82(e) of the Criminal Code?

Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, I want to be able to give the hon. member a full answer which includes not only an appreciation of the law but an appreciation of the facts and I will combine those when I give the answer.

Mr. Baldwin: If your law is no better than your facts you have a long way to go.

* * *

[*Translation*]

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

QUEBEC—DESIGNATION OF SPECIAL AREAS TO ALLEVIATE UNEMPLOYMENT

Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion.

[Mr. Gleave.]

Considering the disturbing increase in the unemployment rate in Quebec, does the minister intend to designate other special areas in that province so that they may benefit from the provisions of the act, and so as to reduce unemployment?

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, almost the whole of the province of Quebec is already designated under the act, even the hon. member's riding, and we shall certainly assist any firms wishing to settle in that province.

Mr. Asselin: I thank the minister, Mr. Speaker.

[*English*]

CORNWALL—REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON STUDIES AND PROGRAMS

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, in the month of April I asked the minister a question concerning a constituency not represented on the floor of the House, namely, the area of the city of Cornwall. That area had the highest unemployment rate at the time the question was asked and it has not changed since. The minister at that time assured me that the question would receive early attention but six or seven months have gone by. Could the minister today tell the House what has been done?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I believe I answered this question a few days ago. Since then, the federal government has decided to invest a large sum of money in the rebuilding of the Cornwall wharf and we will continue to study projects which will, no doubt, remedy the unemployment situation.

[*English*]

Mr. Diefenbaker: Why such a long delay?

[*Translation*]

SAINT-HYACINTHE—DESIGNATION AS SPECIAL AREA

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, does the minister want to say that he has finally reached a decision regarding the Saint-Hyacinthe region, which also suffers from unemployment?

[*English*]

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Perhaps we have reached the point where we should draw the line. I have suggested to hon. members that it was not quite in order to go over every region of the country to determine whether it is designated. Having heard the question from the right hon. member for Prince Albert, perhaps this would be a good place to draw the line. I suggest to hon. members that questions referring to individual regions are not quite in order at this time.

Mr. Diefenbaker: If I may rise on a question of privilege, I did not deal with Prince Albert but with Cornwall. Having been in Cornwall I felt that the matter should be raised in view of Your Honour's position of complete neutrality and inability to make representations here in the House.

COMBINES

ALLEGED MONOPOLY IN ALBERTA BROILER INDUSTRY

Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Is the minister having his department investigate an alleged monopoly developing in the broiler industry in Alberta in view of the fact that 80 per cent of the industry is dominated by the Alberta Poultry Marketers Co-operative as outlined in a recent study released by the University of Alberta?

Hon. Ron Basford (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs): Mr. Speaker, thanks to the hon. member, I and my department are aware of the report and it is being examined for any possible breaches of the Combines Act that might be involved.

* * *

NATIONAL DEFENCE

ARMED FORCES—INQUIRY AS TO PAY INCREASES

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of National Defence and is in respect of a pay increase for the armed forces. Have the minister and his colleagues in the Treasury Board any charity in their hearts now that it is about a month overdue?

Hon. Donald S. Macdonald (Minister of National Defence): Yes, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues in the Treasury Board do have charity in their hearts.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could indicate whether we might expect an announcement on pay increases soon?

Mr. Macdonald (Rosedale): I am afraid I cannot do that at the moment, Mr. Speaker.

* * *

INQUIRY OF THE MINISTRY

Mr. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton Centre): Mr. Speaker, may I refer to an answer given to a question put by the hon. member for Parry Sound-Muskoka on November 10 at page 1043 of *Hansard*. The Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources at that time stated that the ministers in charge of the water pollution questions and environmental management from the provinces of Quebec and Ontario attended a meeting which reached an agreement to the effect that on the completion of the Quebec-Ontario study of the Ottawa River which will be completed early in the new year "we will proceed to enter into a joint water quality management agreement pursuant to the terms of the Canada Water Act."

My question is directed to the Minister of National Health and Welfare. Would the minister please check into the authenticity of the raw sewage being flushed directly into the Ottawa River by the French Embassy,

the British High Commission and none other than 24 Sussex Drive?

* * *

SOCIAL SECURITY

GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): I should like to direct a question to the right hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that the Senate Committee on Poverty is going to recommend some form of guaranteed annual income and in view of the further fact that the Prime Minister will have the honour of presiding over the highest number of unemployed Canadians in history this winter, would he inform the House—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

* * *

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION

ATLANTIC PROVINCES—MODIFICATION OF DEVELOPMENT POLICIES

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. In view of reports arising from the discussions at the Atlantic Provinces Economic Conference pointing out that regional development policies require extensive modification, especially in the area of resource development, can the minister say whether such modification is contemplated? If so, will he make a statement on motions clarifying the government's legislative role in this area?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, we are continually analysing programs and projects and trying to improve on them. We certainly intend to go on with it if the House decides to allocate considerably larger credits for that purpose.

[*English*]

REQUEST FOR STATEMENT ON RECOMMENDATIONS BY COUNCIL ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Patrick J. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley): Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday I asked the minister about the different methods he is studying for improving the program. Is the minister prepared to make a statement on motions this session as to the firm recommendations made by the Council on Rural Development which comes under his department?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Jean Marchand (Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Mr. Speaker, I believe the other day I did reply that this report is being considered by my department and immediately we come to some conclusions, I shall make a statement in the House, if need be.

[*English*]

LABOUR CONDITIONS

UNEMPLOYMENT—FORECAST FOR NEXT FEBRUARY

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Labour because he is always very frank and open. I assume the department has made an estimate or forecast of the rate of unemployment this winter, in particular the month of February. Can the minister disclose this forecast to the House now or in the debate later? It would be very helpful to the country and to that discussion.

Hon. Bryce Mackasey (Minister of Labour): The only figure I can speak about with accuracy is the figure for the month of October which indicates that for the first time seasonally adjusted unemployment rates show a reduction in that serious problem. Second, there are more Canadians at work today than at any time in Canadian history.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It seems we are now embarking on the debate which will begin in a few minutes. The question period has expired.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

WEEKLY STATEMENT

Mr. Baldwin: I wish to ask the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council the intentions of the government with regard to the business for this week and next week.

Mr. Jerome: Today, of course, is an opposition day. Tomorrow we will call the motion standing in the name of the Minister of Finance with reference to the surtax on shirts. That will be followed by resuming committee of the whole on the emergency powers bill. This will be followed by the statutory instruments bill, the CNR finance and guarantee bill, the Buffalo-Fort Erie bridge bill, the packaging and labelling bill and the statistics bill. It is intended that Thursday of next week will be another allotted day for the opposition.

Mr. Baldwin: In view of the fact that the debate which we were on on Tuesday and which it is proposed to continue on Friday overshadows all of the program, will the Parliamentary Secretary discuss with his minister and the Minister of Justice a proposal to limit speeches in committee of the whole to ten minutes, with one contribution in respect of each clause, and also consider whether steps could be taken by agreement to complete that bill tomorrow provided there can be some agreement among the members of the Liberal caucus?

Mr. Jerome: We would be delighted to pursue any efforts in that direction, Mr. Speaker.

[Mr. Marchand.]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—LABOUR CONDITIONS—POLICIES AND PROGRAMS TO INCREASE EMPLOYMENT—INCREASED UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS

Mr. David Lewis (York South) moved:

Whereas there has been a relentless upward climb in the level of unemployment in all regions of Canada, and

Whereas a number of responsible economic authorities have predicted record levels of unemployment this coming winter, and

Whereas, unless special measures are immediately taken, the likelihood of serious increases in the level of unemployment in the Province of Quebec and the City of Montreal will add to an already critical situation,

Therefore, be it resolved that this House calls upon the Government to institute, in co-operation with provinces and municipalities, policies and programs that will increase significantly the number of jobs available this winter and, as a special measure of assistance to those who remain unemployed, to increase both the amount of unemployment benefits and the eligibility period provided by the Unemployment Insurance Commission.

He said: Mr. Speaker, we placed this motion for debate today because it is clear to anyone who looks at the situation objectively that our country is facing a crisis with regard to unemployment. Whether one uses the seasonally adjusted figures or the actual figures, the problem of unemployment in Canada now and the forecast for this winter suggest that the problem is extremely distressing and dangerous. I admit that the seasonally adjusted figures are more appropriate to use in terms of the trend annually, but they do not touch on the human beings involved. The number of people who are unemployed at any time must be of concern to those who want to see justice in our society. The actual figure gives the human story of frustration, idleness and distress. I am going to be concerned with the actual figures rather than the more theoretical seasonally adjusted figures.

When one says that there is an unemployment problem in this country he immediately hears the kind of remark made a few minutes ago by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey), namely that more Canadians are at work today than ever before in the history of our country. That is true, but it is as irrelevant and misleading as it is true. It is irrelevant because it does not touch on the fact that hundreds of thousands of people are unemployed. It is misleading because it ignores the fact that in our country at the present time there is, on an average, an increase of between—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for York South has the floor.

Mr. Lewis: I do not intend to waste any time on that comment. When the hon. member gets half his wits back I will listen to him.

What the minister fails to see, although I am sure he is aware of the fact, is that every year there is an increase in the work force in Canada of between 300,000 and 350,000. These are new job seekers. If the number of

employed in Canada did not increase every year, unemployment would now have reached close to two million instead of 400,000. The relatively small increase in the number of people employed in Canada is to be expected in view of the increase in the total work force.

As the Economic Council of Canada has shown in table 3 of its September, 1970 report, instead of 300,000 or 350,000 new jobs, which would have kept Canada at the same rate of unemployment in 1970 as in 1969, and that was high enough, in 1970 only 77,000 new jobs were created in this country. There were about 77,000 new jobs created in 1970 in this country. So assuming the increase in the total work force is something like 300,000, there is already a shortfall of 225,000 jobs even for those who have been added to the work force, quite apart from the numbers who were unemployed before. The situation is serious and I hope no member of the government will try to hide behind the increase in the participation rate, as the economists call it, or the increase in the number of people actually at work, to fool themselves to the point of asserting that there is no unemployment crisis in this country.

• (3:00 p.m.)

In October of this year there were 419,000 unemployed, an increase of 21,000 as compared with the month of September. Unemployment showed an increase in practically all the regions of Canada with the exception of the Maritimes. The Quebec figures showed an increase as did those of Ontario, the Prairies and British Columbia. Some of these increases were very striking. Perhaps the most significant fact which emerges from these figures, and one which I believe members of all parties ought to look at with the utmost concern, is that 23 per cent of the unemployed in October, 1970, were young people between the ages of 14 and 19. If we add the number of people aged between 20 and 24, we find that 45 per cent of all unemployment in Canada come into this larger category, that is, it occurs among those under the age of 24. Young people leaving school, or leaving colleges and universities, are frustrated by their inability to find work, their inability to make a contribution to society and to fulfil their young, hopeful lives. Aside from terrorism, there could be nothing more destructive to the social order than to have hundreds of thousands of young people leaving schools and colleges confronted by the frustration and despair which unemployment produces.

The other significant fact which emerges from these figures relates to problems we have faced and dealt with in the last few weeks. Of the total of unemployed in Canada in October, 1970, 38 per cent were in the Province of Quebec. A province which has only about one quarter of the total work force has almost 40 per cent of the total unemployment. And these are average figures I am giving, something which always worries me; I suppose our statistics can never be perfect, but when we talk about the number of people who are unemployed in Quebec or the Maritimes or elsewhere, we are talking about the province as a whole. But when we consider eastern Montreal, for example, or the County of Gaspé, I have no doubt that unemployment in such places may well amount to 15 or 18 per cent. So, one finds a concentration of desperate people without work in certain areas of a province or in certain areas of the country. I will return to the significance of this in a few moments, although I am sure it is already clear to everybody. At any rate, the unemployment in connection with which we have the figures for October has risen sufficiently for it to be considered as an extremely serious situation.

But this is nothing compared with what every forecast for the coming winter tells us. The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), in an attitude which he so often and so unhappily displays, made fun of, or made an insulting reference to, the President of the Canadian Labour Congress who said there would be 9 per cent unemployment this winter and that the figure might climb as high as 11 per cent; the figure he forecast was 750,000. When a question was asked based on the statement by Mr. MacDonald, members of the House will recall that the Prime Minister made an insulting statement about his not being a reliable source from the point of view of veracity, or some such phrase. Well, the Prime Minister can make that kind of flippant remark as often as he likes; I suspect that the more often he does it the more the people of Canada will recognize it, and him, for what they are. The fact is, that what Mr. MacDonald said has been said by every reputable economist in this country—they are not labour people, either. Mr. Robert Crozier, an economist with the Economic Council of Canada, said as reported in an article in the Toronto *Star*, from which I quote, that by next February or March, unemployment will be up to 9 per cent, or maybe a little above. In numbers, he put the figure between 750,000 and 800,000. Mr. Forrest Rogers, economic adviser to the Bank of Nova Scotia—not a revolutionary institution, Mr. Speaker—said he thought there would be 8.5 per cent unemployed; 9 per cent, he thought, might be a little high, though he was not prepared to argue that the rate might not reach 9 per cent. Professor Sydney Ingerman, labour economist at McGill University said the actual rate of unemployment nationally would be in the area of 9 to 10 per cent. So, what the President of the Canadian Labour Congress said was supported by these and many other Canadian economists. Indeed, if I remember correctly, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) himself admitted there would be very heavy unemployment this winter. I cannot recall whether or not he gave a figure, but he said he expected very heavy unemployment.

If there are to be between 750,000 and 800,000 unemployed, this unemployment will, as usual, be concentrated in the depressed areas of the country. So even larger numbers will be in the Province of Quebec; even larger numbers in the Atlantic provinces, and even larger numbers in the depressed areas of the Prairies and of Ontario. So if we are talking about 9 per cent as a national rate of unemployment, it will be 12 to 15 per cent in the Province of Quebec, probably 15 to 18 per cent in the Atlantic provinces, and 20 per cent or more in the area where unemployment is concentrated in the Gaspé and the eastern region of Montreal.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the direct result of government policies which have been pursued for the last while in an

alleged fight against inflation. It is the government which has deliberately slowed down the economy and which is responsible for this growing unemployment, as well as for an increasing number of business failures. They are responsible for the fact that many small businesses, even if they have not failed, find themselves under extreme economic and financial pressure.

The Prime Minister said some time ago that he was prepared to accept 6 per cent unemployment as a consequence of his policies against inflation. Well, on a seasonally adjusted basis he already has a rate of 6.5 per cent as of October and on an actual basis he is likely to get between 9 per cent and 11 per cent, and even higher in some areas during the coming winter. The so-called fight against inflation about which the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister have been talking has proved a disaster for hundreds of thousands of ordinary Canadian workers.

• (3:10 p.m.)

This disaster has also been felt by families. Everyone who has studied unemployment figures knows there are large numbers of people who are not taken into account but who are nevertheless out of work. For example, women who stop trying to get into the labour force; young people who give up in despair at trying to get a job. The likelihood is that this winter there will be not 750,000 to 800,000 unemployed but much closer to one million—certainly 900,000. Add to this the dependants of those who are unemployed, and this winter there will be without exaggeration between two to three million people who are either out of work or suffering from the loss of income of those who have no jobs.

We warned the government that their policy would result in this kind of disaster for the people of Canada. I suggest disaster is not too strong a term when we consider what we can look forward to this winter. All over the country welfare rolls have been climbing. In every major industrial city, the welfare budget has been exceeded. In Toronto alone $22 million more than was budgeted for has been spent on welfare. The same is true in the borough of York and surrounding areas. When I speak of Toronto in this context I am talking about metropolitan Toronto, not merely the city of Toronto. The same is true in other parts of the country, as some of my colleagues will no doubt point out. Again, the burden of the government's policy has been thrown on those who are least able to bear it, namely municipal governments who have to squeeze their provincial government for additional revenue to meet expanding welfare costs as a direct result of the policy of this government to increase unemployment.

All of this has direct relationship to the troubles in the province of Quebec that we have been discussing in this House for the last weeks. In one of the speeches I made I said—this was also said by my leader and other members in this House—that while no one has suggested that the people in the FLQ are concerned merely, as they claim, with social justice, it is nevertheless true that small groups of self-styled revolutionaries would not have dared do the kind of thing the FLQ did were it not for the social and economic circumstances in Quebec that gave them encouragement. We have all admitted these are twisted men and women with criminal psychologies, people who require the kind of attention the Police are giving them and ought to have given them a long time ago.

If I may quote my previous words, were it not for the frustration of the young, the despair of the old and the hurt of the unemployed, there would not have been the soil in which to plant the seed of the FLQ. If there had not been these conditions, the FLQ would not have evoked any sympathy at all; they would have been detested by everybody and would not have attempted what in fact they did attempt. When you have despair, unemployment and depressed economic conditions, you are inviting disaster and unrest of one sort or another.

This situation must be added to a history of economic distress and inequality. The young Quebecois can look at a history over a large number of years of being unable to get the same job as an English-speaking Canadian or to climb to the same heights; a history where the average wage in the province has traditionally been below that of the province of Ontario; where out of 77,000 jobs created in 1970, 49,000 were in the province of Ontario and only 3,000 in the province of Quebec. Now we have the prospect of unemployment this winter on an increasing scale. With such a history as this the government, indeed this Parliament, is just begging for trouble. This is why this subject is of such immediate and important concern to me, and I am sure to all members of the House.

I am trying to finish within my allotted time, so I shall not elaborate further on that subject. Let me pass on to another matter. The heartbreaking fact in the present situation is that there is not much one can do in November that will affect unemployment figures for January, February or March. As economies function, there is always a time lag of six months to a year before any investment begins to produce employment or an expansion of the money supply begins to improve the economy. The same is true of fiscal and other policies.

This government has sat back with the knowledge that there is not very much they can do at this time, in November, to ease the tragedy of the next several months. What is equally true is that the government's attention was drawn to this fact six or eight months ago. Indeed, I remember asking the Prime Minister about six months ago a question based on the proposition that he and I both knew that there would be a time lag before any improvement in the economic situation could be felt, and that therefore he ought to start to ease the money supply, lift the constraint on public expenditures, so that any action that he took then would have some useful and substantial benefits this winter for the unemployed. I remember my leader asked that question, and the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) also drew the attention of the government to this matter.

I suggest that even a child at school who had studied even to a slight degree the subject of economics would

have known perfectly well last spring that unless the government took steps at that time to increase economic activity in Canada we would be in the fix that we are going to be in this winter. And believe, me, Mr. Speaker, we will be in a fix. I do not say that with the slightest degree of pleasure, but rather with profound regret at the government's failure to listen to what obviously is economic good sense. Even though the government wished to implement nineteenth, perhaps even eighteenth century economic policies, it should have had the elementary sense to start improving economic conditions six or eight months ago with the hope that by this winter the situation in the country would have improved. It did not do so. There was no plan and there never is. So you drift along and come to the winter with the kind of unemployment that is now being forecast.

• (3:20 p.m.)

I want to use my last two or three minutes to put the following suggestion on record. There are some things that ought to be tried immediately. They will not serve to cure the unemployment problem this winter and they will not even serve to reduce the number of unemployed very substantially, but they will serve to give jobs to perhaps 50,000 or 100,000 people. Saving the dignity and the lifestyle as well as the self respect of even 50,000 or 100,000 unemployed is important if you are concerned with human life and human dignity. It is worth doing these things to reduce unemployment by at least the number it can be reduced.

I propose first that the federal government should immediately call a federal-provincial conference on the subject of unemployment and none other, and that the federal government should encourage the provincial governments to bring to that conference representatives of the major municipalities in their provinces. I do not care whether these are ministers or officials, as I am not interested in protocol. I am interested in getting together spokesmen for the federal government, for the provinces and the municipalities, to sit down and work out some concrete things that can be done this winter to reduce unemployment, particularly in the major industrial centres of this country.

There are things to do. There are schools and hospitals which could be built. There are sewage plants required and there is some roadwork that in some parts of Canada could be done in the winter, although not in many areas. There are jobs of that kind that the three levels of government could arrive at, not with any exaggerated objective but with the perfectly practical objective of creating in each industrial centre in this country another few thousand jobs and thereby remove those people from the unemployment rolls.

I suggest secondly that special programs of this sort ought to be aimed at the highly industrialized centres of the province of Quebec. I said during our debate on the War Measures Act and at other times, and I say now, that as one member of this House and as one Canadian I believe it is vital at this stage of Canada's history to pay particular attention to the social and economic distresses of that province in order to remove at least some of the soil in which extremism can and does grow.

Third, I suggest there should be a real change in the way in which the Department of Regional Economic Expansion is functioning at the moment. My inquiries in several areas across the country from people in municipal office, people who are members of various advisory councils, committees and what not, have persuaded me that there now lie on the desks of officials of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion many projects on paper which have been prepared for municipalities in the provinces. These programs could be started tomorrow if the bureaucratic red tape were cut and if the Department of Regional Economic Expansion stopped bickering about little details that stand in the way of getting them underway. Perhaps more thousands of unemployed could be saved this winter.

I have only this suggestion and one other, then I am through. I suggest an immediate increase in old age pensions. The old age pensioner uses every penny he gets in consumption and he cannot save a thing. Therefore, any increase in old age pensions is an immediate increase in the demand for goods and services, and is an immediate stimulus to the production of those goods and services in the country. That is one of the best and most clear ways of making sure that every dollar given is a dollar that goes into the consumption cycle and therefore into the industrial and services production cycle.

Finally, I was heartbroken to hear the Minister of Labour say categorically earlier today that he does not intend to make any change in the unemployment insurance arrangements. This is a great and heartbreaking pity. I cannot see any reason, if we are to have large numbers unemployed this winter, why the government could not immediately increase unemployment insurance benefits to $100 per week, as is proposed in the White Paper, and extend the period of eligibility for those who have exhausted their benefits in accordance with the present rules, so that at least the months of this winter will be covered. This would not solve unemployment in the winter months, but at least some unemployed in the winter months would be covered and this would be doing the human and decent thing. It would make it possible for the unemployed to live more decently and also it would prevent the kind of despair that leads to unrest.

We placed this motion on the order paper not just to have a motion for debate, but because of our conviction that precisely at the time when the country has faced a crisis of the sort we have been discussing for weeks, it is necessary to bring ourselves back to the fundamentals in society and to look at the social and economic consequences of this very desperate problem of unemployment now as well as the greater unemployment during the coming winter.

Hon. Robert L. Stanfield (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, there can be no question but that we are confronted in this country with the prospect of a serious unemployment problem this winter. It is difficult, if not

impossible, to get any prediction from government sources. Predictions from individual sources have indicated unemployment running up to 9 per cent, not seasonably adjusted but 9 per cent in terms of actual unemployment.

The figures for October are by no means reassuring. The hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) has already called attention to the percentage of the, 419,000 persons out of work during that month who are under the age of 24, and the bitterness and disillusionment which this must be causing. It is clear also that the percentage of unemployment which might be considered long term unemployment, that is persons who have been unemployed for several months, is substantially on the increase. At the end of September, for example, there were 390,000 claimants for unemployment insurance benefits as compared with 260,000 at that time in the previous year. This is the result, in part, of increased unemployment and, in part, the fact that those who were unemployed this year remained unemployed for a longer period of time than was the case a year ago.

Let us compare the figures for August, September and October of this year to the figures for the same period in 1961, when later on in the year there was approximately 9 per cent unemployment. We find for the month of October, 1961, the actual rate was 4.8 per cent whereas this year it is 5 per cent. In 1961, the seasonally adjusted rate was 6.5 per cent whereas this year it is 6.6 per cent. There is every indication, therefore, of a tough winter. It is going to be especially bad in some regions.

• (3:30 p.m.)

We must understand that while we should be particularly concerned about regions which are exceptionally hard hit, unemployment is a problem across the country. I believe in the great province of Ontario, for example, there are, according to these October figures, some 108,000 persons out of work or about 25 per cent of the total unemployed. So, we should not think of this as simply a regional problem, although we have to be concerned about the effect in some regions of the country. We are confronted with the prospect of an unemployment rate which will be dangerously high during this coming winter. Even the term "mass unemployment" should be used with care because it might lead us to think in terms of masses and statistics rather than in terms of the individual and the social reality of this kind of unemployment. Unemployment is not a statistic. It is degrading and represents a loss of dignity and self-respect in the individual.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: It is a disaster for the family and, incidentally, is also a blow to the economy. This is what this government seems to fail to understand. Surely, it is obvious that mass unemployment leads to stagnancy, leads to market loss, cuts, the demand, leads to a need to cut costs and hence more unemployment. It is a vicious circle, in addition to the terrible losses from the point of view of the individual. Today, in this discussion, we can only focus our attention on what we can do and recommend.

I should like to spend a minute or two, first of all, in considering what has brought on the situation as described by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) and others. It is of course a consequence of the deliberate slow-down brought on by the government as part of its fight against inflation. I am pleased to see that recent figures indicate the cost of living is flattening out. I am pleased to see this, although it remains to be seen whether it represents much success in respect of the root causes of inflation. For example, I question very much whether there is as close a connection between unemployment and the control of inflation as this government appears to believe.

Certainly, I repeat that the deliberate slow-down of the economy and the resulting creation of substantial or mass unemployment is an inhuman way to fight inflation. We are seeing some of the consequences of this inhumanity this year. The government has accepted unemployment much too casually. This can be seen in the complacency which was evident of the Speech from the Throne. One would have great difficulty in relating what the Governor General was talking about to the same country in which we live if one were to read the Speech from the Throne now. A few days ago, when questioned about what more the government would do to fight unemployment, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) said that it would do more if it proved to be necessary. What proof does the Prime Minister require that more is necessary? What more proof is required than what has been forthcoming? Independent people who have no axe to grind forecast that three-quarters of a million Canadians will be out of work. Let me emphasize—and I have to put this interpretation on events because I cannot believe the government is completely callous—that the economic forecasting of this government must simply be deplorable. That is the only way I could explain what has happened unless I were to draw the conclusion that the government simply does not care and I do not choose to do that.

When one contrasts the kind of forecasts made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) in his spring budget, for example, with what is actually the outlook today, and when one contrasts what we now know is the real thing as compared to the kind of complacency that exuded from the Speech from the Throne, surely there can no longer be any doubt that the Economic Council of Canada was absolutely correct in insisting for a number of years that the government should take part in establishing an independent short-term forecasting unit. If the government had not been so stubborn, and had taken this advice of the Economic Council, the government might have been prevented from taking this horrible road which will cause the Canadian people so much suffering this year. Let us have no more of this kind of forecasting which leads to the kind of emergency we are talking about here today.

There is, of course, a short-term problem we are facing now and a longer-term problem, both of which are quite severe. I am not prepared to admit that nothing can be

done with regard to the winter or that the short term and longer term problems are entirely distinct. I am not prepared to admit this, but I wish to emphasize that the government must be prepared in respect of its over-all approach and the methods it uses. We have the attitude of the Minister of Finance the other day when he said, I believe in answer to a question from the New Democratic Party, that if expenditures were increased he hoped the opposition would be prepared to support a tax increase to take care of them. Apart from anything else, this is an answer which would appear to indicate an attitude which is completely oblivious of the problem we are facing this winter. That type of answer was wrong-headed on three counts. First, it overlooked the need for expanded employment. Second, it implied the conviction and the assumption that tax increases are themselves anti-inflationary, whereas this by no means is apparent in view of the experience in this country during the past couple of years. Third, I believe the minister was ignoring the fact that if we use the technique suggested by the Economic Council of Canada, that is, the use of a full employment budget analysis. There is still some pretty substantial restraint in the over-all stance of governments in this country, particularly the government of Canada.

I suggest, without offence, that the Minister of Finance and his associates are living in the past, and that the massive number of unemployed this winter are paying a heavy price for this. Even this government must surely recognize now that it is confronted with a serious problem, that the outlook is substantially different from that forecast last spring, that more must be done to move the economy forward and that more must be done to meet the prospects of this winter.

I say there ought to be an autumn—or perhaps now early winter—budget. The Minister of Finance ought not to wait until spring to outline the fiscal policies and fiscal stance appropriate to Canada in this new context. This must now be obvious to the government.

An hon. Member: Do it now, why wait till spring.

Mr. Benson: I did it a month ago.

Mr. Stanfield: The minister said he did this a month ago. He presented a sort of resumé of the things he would do. That is far short of a statement of a budgetary nature including a forecast of conditions and including, in particular, a precise statement of the objectives and stance of the government. It is urgent that this government now set out clearly the course for the economy as it sees it and remove the ambiguity that exists, because the government keeps talking about restraints at the same time as it keeps talking about loosening the supply of money. As a result, Canadians do not really know today how much expansion in the economy and reduction in unemployment the government would really like to see brought about. The government must give leadership, it must set a clear course for the economy.

Employment Programs

• (3:40 p.m.)

The psychology of the situation is very important. As I said, I do not think that Canadians generally, including the business community, are certain in their minds just where the government would like the economy to go. The government must remove the uncertainties that are holding back decisions in the private sector with regard to investment. There is, first of all, the floating dollar which is creating great uncertainty because nobody knows whether it is going to be pegged for sure, when it is going to be pegged, or the rate at which it will be pegged. I realize that the minister cannot tell me this afternoon what his plans are in this regard. I realize he cannot tip his hand. But I do urge upon him the importance of removing the uncertainty that this creates as soon as it is possible to do so, because this is creating great uncertainty, especially for those involved in the export business, but also for those involved in virtually any business in the country.

Second, there is the uncertainty that exists today with regard to tax reform. People who are making decisions about investment do not know how much of the white paper on tax reform the minister will implement. They do not know whether the minister is going to accept the recommendations made by the House of Commons committee and which recommendations of the Senate he will accept. Here, we have another area of confusion and of uncertainty. It is important that the minister clarify and eliminate uncertainty in this area as rapidly as possible.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Stanfield: I think also—and I make this recommendation very earnestly to the minister—that tax reductions would be appropriate in the present context. We in this party have urged for a long time the elimination of the 11 per cent sales tax on building materials. I urge that this be done in the area of housing because this would very substantially stimulate a good deal of employment in the near future, and quite quickly.

I suggest also that the minister should move to reduce income taxes, especially for those at the lower end of the income scale. I suggest it is not good enough simply to eliminate the 3 per cent surtax after January 1. It is simply not enough to drop that surtax after January 1 to achieve the necessary psychological effect. It would be like a number of changes that the government has made to date, and no doubt we will hear them repeated by the Minister of Finance as they have been repeated time after time by spokesmen for the government. These changes have not been enough to establish the necessary psychological climate in the country to support a healthy expansion.

I suggest that a reduction in income tax, especially, as I said, at the lower end of the scale, of at least twice the level of the surtax, which I hope will go in any event after January 1, will do a lot to help create the necessary climate for expansion. There is no reason at all to believe in this context that this would be an inflationary propos-

al. Indeed, it would be very interesting to see whether it would not work in the opposite direction and whether a reduction in some income taxes would not have the effect, for example, of reducing the extent that workmen feel the need to press for wage increases. Second, there is no reason to believe that by reducing taxation in this way at this time the government would be necessarily reducing its revenue prospects to any substantial extent, because if this tax reduction did have the effect of creating an appropriate climate for expansion, expansion in employment, the economy of the country would very promptly begin to generate additional revenues for this government as well as for other governments.

Then, again, there is the argument in terms of equity, of doing something in particular for those at the lower end of the income scale rather than waiting until the whole tax reform package is implemented. A reduction in taxation at this time, is, I think, a step well worth taking, well calculated to produce expansion, not calculated to create inflationary pressures. It might very well work in the opposite direction. It is quite consistent with any cooling off that the government might feel necessary in the future. Let us see the government establish a better forecasting system if they are going to talk about cooling things off again. It is obvious that they started to cool things off too late and it is equally obvious that they have cooled things off for too long.

The measures I have suggested today, including an efficient forecasting system, are intended to help out in this area. As regards the immediate problem, I agree with the hon. member for York South that the provinces should be called together. Every municipal and provincial government has projects on its books that have been deferred simply because of budgetary considerations. They could put them into effect very quickly.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I regret to interrupt the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) but I do so to advise him that the time limit fixed by special order today has expired. Is there unanimous agreement to allow the Leader of the Opposition to continue?

Some hon. Members: Carry on.

Mr. Stanfield: I am reluctant to do that, Mr. Speaker. I will just say a few words more. A special order has been passed and I do not think I should speak longer. I think I made my point. Although I have not been able to end up with the proper flourish, I will defer that.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Charles-Eugène Dionne (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker—

[*English*]

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. I beg the minister's pardon. It was my understanding that the spokesmen for the opposition parties would speak first. However, since the minister is on his feet, I will recognize him.

[Mr. Stanfield.]

Mr. Benson: Mr. Speaker, I am quite willing to listen to the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Dionne) if he wishes to speak at this time.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Dionne: Mr. Speaker, the motion now under consideration is, in my opinion, most important. Unemployment in Canada has reached such an alarming rate that it is useless to make provocative comparisons and try to establish facts with statistics which do not always reflect the real situation, since a great number of unemployed are not registered with Manpower Centre offices.

To undertake to prove, by juggling with figures, that there were more unemployed in 1970 than in 1969 or by going back to 1960, 1962 or 1963 to show that the number of unemployed was higher under another government will not solve the problem.

I have heard so many sterile speeches on this matter in the House that I have come to the conclusion that though figures probably do not lie, there are surely liars who juggle with them since there are always contradictions in this regard, depending on who is in power and who is in the opposition.

Thousands are unemployed in Canada and we must endeavour to find the means to reduce the demoralizing effects of that social evil.

During the depression from 1929 to 1939, those of my age realized that the governments were unable to solve the problem. Various plans were tried out: welfare, a type of concentration camp where people were paid 20 cents a day. The workers protested against the use of machines, mechanical shovels and others, which took away the work they wanted to do. And so, our administrators, Grits and Tories alike, proved their incompetence to a population that remained patient and courageous in spite of it all.

Their numerous study sessions only resulted in the adoption by the Canadian Parliament of the Unemployment Insurance Act, which went against the theories of the champions of full employment. The enactment of such legislation has helped many workers and has created employment for some officials—who could do better sometimes—to whom it was explained that their job was to help the unemployed faced with problems, which justified their full time employment.

The motion under study recommends that the unemployment benefits should be increased and the eligibility period extended. This is logical, considering the present situation. However, being aware of the mentality of the public service within the present financial system, which enjoys discretionary powers, I can imagine the groans that will come from those who seem to be commissioned to protect the fund before the unemployed.

Let us hope that they will show more realism in front of the present alarming situation.

It will no doubt be answered that the new legislation is still being studied and that it will not take effect before several months. This is no reason to delay a decision called for by the circumstances. Besides, the act has often been modified since it came into force.

In 1939, in the middle of an unemployment crisis, the government did not ask for delays before declaring war. Decisions were taken without hesitation. Let us hope that after the events which have taken place subsequently, our administration will finally understand that it is not normal to leave in destitution courageous people who are quite willing to have a decent living in a country they helped to build.

A convenient way for not worrying about this problem is to try to deny its existence. It is the first reaction one notices among some politicians, and in the press which is at their service. I want to point out the difference between this crisis and that of the thirties. This one is not approached with the same resignation as the other. Very few people knew the cause of the great crisis that happened before the war. Today, thousands of people know exactly that it is a purchasing power crisis, a money crisis.

Let me quote at this point part of a speech delivered by former president Roosevelt, in his inaugural address given during the crisis period of 1929. Here it is:

It is in this spirit that you and I have to face our difficulties. Only material interests are involved, thank heaven! Values have fallen to amazingly low levels; taxes have increased; we have lost our solvency power; all governments are confronted with an alarming reduction in their income; the exchange system is paralysed in the commercial traffic. A more serious situation still is an army of unemployed facing the problem of its subsistence, and a great number of other individuals who have but greatly reduced income. One must be a smug optimist to deny the dismalness of the situation...

The changers have given up their seats in the temple of our civilization. We can now restore and consecrate again this temple of ancient truths. The extent of the restoration will depend on how far we shall go in substituting superior social values to purely monetary motives.

Happiness does not consist only in the possession of money; it is found in the joy of work accomplished, in the emotion of the creative effort.

It must be recognized that material wealth is not a barometer for success.

No doubt the 1970 administrators will reply that the situation is not the same today.

I understand that the various programmes of pension, allowances, unemployment insurance and others have contributed to bring a little relief in an intolerable situation. But let us consult the reports of the Economic Council of Canada for 1969 and 1970, and the editorials of current newspapers. In its edition of April 23, 1969, *La presse* published an editorial entitled "Poor Man's Bread", and this is what it said:

We will never be ashamed enough, we will never be humiliated enough; the truth is thrown into our face: "four million Canadians live in a state of poverty!" You do not want to know anything about that because your personal comfort, your high standard of living, even the affluence which is common with many people must not be upset and then the problem of the have-nots does not concern you. This is what you think: think again!

Whether you like it or not, however annoying the shedding of light on harsh truths, the Economic Council of Canada has just given a lesson to the whole country in a brief introduced yesterday before a special Senate committee.

• (3:50 p.m.)

The tone is cutting and no one is spared. Here are a few examples: Poverty is a fact. Its victims are numbered in millions. Those who claim that there will always be poor people, are but disgusting egoists. To have so many underprivileged in an affluent society is a shame. To repeat that the evil can be cured once and for all is fallacious. The Senate committee was shocked. It had every reason to be.

In closing, the editorial writer added and I quote:

Pious wishes will not help much. When a society becomes "poisoned"—the phrase is taken out of the document—it has little use for verbal poultices. The most scholarly theories collapse. Alas! the Economic Council itself, frantic in the face of a situation which it dares not describe, has no other recourse but pompous words. Public understanding, enlightened humanitarianism, combined effort of institutions and governments. Of course, there is nothing more noble. However, the daily bread cannot be found in dictionaries.

In the official report of the Debates of the Senate for November 5, 1970, the hon. senator for Madawaska-Restigouche, speaking on poverty in Canada, stated this:

My colleagues on the poverty committee know what I am talking about because they too have heard these people. We have visited their homes. We have talked with them. We have talked to their children. It would be impossible for me to try to describe some of the scenes we witnessed.

Never before have I thought that in a country like Canada, a country so rich in natural resources, this Canada of ours where the standard of living is amongst the world's highest, I would witness such living conditions.

These people are furious because during the last fifteen years they have been running around the country to find employment, and when they succeeded in doing so and became established, they were soon displaced by so-called progress.

We have all this misery and poverty around us while we spend billions of dollars on social welfare. Just think for a moment what it would be like if those social measures were not in effect today. It would make the thirties, which we all remember, seem like years of good fortune.

And yet today we are so geared that we can spend up to $30,000 to create one job. What a price to pay, honourable senators! What a stupid price, I would say! And to whom is it paid? In most cases to people who are taking advantage of the loose legislation covering the tax payer's money to serve their own interests rather than the public interest.

And furthermore, in the same speech, the senator stated:

We are living in a sick society. I feel it is a sick society when freedom is abused every hour of the day, with no respect for the consequences. It is a sick society where respect for and cooperation with the authorities elected by a democratic system are gradually being replaced by obstruction, vengeance and, too often, by revolutionary action. It is a sick society with a monetary system whereby every dollar in reserve may be doubled in 10 to 12 years due to the high rate of interest.

This statement of fact can be made in Canada in 1970. You will agree that it is high time for the supporters of the "just society" to wake up and to find another remedy than credit restrictions and taxes on building materials to improve the situation.

Forced unemployment, with the physical and moral miseries which come with it and often follow it for years is a calamity; this is a truly modern curse which

should have our society blush with shame, a society which is so proud of its science, of its civilization and of its democratic institutions.

The remedy to such unrest is, first of all, to find the causes and, then, to apply an efficient medicine.

It is found that unemployment prevails when products do not sell. Indeed, when manufacturers get fewer orders, they lay off personnel, which adds to the number of unemployed.

An ill-adapted production helps create unemployment. The Lauzon and Sorel shipyards are clear evidence of uneasy adjustments. Another reason for unemployment is machinery and automation. The worker becomes unemployed when the machine produces in his stead. Machinery has even been invented for that purpose. Unbalance between increased production and limited purchasing power worsens as fast as progress demands the installation of new machinery.

The solution to such an issue is distribution among people of profits due to progress. The more products become independent of the work of the individual, the more they should be distributed otherwise than through wages. This is the aim of the Ralliement créditiste when it asks that a periodical dividend be given to everybody.

Whether the problem is an accumulation of products due to lack of purchasing power or the replacement of workers by machinery, a dividend is the solution.

A wage increase would be absolutely useless to workers replaced by machinery. On the other hand, as any wage increase is reflected in higher prices for products—even if an increase of $1 were granted—if the merchant sells one more dollar for the same quantity of products for $1 more than in the past, the consumer cannot give a larger order.

Quite often the main cause of problems experienced by most Canadians lays in the mechanism employed for distributing goods; it operates slowly, whereas in this century speed rules supreme and means of production have undergone changes allowing maximum results in many areas; some politicians even feel alarmed and sometimes speak of overproduction.

They are not realistic enough to realize that we are dealing with underconsumption even though the reports of the numerous commissions they have set up prove beyond any doubt that a high percentage of Canadians live in poverty and lack all sorts of goods which the production system keeps displaying before their eyes by making use of all available advertising media while the consumer has to make do without these goods since he cannot afford to absorb this abundant production.

A specialized education is not required to realize that we are living in an upside-down world. Facts prove that we are able to produce but at the same time they show that we are not intelligent enough to distribute the goods we produce. It is the height of absurdity! Such a situation justifies the logical moves of those who advocate a distributive economy in order to bring back some order in a society whose leaders seem to have gone insame.

[Mr. Dionne.]

We recognize the difficulties involved in putting this system back on its feet, but since this is necessary we must act without delay if we are truly determined to prevent revolution.

Why could we not have—besides commissions on the public service, education, public utilities, unemployment insurance—a monetary commission comprising experts on figures and on love of the poor, responsible for developing the technique of balancing the production of goods with the need to provide each man with enough to live, and for working out payment and credit procedures in a spirit of reliability, foresight and honesty? Since it is the country which answers for currency, is it not its responsibility to benefit from it and regulate its exchange?

The endless studies on poverty will produce no practical result. It is necessary first to straighten the monetary system, a human institution controlled, monopolized and rarified when necessary by handlers of money and credit, exposed by the highest doctrinal authority in the world. In this respect, let us refer to the encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno.*

We should not linger on old methods which have produced the results we know: inflation, recession, ever higher taxes, an increasing national debt which is unpaid and unpayable under the present system.

Why continue to look for undiscoverable solutions in that upside-down system?

We of the Ralliement créditiste do not pretend that a monetary reform would be the panacea likely to remedy all evils, but we have good reasons to believe that it is one of the best means to find adequate solutions to the current problems.

• (4:00 p.m.)

[*English*]

Hon. E. J. Benson (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, I was sorry that we were unable to hear the final flourish of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield). He got to the stage where he was going to increase exemptions, reduced taxes and with the additional money he found thereby was going to call the provinces together to spend it. I was wondering what he would do for a finale.

The motion presented by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) and his remarks to the House, provide further evidence of the tendency of his party to regard current economic conditions in a vacuum, as unrelated either to the past or the future. Neither the past nor the future can be ignored, however, if we are to consider current economic problems with some proper sense of perspective.

Let me point out at the outset that there is probably a very large measure of agreement among us about what should be our basic economic objective, that is, achieving the greatest year to year increase in production, employment and incomes that is possible without creating a self-defeating spiral of costs and prices.

Where we differ in a fundamental way is over the means that should be adopted to achieve this objective.

In sharp contrast to many in the opposition, the government came to the conclusion that the steadily escalating inflation which began in the mid 1960's posed a serious threat to the achievement of this objective over the long term. We were accused and continue to be accused of having a psychopathic obsession over the danger of inflation. We were accused of being prepared to sacrifice employment because of some academic attachment to price stability—as if the two were not directly related.

Let me emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that our deep concern over the problem of inflation has not reflected any lack of concern over unemployment. On the contrary, we were concerned about inflation primarily because it threatened to undermine the very foundation of our economy and thus prevent it from achieving its potential growth together with higher and more stable levels of employment.

In recent months, governments of most countries around the world have come to share our deep concern over inflation. It was one of the issues foremost in the minds in those attending the annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund in Copenhagen last September. In its annual report for 1970, published earlier in the month, the IMF pointed out that the performance of the world economy during 1969 and the first half of 1970 was marked by what it described as "severe inflationary pressures" and stressed, to use its words, "the central need for restoration of financial stability in the major industrial economies, and particularly in the United States".

• (4:10 p.m.)

During the Throne Speech debate, the Leader of the Opposition was inclined to dismiss rather scathingly the views of what he termed "international bankers" as being of no account.

Since he, himself, referred to the approach of the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, it is of particular interest that in its mid-year review the OECD asserted that "price inflation is an old problem which has now acquired new dimensions and a new urgency" and emphasized the need for member countries to adopt the necessary fiscal, monetary and income restraint policies to bring it under control.

A few weeks ago, the Economic Council of Canada published a review of the Canadian economy. The report pointed out that recently the growth of the economy has fallen significantly below its real potential, but it also strongly suggested that inflation was the major cause of this development.

The Council said, and I quote:

> On the whole, but with the glaring exception noted below, the performance of the economy since we started to make such appraisals in 1964 has been relatively good—certainly good in comparison with the generally poor performance in the late 1950's and early 1960's.

The glaring exception to this generally good record cited by the Council has been, in its words, "performance in relation to the goal of reasonable price stability."

Over the past several months we have made considerable progress in overcoming the glaring defect in the performance of our economy referred to by the Economic Council in its most recent report. Only last week, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics reported that for the third month in a row the year-over-year increase of the Consumer Price Index in October amounted to only 2.8 per cent. On a seasonally adjusted basis, the increase in the index since last February has amounted to 1.5 per cent at an annual rate. This record of performance surpasses that of virtually any other industrialized economy and stands in particular contrast to that in the United States, where the increase in the Consumer Price Index for September amounted to 5.6 per cent over the previous year.

As I have acknowledged many times in the past, resolving the critical problem of inflation has been a long, arduous process and it has carried its own costs in terms of a temporary moderation in the rate of economic growth.

In this context, I think it is worth recalling the observation made in the 1970 annual report of the International Monetary Fund that, and I quote:

> —the experience of industrial countries in the recent period seems fully consistent with and bears out the well-known proposition that the maintenance of financial stability in the short-run will make for a better growth and employment record over the long-run.

Despite the clamour of members of the opposition, Mr. Speaker, we have not been prepared to sacrifice long-term benefits for the economy in order to achieve short-lived illusory gains because we are convinced it is not in the best interests of the Canadian people to do so.

At the same time, however, we have been deeply anxious to see the economy move ahead toward its full growth potential as soon as, and as quickly as, this could be done without severe risk of a renewed and destructive price and cost spiral.

In my remarks to the House on October 13 during the Throne Speech debate, I outlined in some detail the steps that have been taken over the past seven months to stimulate economic growth as the inflationary pressures slowly began to recede. It is not necessary for me to reiterate now all of those various measures we have taken to stimulate a faster rate of growth of production and employment. I would like to emphasize, however, that over this period fiscal policy has progressively become strongly expansionary.

The March budget itself proposed a significant increase in the stimulus from the federal sector, providing for an increase in cash requirements over the previous fiscal year of about three quarters of a billion dollars, not including requirements to finance policy exchange transactions. Primarily as a result of expansionary policy measures adopted by the government in the interval, the cash requirement for the current fiscal year has risen to $1.3 billion, with a further $1.2 billion being required to finance foreign exchange transactions up to October 1.

On a national income accounts basis there has been a shift from the surplus for last year estimated at $648 million to a deficit in the current year that is estimated

currently at $450 million, a swing of more than $1 billion. In contrast to what the Leader of the Opposition has said, I think this is a very signficant move in fiscal policy in Canada.

Mr. Stanfield: You can't live on that.

Mr. Benson: And you can't live on your credit. In my speech of October 13, I indicated to the House that during this period there had been a shift of similar magnitude on the monetary side in the expansion of monetary policy, with the result that ample credit is available in the banking system to supply the needs of all credit-worthy borrowers. In the interval there have been two further important developments in the monetary field.

Toward the end of October, the chartered banks began lowering their prime lending rates from 8 per cent to at least 7½ per cent, providing a spur for a further increase in loan demand.

I am sure that all hon. members will welcome the announcement that effective today the Bank of Canada's bank rate has been reduced from 6½ to 6 per cent, reflecting the recent decline in short-term treasury bill yields to less than 5 per cent for the first time since 1967. Today's reduction in the bank rate is the fourth since May of this year and represents a decrease of 2 percentage points from the 8 per cent peak established in July, 1969. This lowering of the lending rate of the Bank of Canada, which goes hand in hand with a continued increase in the money supply made available by the central bank, is only one more in the series of measures adopted by federal authorities to promote increased economic growth as quickly and to as great an extent as circumstances and sensible economic management will permit.

In his motion, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for York South refers to the relentless upward climb in the level of unemployment in all regions of Canada and suggests that a number of unnamed—he named one or two recently—but allegedly responsible economic authorities are predicting record levels of unemployment this winter.

For our part, we have never sought to minimize our concern over the increase in unemployment to a level far higher than we would like to see. I am willing to refer to my budget statement of last March in this regard. At the same time, however, there is nothing to be gained by exaggerating the nature and extent of the problem, unless it is some brief political advantage.

Recently I suggested publicly that on a seasonal basis —the hon. member said this is the fair way to measure the trend in unemployment—unemployment had about reached its peak and expressed confidence that we could look forward to continued improvement. I am sure most members will welcome the report published today by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and the Department of Manpower and Immigration that on a seasonally adjusted basis unemployment dropped from 6.9 per cent in September to 6.6 per cent in October. I might observe, in passing, that in the United States there was a further small increase in unemployment during October.

An hon. Member: Their rate is different.

Mr. Benson: The rate is different because the measurement is different. What makes this report particularly gratifying is the fact that the decline in unemployment during October to the level existing last June occurred despite an increase in the labour force of 10,000 on a seasonally adjusted basis, and despite the fact that the General Motors strike had been underway for five weeks at the time the survey was taken.

I should make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that while those on strike are not counted as additions to the unemployed, the shutdown of General Motors plants has led to the laying-off of a significant number of workers in associated industries which supply General Motors factories. It is because of this factor that reports of an impending settlement of the strike are all the more welcome. During October there was an increase in employment, seasonally adjusted, of 34,000, which was matched by a similar increase in September. While the importance of this expansion in employment over the two-month period should also not be exaggerated, the figures suggest that the economy may be becoming more robust than it was earlier in the year.

• (4:20 p.m.)

One of the important factors in determining how quickly economic growth regains a healthy momentum is capital investment, particularly in the private sector. As hon. members are aware, actual capital expenditures by business this year appear to have fallen significantly short of the large increase indicated by company investment intentions. Nevertheless, a strong underpinning to capital investment both this year and next has been provided by the marked resurgence which has taken place in housing construction as a result of the heavy volume of funds made available by the federal government. In October, housing starts were running at an annual rate of 270,000, which represents a very sharp increase from the annual rate of housing construction of 136,000 in the second quarter of this year. I think this is an indication of the effect government action has had with respect to unemployment.

Mr. Alexander: It will still be short.

Mr. Benson: Earlier this week my colleague, the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) made public a survey of 200 of the largest companies in Canada indicating that they planned increases in capital spending next year of 11 per cent. While this expression of intention is a less than infallible guide to the expenditures which will actually be made, it is nevertheless encouraging that these major companies are contemplating a substantial expansion of capital investment in the year ahead.

The motion before the House, Mr. Speaker, makes special reference to the unemployment situation in Quebec, a problem about which we are very conscious. But to maintain proper perspective, I think I should point out to hon. members that the problem of unemployment in that province goes beyond that caused by slow growth of the economy generally. A few moments ago I referred to the importance of capital investment in stimulating economic growth and new job opportunities. Over the past four years, however, there has either been a decline or only a modest rate of growth in capital spending in Quebec as compared to the rest of Canada. In 1969, for example, private capital investment in the province per capita was only 62 per cent of the national average, compared to 84 per cent in the Atlantic region and 101 per cent in Ontario.

Notwithstanding the events of recent days, there has, I believe, been a significant change in the political climate in Quebec which is reflected in the election to office of a provincial government pledged to place a new emphasis on promoting healthy economic growth. It is for this reason particularly encouraging that the survey of large Canadian companies to which I referred earlier indicated an above average increase in the amount of capital investment planned for Quebec next year.

Mr. Paproski: A couple of million?

Mr. Benson: Hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. Paproski: What about Alberta?

Mr. Benson: This estimate would appear to be in line with reports of major capital projects expected to get under way in the province over the next several months about which Premier Bourassa said last week he would be making an announcement shortly. It is just such developments which will provide the strongest possible base for promoting the accelerated long term economic growth of the province.

At the beginning of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I noted that the International Monetary Fund, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development and the Economic Council have all recently warned about the dangerous effect of inflation in undermining the strength of the world's economies. Before concluding, I want to underline the further warning from each of these organizations about the need to exercise caution in stimulating the renewed expansion of the economy after inflation has been brought under control because of the continuing danger of unleashing new inflationary forces.

In its most recent report the Economic Council emphasized that, to use its words, "great care must be taken to move in a more gradual way back to potential in order to avoid the excessive surges of inflation-creating demand such as occurred in the mid-1960's and pushed the economy hard against its potential". The progressive and far-reaching series of measures we have taken over the past several months represent strong and positive action by the government to stimulate economic growth. We remain more than ready in the future to adopt those further measures which are possible to promote faster expansion of production, employment and incomes without sacrificing the hard-won gains we have made in our crucial fight to restore economic stability, upon which sustained economic growth and high and growing levels of employment ultimately depend.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, it is difficult, in a 15 minute speech, to advance a serious economic argument, especially when one has already made some notes for another speech.

To reply to the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson), may I say, first of all, that one of the central assumptions he made was that a direct causal connection existed between price stability on the one hand and long range growth and full employment on the other. This came out clearly in his speech. Yet he put forward not one shred of evidence to justify this contention. He is right in saying that relative price stability exists today, but if he wishes to argue that this degree of price stability is connected with economic growth why does he not present some statistics on which to base his argument? Why does he not take prices within a sector of the economy, show that they have been maintained at a relatively constant level and then, show, also, that there has been an expansion of employment in that sector? This would be significant information. But he does not attempt to do this. I have no time in which to elaborate upon the point, but I suggest he could not do so in terms of the economy as a whole.

There is a good deal of evidence to show that many countries have maintained price stability while experiencing high levels of unemployment, and there are numerous other countries which have maintained high levels of employment concurrent with a lot of inflation. It is this kind of information which has led such reputable journals as the Wall Street *Journal* to conclude that attempts to find a connection between price stability and economic growth should be abandoned because the evidence no longer warrants making the kind of assumption which underlines the hon. gentleman's policies. The minister has trotted out once again an essay in the conservative economic thought which has motivated the government; he has provided us with nothing more than the rhetoric we have heard many times in the last two years to support his position.

The other point I will make before getting into the ten minutes or so which remain to me concerns the minister's reference to the low rate of capital investment in recent years in the Province of Quebec. It is true there has been a low rate of capital investment in the past, and I, with other hon. members, are glad to know that this situation may be changed. What better reason for a massive introduction of public capital into the province? I will return to this point later.

• (4:30 p.m.)

The fact is that there are 419,000 unemployed in Canada, an increase of some 105,000 over the same time one year ago. Non-partisan economists have predicted that we may have as high as 9 per cent of the labour

force unemployed this winter. In other words, the Prime Minister is in power at a time when there will be more unemployed Canadians than at any previous time in history, hardly a commendable record for one who is supposed to be a progressive politician. As the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) and the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) have indicated, unemployment is not simply a statistic: it means gross human deprivation for the men and women directly involved, and also certainly for their children. Something has to be done to remedy the situation.

Closely related to unemployment are welfare costs in the cities. I am informed that the city of Montreal is now spending $68 million a year on welfare. Toronto has exceeded its present annual welfare budget by $22 million. This year Edmonton has exceeded its budget by some $350,000. My own city of Oshawa, a much smaller community than the other metropolitan areas, has exceeded its welfare budget for this year by some 280 per cent, and this in a relatively prosperous part of the country.

As everyone knows, the federal government involves itself in many ways in urban affairs. Most of the unemployed in Canada live in our cities. The government could take action in many areas, such as communications, housing, transportation, postal services, pollution control and so on, which could stand an infusion of public capital.

I do not want to exaggerate the benefits that would accrue from such an infusion, for it would take time for the effect of such investment to pay off in full employment. But it would be paying off by next February, when the forecast is that we will have the highest level of unemployment this winter. I suggest a conference should be held soon between the federal government, the provincial governments and representatives of our major municipalities to make clear that unemployment is a serious issue.

Certainly I think there is need to do something about housing and urban renewal, both for its own sake and for the spin-off effect this would have on the whole economy. About 80,000 people today in metropolitan Toronto alone are on the public housing lists, a figure that exceeds the population of my own city. Yet the government spends a sum total of 3 per cent of its housing money in the public housing field. It is the poor people of the country who are waiting for public housing, yet 97 per cent of government funds for housing go into other sectors that need less help.

I have recited a number of areas in which the government could spend money beneficially, and housing as I say, is one of them. It is an area in which the government should spend even more money, after consultation with provincial and municipal governments.

Another step tnat should be taken immediately at the federal level is to increase the rate of unemployment insurance. This has already been suggested. If this action were taken now, thousands of people who will be unemployed this winter would receive help. In addition, the time for which unemployed people are able to collect benefits should be extended. In general terms, the government must also begin now to rid itself of its old ad hoc monetary and fiscal policy approach and to indulge in serious economic planning which is aimed at full employment. The government must get away from its preoccupation—and I emphasize that word—with price stability. Stable prices are important, but weighed against the priority of full employment that must take second place, as indeed is the case in all advanced countries of western Europe.

I want to speak briefly about the issue of Quebec. According to the most recent figures, 45 per cent of the unemployed of this country are between the ages of 14 and 24. In terms of what is taking place in the province of Quebec, I suggest this is a serious condition. Those who become involved in radical politics, whether of the FLQ variety or the democratic sort associated with the Parti Quebecois, tend overwhelmingly to be in that age group. This group consists of a curious mixture. On the one hand, there is the highly educated, young university student radical; on the other hand, there is the very poorly educated young person, for example, the taxi driver in Montreal. This is not a coincidence. What we are witnessing now in Quebec is a common phenomenon around the world, that is the young radical student discussing issues from his, in the case of the FLQ, terrorist point of view with the young unemployed worker. He attempts to "radicalize" the young worker.

What needs to be done, and done right away, is to solve the unemployment question, particularly among the young people of the province of Quebec. A study undertaken shortly after the last election in that province showed that some 50 per cent of the workers who lived in the east end of Montreal and voted for the Parti Quebecois did so not for separatist reasons at all but because they wanted social and economic reform. If we want to repair the damage that, in my view, has been done by the Prime Minister in recent weeks, we must reach these young workers of Quebec and provide jobs for them as soon as possible. Then and only then, in my view, will we have a chance of keeping Quebec in Canada.

At the same time, we must give a greater sense of participation to the young student who is not economically deprived, both within his own province and within Canada as a whole. It seems to me it is primarily this lack of opportunity within the country as a whole that has led to his decision to opt out of Canada. To deal with this kind of young person in Quebec, we will require much more sophisticated approaches than merely economic ones, though I do not have time to elaborate on this. Nevertheless, I cannot emphasize too much the need for something to be done about the young unemployed workers of the province of Quebec if we are to prevent Quebec from separating from the rest of Canada. Without their support separatist students would get nowhere.

• (4:40 p.m.)

In this regard, and this will be my concluding point, it seems to me once again that the federal government,

because of its involvement with provincial and municipal governments in many aspects of policy, could be doing something. The mayor of Montreal has proudly suggested that his administration is going to spend some hundreds of thousands of dollars to build 3,000 new low income homes which will be made available to people with lower incomes after the Olympics. What he has not pointed out or emphasized is that the same city is going to lose 3,400 units now in existence during the preparation of that great extravaganza. This represents a net loss of some 400 housing units to the poor people of Montreal. What the federal government could do if it were really serious about involving itself with the concerns of the poor people, particularly those in the province of Quebec, is say to the mayor of Montreal he will not get one cent of federal money to put into that extravaganza unless this policy is changed and unless he begins to do something now about the welfare of these poor people.

The politics of grandeur are popular not only with the mayor of Montreal but, unfortunately, with many other people in that city. This approach must be abandoned if the real needs and interests of the average citizen in that city are to be met. The federal government has an important responsibility to not encourage the politics of grandeur by participating in this Olympic project of Mr. Drapeau. That is one act, symbolic if you like, of a number of similar practical moves the federal government could make in respect of municipal politics, not only in Montreal but elsewhere in this country. I will conclude with that suggestion, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ovide Laflamme (Montmorency): Mr. Speaker, I listened to the remarks of the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) and, although he delivered his speech in a very commendable way, I think it might be well to point out to the hon. member for York South that he spent 28 minutes out of his 30-minute speech bewailing unemployment, stressing its disastrous and unfortunate consequences. I feel that on that score, except for a few allusions he may have made, all hon. members agree.

And as time went by, I became very anxious to know what constructive suggestions he might make to the government to change the situation he so intelligently and learnedly put before the House.

For another minute, he spoke about the effectiveness of the measures and towards the end of his speech, he talked about the establishment of special programs of a general nature following a federal-provincial conference with the co-operation of municipalities, about changes of attitudes in the Department of Regional Economic Expansion and about an increase in old age pensions.

Mr. Speaker, the disastrous effects of unemployment cannot be denied. The hon. member for York South talked about the unemployment conditions in Quebec. I agree with him on that subject, but more so with the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent) who just sat down and who said that something must be done to fight unemployment in Quebec.

In 1969, the hon. member for York South said, if those figures are accurate, that 45,000 new jobs had been created in Ontario. On the other hand, the federal government is blamed in certain areas of the country for overdoing it in Quebec, where only 3,000 new jobs have been created. Yet, the same federal legislation, the same measures of assistance are involved.

Mr. Lewis: It was not in 1969, but in 1970.

Mr. Laflamme: I thank the hon. member for his correction, but whether it is in 1969 or in 1970, the argument is basically the same, to wit under the same federal legislation, 45,000 new jobs are created in Ontario and only 3,000 in Quebec.

Why this anomaly? I do not agree with the reasons given by the hon. member. The real cause of the shortage of investments reported by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) and one which has yet consequences for which the federal government is required to take emergency action, so to speak, is the lack of stability and action which, for too long a time, have been a characteristic of politics in Quebec.

While nowhere else in our country was any disagreement possible on the basic structure of our society, in Quebec, this matter was challenged and the news was splashed all over the front page of all Canadian newspapers.

And while unfortunate events were taking place in Quebec, investors were being frightened away so that, as the Minister of Finance has just stated, capital investments in Quebec in 1969 only reached 62 per cent of the national average.

The hon. member for York South should understand that basically this terrorist action is not linked to unemployment. The hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby has just said that activitsts and terrorists are generally found among the unemployed who have lost hope. This is true. However, the agitators in Quebec who are mainly responsible for a drop in investments, and, consequently, more unemployment, have been led on by the political climate which prevailed for too many years. This state of affairs has been gradually disappearing, so we hope at least, since April 29, 1970.

I have no intention of singing the praises of Mr. Robert Bourassa, premier of Québec. The people of Quebec, in the last election, had no other choice but to vote for a party that was the only one, in the last ten years, to advocate keeping Quebec in the Confederation and putting an end to the sterile debates on constitutional reform and the carpet wars. The Liberal party wants to solve the economic problem and to take action in that area.

Almost all the people would have wished to cast their vote for it, except those who, cleverly stressing the problems obtaining in Quebec, tried to make the people believe that the Ottawa government is against the adoption of any legislation that may be helpful to the poor. This climate seems to be lifting and since Quebec has a government able to really understand the situation, it is

our duty in Ottawa to say that the federal government is not against the province of Quebec, as we were told for 25 or 30 years.

I call the attention of the hon. member for York South—and I know that the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Asselin) has brought in a correction in this connection—to the heading of an article in *Le Devoir*. The hon. member for Charlevoix tries again to raise a problem of which the population is extremely tired. This heading is as follows:

Martial Asselin: Without a special status for Quebec, Canada is finished.

We have been reading such titles in newspapers for ten years. We have been saying over and over again for ten years that the Quebec people do not want the resumption of fruitless constitutional discussions but rather economic action.

In this regard, the federal government is doing presently what it ought to do. Indeed, it passed an act on economic development. This legislation is not perfect but since January 1, 1969, the federal government has contributed to the development or the establishment of 267 new industries in the province of Quebec. About $39 million have been paid to Quebec as incentives to economic and industrial expansion. In Ontario, 45,000 new jobs were created—as compared to 3,000 in Quebec—with only $10 million in aid to economic expansion.

If something is wrong in Quebec, it is attributable to the lack of investors, I think. As a matter of fact, they run away from political complications that some provincial politicians have kept up while pursuing their own purposes. Among the efficient measures the government has implemented, are the system of equalization payments and the aid to economic expansion which, according to some other provinces, constitute preferential treatment to words the province of Quebec.

Just recently, steps have been taken to solve problems in the textile industry, which creates many jobs in Quebec, particularly in the Montreal region and in part of my riding.

However, measures implemented or to be implemented by the hon. Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) will ensure better control of imports and a rational increase in the number of jobs in the industry.

Those are absolutely positive measures likely to bring about a more promising future for workers of Quebec. I do not intend to blame the hon. member for York-South for trying to establish a relationship of some sort between FLQ activities and the unemployment situation which prevails at present. Indeed, most FLQ members are connected with the Parti Québécois. They specifically advocate the destruction of Canada. I would not think that these same people would tackle the federal government.

While I agree with the hon. member for York South concerning the unfortunate effects of unemployment, I believe he could give a hand to his fellow members and especially those from Quebec and try to impress on the population that the federal government has done more than it could possibly do.

[Mr. Laflamme.]

It has been said that federal legislation sometimes favour Quebec sometimes the rest of Canada. Fifteen times more jobs have been created in one province than in another. This depends on the lack of capital and inaction on the part of the government at the provincial level.

It is essential during the following months that unemployment be reduced in our province, as well as in the other provinces where the rate of unemployment is entirely unacceptable. The support of the whole Canadian population is needed, as well as a common front, to preserve unity in the country by supporting the measures deemed essential by the government to ensure security of employment.

• (4:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Heath Macquarrie (Hillsborough): Mr. Speaker, I, of course, agree with my leader who began by saying that the matter of unemployment is not simply a regional problem. Of course it is not. Nevertheless, in my brief intervention of 15 minutes I shall try to call again for attention to the economic ills of the Atlantic area. To try in 15 minutes to discuss the neglect of a century is a challenge, sir. I wish it were not necessary for us here constantly to bring to the attention of this Parliament the problems of our regions. I would much prefer to be able to point to levels, statistics and satisfactions in the economic life of Atlantic Canada which would equal many of the non-economic aspects which are so much to be cherished in our part of Canada. Yet I do not apologize for declaring and reiterating the needs and inequities of the provinces by the sea. Confederation was a merging and sharing of many things. Certainly, it is a sharing of disadvantages, especially those which the act of confederation itself imposed or made more burdensome.

This country is not truly prosperous if any of its regions, or governments, or its people are seriously disadvantaged as a result of the acts of omission or commission of the national government. The resolution refers to the serious problems in Quebec. We all feel concern about such matters. Surely, all decent people want to help this province in its present travail. In many ways Quebec and Atlantic Canada have similar weaknesses, problems and disadvantages. While there have been dramatic, and sometimes I feel dangerous, reactions in Quebec that have not been in those the provinces by the sea, let us not think that the economic problems that concern us and the disadvantages that exist are less critical, less serious or less blighting than those which for too long have affected and inhibited the province of Quebec. In fact the difference, in a general way, may be that ours, sadly, have been of much longer duration. But because we have become accustomed to the role of being the Cinderella of confederation does not mean that we have grown enamoured of that role. In fact, we have long since grown weary of finding ourselves at the bottom of the favourable economic statistics and heading those which are unfavourable. The fourth report of the Economic Council of Canada set out vividly the continuing and deplorable situation.

• (5:00 p.m.)

I referred the other day to the latest report from APEC, a very important and dedicated body in Atlantic Canada. They pointed out on November 6:

> And the outlook for construction is bleak, with a 30 to 40 per cent fall in the value of construction contracts awarded in the first seven months of the year.
>
> "Most indications of the business climate in the region in the closing months of 1970 and the first half of 1971 are not good"—
>
> "Prospects for resurgence from the slowdown of the past few months are not favourable since there are few signs of significant federal or provincial measures to offset the current slowdown."

They go on to say:

> "It may be too late already to avert a severe economic crisis in the region this winter..."

The government of Canada cannot put into effect all remedial measures which are necessary, although I believe and affirm here that the prime responsibility is theirs. Other jurisdictions within the region must also accept their share of responsibility and must be called in for a massive assault upon the problems which for too long have inhibited our growth.

In fairness, I must say that something has been commenced by the government in Ottawa. Since the then Premier Smith of Nova Scotia raised the question of economic disparity to the level of agenda discussion at the Dominion-provincial conference, the question has at least earned a new level of constitutional respectability. What has been accomplished, however, is much less than what has been proclaimed. There has been a great deal of sounding of trumpets, and far too few advances. Plans, programs and projects have been plotted by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, a plethora of them, and of course we all accept the need for planning and innovation. We are not fearful of new techniques and new approaches.

But apart from studies, apart from long range plans, have we had a serious assault on the grave problems facing us now, this fall, this coming winter? The signs are, as I have indicated in the quote from the APEC report and others I could bring to bear, that the winter ahead down east will be once again a winter of discontent. These are grim forecasts. In considering the cold realities of the last many years, none of us is sufficiently optimistic to believe as we would like to believe that these statistical projections will be proven wrong in the actuality.

One especially disturbing and recurring problem is the high incidence of unemployment among the young in our region. It has grown chronic year after year and has been invariably twice the national average. The only reason it is not twice the national average at this moment is that the national figures have gone so bad. That is what happened to the statistics.

How long have we known down there that the basic problem was at its worst for those under 24 years of age, as indicated by the figures that the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) mentioned for the nation. Do we not realize that the figures are deflated somewhat by the constant and eternal outward migration from the region toward Toronto where our young people end up looking for what they think is the promised land, some of them even making the newspaper columns of some slick metropolitan daily which refer to the dispossessed Maritimers who wear white socks? Very clever!

A shocking figure with regard to housing came out the other day. Housing starts in the four Atlantic provinces for the first nine months of this year totalled 3,351, a drop of 39 per cent from the 5,509 starts recorded during the same period last year. In every province there is a drop in the figures relating to this very important matter of housing. There is a serious lagging in the construction industry. There is much that has to be done, much that demands action immediately. While we appreciate the fact that there are some plans under way by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, we ask that attention be given to the problems that face us this fall and this coming winter, before that which has long been bad becomes far worse.

One thing that has always troubled me, as the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) tries to do something for the region—and I believe he is trying—is that there is no pervasion into other departments of the government of the general concept of regional disparty. We find that as he tries to set up long range employment opportunities, some of his colleagues through their departments will be taking measures which result in under-employment and unemployment. Projects are cut off, personnel is diminished. Surely, if we are serious about the question of regional disparity, every department in the government should recognize the fact and govern itself accordingly, so that the dispersion of these disparities, if I may be alliterative, becomes the prime role and high priority of the government.

I think also that we must move quickly for concerted action by all levels of government. We must regionalize our assault upon the problems in the Atlantic provinces. I am doubtful if a Maritime union will come about quickly, but we must, we should and we can have a great deal more co-ordination and co-operation as we assault the massive problems which are shrinking the economy of the provinces by the sea.

I ask again for the government to show a little sensitivity to the immediate problem. I will give an example. In the province of Prince Edward Island there is one industry which is capable of great expansion, namely the tourist industry. It does not require a royal commission to go to the Charlottetown airport and count the number of seats in the aircraft and the number of seats in the terminal building to know that we need an extended airport. One does not need to be a genius to know that in my constituency, which is the smallest in terms of land and much smaller in terms of agricultural production, where we produce a million and a quarter pounds of blueberries, a freezing plant would be a good thing. You do not need a five year plan to realize this.

I can only cite these as some of the immediate aids to solve our economic problems. I bring these problems

rather sharply to the attention of my colleagues because the government seems not yet seized of the compelling urgency of our regional problems. I give the government one very practical suggestion. It is one along with those excellent suggestions which my leader put forward, and he knows more about these problems in the Atlantic region than any man in this country. I say that it is time for a renewal, a recreation, a resurrection of the Atlantic adjustment grants.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Macquarrie: In the province of Prince Edward Island we have a regional economic expansion plan. I wish it well, but when you see a little province like P.E.I. called upon to put up $2 for every $1 that the national government puts forth, you realize that that is not the kind of planning we need. The ratio should be reversed at least, but better still we should have the kind of thing which was extended in 1957 and 1958, an assistance which would enable the provinces to meet the needs of their people in these days when expanded social services are required. That is one suggestion I put to the government at present—bring forward new Atlantic adjustment grants. Use the same figure as before, but compute it in relation to the increased cost of living and you will see what happens to the $35 million.

We ask, sir, that statistics such as those which came out in the fourth report of the Economic Council of Canada be considered and the terrible economic disparity be diminished. If that is not the job of the national government I do not know what is. Looking at per capita income figures we see that in the province of Ontario the average income is $2,296, in the province of P.E.I. $1,370, and in the province of Newfoundland $1,173. Do we need to talk any more about disparity? If I gave figures for the cost of living, the disparities would be all the more. I call on the government to look seriously at this excellent resolution, thoughtfully worded and carefully presented, and to look very carefully at a place which has known more unemployment, more neglect, and more disparity than any other part of this great land.

• (5:10 p.m.)

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Carter)—Fisheries—depletion of marine resources; the hon. member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow)—Canadian National Railways—non-payment of minimum wage—discussion by Minister of Transport with president.

[Mr. Macquarrie.]

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

ALLOTTED DAY S.O. 58—LABOUR CONDITIONS—POLICIES AND PROGRAMS TO INCREASE EMPLOYMENT—INCREASED UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BENEFITS

The House resumed consideration of the motion of Mr. Lewis:

Whereas there has been a relentless climb in the level of unemployment in all regions of Canada, and

Whereas a number of responsible economic authorities have predicted record levels of unemployment this coming winter, and

Whereas, unless special measures are immediately taken, the likelihood of serious increases in the level of unemployment in the Province of Quebec and the City of Montreal will add to an already critical situation,

Therefore, be it resolved that this House calls upon the Government to institute, in co-operation with provinces and municipalities, policies and programs that will increase significantly the number of jobs available this winter and, as a special measure of assistance to those who remain unemployed, to increase both the amount of unemployment benefits and the eligibility period provided by the Unemployment Insurance Commission.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Roland Godin (Portneuf): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support the motion before us and I think that every member normally elected and free from any financial obligation should do the same.

The hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis), who has introduced this motion, deserves congratulations because he wanted to draw the attention of the government to the unfortunate situation in which too many Canadians find themselves. The results of this government and of the previous ones are summed up in this motion, which tells quite a different story from that of the Canada Year Book, which gives the interesting side of the economy.

For instance, this valuable book points out the high rate of productivity achieved by wheat and milk producers. A wheat and milk surplus supports this contention. The same book interestingly notes that the country still ranks first as a world exporter of mineral products. Through that book, we learn that Canada remains the main world producer of nickel and zinc, is second for the production of asbestos and uranium and numbers among the great producers of copper, gold, potash, iron, lead and silver. It is also gratifying to learn that Canada comes third among the world producers of various minerals, after the United States and the Soviet Union. The book even says that Canada will become the greatest potash producer of the world. Third largest world producer of aluminum, large producer of oil and natural gas, Canada also meets 40 per cent of the demand for newsprint and asbestos throughout the world.

In spite of the large quantity of raw materials exported at extremely low prices, such as iron which in Quebec has a 50 to 70 per cent dosage, and which sells for 2 cents a ton, we hold a record, namely the equivalent of $850 per capita for exports. This record can mean a lot if it is compared with American exports of $370 per capita and the world average of $171.

In view of these results, how come we have so many poor people?

In our prosperous country, whose production this year will reach about $80 billion, that is $3,800 per person—which is the evidence of an overabundance of products and survival for the whole people—how is it that we tolerate so many people out of work, without income, and with all the resulting want?

How is it that the administration of the luckiest country in the world manages to create enough problems to justify the introduction of the motion before the House today?

How is it that the records I have mentioned a moment ago, have never brought us anything but trouble? Is it that this poor administration is the result of inflation or is it the inflation which is the cause of the poor results which result in an increasing number of victims?

One fine day, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) increased his expense account, and when hard times come he asks for the co-operation of the people by saying: Tighten your belt, we must fight inflation.

But who is responsible for inflation, Mr. Speaker? Has it come in through the back door or the front door? Assuming that the government could not have foreseen it, where have the experts been since 1950? What was the use of all the royal inquiries and task forces?

Is it not a fact that two inquiries were ordered in 1961, one dealing with health services and the other with taxation? It was decided in 1962 to hold an inquiry on banking and finance, and in 1963 another inquiry on bilinguialism and biculturalism was initiated. In 1964 the first report of the Economic Council of Canada was presented to the House. Was it not a statement on Canada's economic goals to 1970?

Since 1965, what have the reports of the Tariff Board been used for?

Since 1966 what steps have been taken following the tabling of the report from the special joint committee on consumer credit?

Since the setting up, in 1966, of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, what measures have been taken to help the consumer?

In 1968, the elections were supposed to solve our economic problems, were they not? Certainly hon. members remember that those economic problems were said to be the result of a minority government. The solution then was to elect a majority government to restore the balance. And now, where is this marvelous balance that this government was supposed to maintain? In 1970, what will the Prices and Incomes Commission, created in 1969, bring us? Will it explain why Canadians should tighten their belts even more when their Prime Minister is increasing his expense account?

What was the use of these commissions and inquiries but to create new jobs for some friends of the government?

Since 1950, 106 commissions gave us to understand that studies were made. However, one thing is sure: those commissions have cost $69,931,417.08.

That is the amount mentioned in a return tabled on October 22, 1969 in answer to motion No. 2685 in the name of the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Dionne).

In the field of agriculture, for instance, four commissions which cost $1,255,000 did nothing more than to point to a glut of milk and wheat quite enough money has been spent just to learn that we have over produced.

Three commissions on finance have cost $1,865,000. They were charged to find, the means of hiding from the Canadian people the real causes of rising living costs. For the government only finance, the glorious, the devine finance, has priority.

Compared with the wishes and profits of finance, the life and the labour of the citizens are of very little importance. The life of the citizens is disregarded, their labour is overlooked and finance always comes first.

Citizens die, workers are unemployed, but finance brings profits. We remember that up to March 1967, the interest rate was frozen for banks, which are now authorized to lend ten times the amount of money they have.

We remember also that the wish of those banks to have this ceiling removed was fulfilled on March 22, 1967, when the Liberal government passed the act which freed them from those restrictions.

The results were not long in coming. Just have a look at some reports from those banks.

In the newspaper *La Presse*, for instance, on the 27th of November, 1967, we could read:

> 26.1 per cent increase in the holdings of the Bank of Nova Scotia.
>
> The final yield, a significant indicator of returns, reached—$3.30 per share—

When you know that the par value of the shares is $2, you cannot help finding out that the business is quite interesting.

The following applies to September 1969, and I quote:

> Increased earnings—Toronto Dominion Bank
>
> Final yields for the third quarter, before assigning losses and taxes, increased by 25.3 per cent—

The same newspaper also reports as follows:

> Total assets of the Bank of Montreal increased by 21 per cent.
>
> Net operating earnings of the Bank of Montreal, for nine months to the end of July, maintained the growth rate achieved in the first quarter of the current year; they are 33.1 per cent higher than earnings in the corresponding period last year.

The *La Presse* dated March 4, 1970, reported as follows:

> Net gains of 33.7 cents per Royal Bank share in the first quarter.

And here is what we could read in Quebec *l'Action* on June 19, 1970:

> Gains of leading Canadian banks . . . increased by 27 per cent.

The rest of the article said that in comparison with last year, the "champion" had been the Bank Canadian National whose assets increased by 60 per cent, followed by the Royal Bank whose assets were 42 per cent higher.

Thus, banks beat their own records. More and more, they pick in the pockets of people, with the results we know. Under the present legislation, indeed, a bank may get 9 per cent interest on $1,600, while it can loan that amount after a deposit of only $100 is made in an account. One has to admit that as an investment yield, it is hard to do any better.

There is also at the present time a housing shortage. In my opinion, slums should be cleared and rebuilt. We know that home building is an important factor as far as labour is concerned and that the financing of a house at lower interest rates would promote that sector of our economy.

The government which encourages certain countries by extending to them credit facilities at low interest rates should extend the same facilities to the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation which could then meet the requests of customers interested in borrowing at less than 9⅜ per cent.

In my opinion, a new start in housing construction does not require a miracle. It is merely a question of doing for Canada what we do for other countries. Since the 11 percent tax on building materials is never charged on products shipped to other countries, I suggest that it be cancelled also in Canada and that instead a 10 percent discount be granted on all materials sold in this country.

In order to assist this government pull the people out of the present crisis, I feel that there is another area worth considering, and that is our merchant navy.

When one sees that Canada does not own more than two merchant ships, whereas Sweden, with a population comparable with that of Quebec, owns a fleet comprising 1,092 units, one cannot help wondering.

When we know that during the years 1875-1880 our country ranked fourth among those that had a merchant marine, it seems queer to see our lakes and rivers deserted now.

If theoretically I am against royal inquiries, knowing the present condition of our merchant marine I would be in favour of initiating one in order to determine who has stolen our ships from us.

All the countries of the world, even those with less shoreline than Canada, take much pride in building and operating ocean-going cargoes.

Considering that our country has 59,670 miles of shoreline—nearly three times the circumference of the earth, the longest shoreline in the world—and that we have tremendous quantities of oil, grain, paper, wood, ore, asbestos, stone, granite and other merchandise to transport towards the great international markets, I endorse the recommendations by the CNTU as follows:

> Build an ocean-going merchant fleet designed to carry at least from 40 to 50 per cent of our exports and imports.
>
> Increase subsidies to Canadian shipbuilding so that Canadian shipping companies may order new ships at prices comparable with those they would pay in the United Kingdom.
>
> Adopt legislation favouring in concrete ways Canadian shipowners, seamen, shipyard workers and all manufacturing industries supplying material and equipment.
>
> Promote replacement of obsolete ships with speedy cargoes that can face foreign competition.
>
> Change the Navigation Act of 1934 to take into account present conditions of sea transport.
>
> Denounce the Commonwealth Navigation Convention (1931) and abolish the extraordinary privileges granted to those countries in order to protect our shipowners against competition from ships carrying the flags of the Commonwealth countries.
>
> Levy a 50 per cent tax on repairs, purchases of ocean-going ships or equipment made in foreign countries, except in cases of emergency.
>
> Restrict exclusively to ships registered and built in Canada and to really Canadian undertakings the use of our coastal and interior waters.
>
> We ask for the immediate construction of a powerful ocean-going merchant fleet, by and for Canadians, to carry at least part of the foreign trade of Canada.

With regard to another matter, there are two quite important groups of Canadians who are neglected: manufacturers of textiles and of shoes.

The government pretends that it just became aware of the situation and in order to improve it a Commission was established. Mr. Speaker, I already doubt its result since if the government had been wiser and more responsible, it would have referred a long time ago to the figures of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and it would have gotten itself acquainted with recommendations contained in briefs presented by executives of the textile industry.

But the government does not care for these briefs, whether they originate from the textile industry or other industries.

I have in hand a letter dated December 12, 1966, addressed to the government by the Canadian Footwear Manufacturers Association. This is what it says:

> Herewith a copy of a brief that we addressed to the Canadian Customs Tariffs and Trade Committee in order to inform the members of this Committee of the serious situation in which the footwear industry finds itself now.
>
> This brief is the fifth that we have sent to the Committee since May 15, 1964 and as you can notice, footwear exports are still increasing at an alarming rate.

Since then, this organization has been submitting briefs at a rate of about two each year, nearly always along the same lines, and as early as 1966 it was said that:

> Importation of footwear from low-wage countries and Communist states accounted for 47 per cent of our domestic production in 1966.

In order to help the Canadian shoe industry increase the number of jobs instead of reducing them, it is essential that the representatives of our government do not grant any tariff concessions in the trade discussions provided for under the Kennedy plan.

It is realized today that, under the Kennedy plan, some importers have been favoured by certain tariff changes.

Mr. Speaker, they have waited for the stores and warehouses to overflow, for plants to close their doors, and for thousands of workers to be unemployed, and now they hire three persons: Mr. Annis from Ottawa, Mr. St-Laurent, well known in Quebec political circles, and a person named Campbell.

Mr. Speaker, even if the name of the latter appears on soup cans, I still think that this commission's conclusions will be "for the birds".

Again, the government must stop questioning the value—

Mr. Deputy Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but I must advise him that his time has now expired.

• (5:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

Mr. Ray Perrault (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that all of us share a desire to provide more assistance for the unemployed. I am sure that none of us would claim to have a monopoly on good will toward those who are seeking employment or who have lost jobs because of economic vicissitudes.

As the motion before us indicates, this is not the responsibility of any one level of government. It is not the responsibility of the federal government alone, of municipal government alone or of provincial government alone. Indeed, the responsibility to combat the current unsatisfactory levels of unemployment in society cannot be confined to government alone and it is fair to say that it goes beyond government. The responsibility extends to all organized and unorganized groups and to the entire population of the country.

For example, the great trade union movement has a responsibility to provide leadership to find satisfactory solutions to the problem of unemployment. Management, similarly, has a responsibility. Those in our farm community have a similar responsibility. Another point has been made very clear by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) over the past two years. He has emphasized repeatedly that the job of managing the economy in this country involves the balancing of alternatives and designing policies which are not only satisfactory in the short run but are likely to achieve the best over-all results.

• (5:30 p.m.)

I have been in the House all afternoon and have listened to the speeches of opposition spokesmen. I have been profoundly disappointed by some of the speeches by these members who would like to replace the present government. I commend certain opposition members for their acutely developed powers of hindsight. As well, some of them have told us what is wrong, without providing solutions. I have a pamphlet which was written by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) in 1943. This eloquent member has been an author in his day. He defined all the problems at that time. He said "we must increase wage levels," "destroy the control of monopolies," "provide guarantees for security," "abandon colonialism" and "bring dignity and a racial harmony to Canada." But not a suggestion as to how. It is strange that after so many years in public life this man still fails to advance specific ideas and solutions to the problem of unemployment and other difficulties which beset our economy. His ability to provide original ideas is as elusive as the quest for the mother lode or as elusive as a piece of pork in a can of pork and beans.

What was the "solution" which he advanced today? He started by saying that we should begin our fight against unemployment by scheduling a federal-provincial-municipal conference. That idea is hardly revolutionary. And then we heard from the financial spokesman for the official opposition. He said the situation in the Maritimes is very difficult and that this government does not have an understanding of the unemployment situation there. He is suffering from at least one type of myopia or loss of memory.

In 1958, when the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) was Premier of Nova Scotia there was a Conservative government in Ottawa. The rates of Maritime unemployment in Nova Scotia were 11.2 per cent in 1958, 11.1 per cent in 1959, 10.6 in 1960 and 12.1 in 1961. We must not forget the history of this country. Those who advance easy solutions in this debate should be aware of the fact that when they had responsibility for government they were not able to provide easy solutions.

I will not spend a great deal of time on the first part of the motion. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) in his policy statement of October 13 and in reply to questions since then has reviewed the alternatives which confront the government at this time. Stated in its essence, this government, like all governments, has to make choices. It has had to make some basic decisions to get the most permanent results out of the limited amount of new funds which it can divert to government purposes—to direct as many additional resources as possible to measures which will benefit permanently the growth of the economy.

Last June the Minister of Finance announced accelerated and increased payments to the provinces in the amount of $75 million. In addition, $150 million remaining to be spent under the technical and vocational school training program are to be disbursed to the provinces in this fiscal year and the fiscal year 1971-72. On October 13 the Minister of Finance concluded that "the effect of these measures was to add $150 million to our budgetary requirements and $150 million to our non-budgetary requirements, or $300 million in all—a very considerable figure."

At the time of that policy speech the minister further announced that he would "ask the approval of Parliament for the expenditure"—this figure should be borne in mind when we talk in terms of increasing unemployment benefits on a temporary basis—"of an additional $60 million to be directed very specifically to the allevia-

tion of unemployment where the unemployment conditions are especially severe." This is being done. "Just under a third of this sum would be used by the Department of Manpower and Immigration in an extension of its manpower training program." Many of the programs involved in the $60 million are under way and new jobs are being created as a result of the funds which were allocated last spring and a month ago.

It is not correct to say that the government has been callously standing by while the unemployed have been suffering. The government has been investing enormous amounts of public money in programs which will give permanent benefits to the unemployed. The government is not merely adding a few dollars and saying its responsibility ends there; it has consciously designed programs to ensure that people will have employment on a continuing basis. In the Pacific region, where my home is, actual allowance payments and other training payments paid by Canada Manpower centres in 1968-69 alone amounted to $8,502,592—a substantial amount of money. This could mean not only long-term benefits for those who are unemployed—but long-term work opportunities and life incomes.

It is important to stress at this point the results which the government's fiscal and monetary measures have achieved. Consumer prices are now beginning to stabilize, as indicated by the fact that the consumer price index has remained stable for the last three months—not an insignificant fact. Investment and residential construction have risen to the point where housing starts are at a rate unprecedented in the history of this country. There is no need to emphasize further the very substantial reduction in interest rates which has taken place at all levels and in particular by the Banks of Canada.

It is strange how many critics blossom forth on the subject of so-called tight money and how little they say when those interest rates begin to decrease and the prime rate of interest eases. The silence is, to coin a phrase, "underwhelming." Yet, this process has been continuing for the past seven months but there has not been one acknowledgement today from the official opposition, although they should rejoice with us and the rest of Canada that interest rates are coming down. These are some of the positive results of the government's policy.

My main purpose for entering the debate is to discuss the second part of the motion which refers to increasing the amount of unemployment insurance benefits. All of us can understand the impatience which this motion implies. I can assure hon. members that the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) shares their desire to increase unemployment insurance benefits at the earliest possible date. The government has been urged to do this. Countless editorials have urged the minister to initiate action to bring about immediate temporary increases in unemployment insurance. There have been many communications from the public since the white paper on unemployment insurance was tabled in this House on June 17, 1970. Yet, as has been indicated, one must deploy as effectively and as beneficially as possible the limited funds available to the government at this time.

This does not constitute the main reason why the government sees certain difficulties in attempts to increase unemployment insurance benefits at this time. It is important to realize that there are no precedents for raising benefits without raising contributions or, in other words, for raising benefits out of general revenue. Hon. members know that one of the main purposes of the Canada Assistance Plan is to provide supplementary assistance to the unemployed. In fact, one of the original elements of the Canada Assistance Plan was the Unemployment Assistance Act of 1956. There are still agreements by some provinces that are carried out under the terms of the Unemployment Assistance Act.

• (5:40 p.m.)

The minister and the government realize that by many Canadians unemployment insurance or assistance in any direct form is labelled welfare and has a bad connotation. I shall not attempt to identify the reasons for this, but hon. members should be reminded that this form of providing for the unemployed, where there is a basic insurance program supplemented by an assistance program, is the normal pattern in most European countries and in the United States. Be that as it may, no one on this side will deny the need for bringing unemployment insurance benefits up to date. This is certainly one of the basic reasons for the white paper which the Minister of Labour presented last June.

During the consideration of the white paper proposals there has been some excellent co-operation from some hon. members on the opposition side. I think it has been a very useful exercise indeed. The hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) and others have made a constructive contribution to this dialogue. I think they appreciate more than anyone else how earnest the government is in its desire to bring in unemployment insurance reforms.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Perrault: I was dismayed to hear the hon. member for York South criticize the preliminary remarks of the Minister of Labour. He suggested there had been a less than frank disposition on the part of the minister to use certain unemployment figures correctly. This is the same Minister of Labour who has expressed his deep concern about the unemployed in the words of his white paper:

> People such as the hired hand on a wheat farm in Alberta; the fisherman casting his nets for cod off the banks of Newfoundland; the young Gaspé-born clerk working by day in a large corporation and taking college courses at night; the newly-arrived immigrant who knows little English or French and possesses few skills, but who is determined to make his way in a complex Canadian city such as Toronto or Montreal.

And then:

> The rewards of economic growth should be directed not only toward the individuals who have had the opportunity for a good education, a well paid job, a two-car garage and a home in the country. They are also for the widow or divorcee who has to raise her children alone on minimum wages earned working long hours in an inner-city garment factory; for the youth who has had to drop out of school to help his family and now finds his particular skill is no longer needed in a sophisticated eco-

nomy; and for the man over 40 who is jobless, not because he is untrained, but because in our youth-oriented society he is considered too old.

The minister went on to say:

In the 70s, it is fully expected that temporary unemployment will be a possibility for a broader spectrum of the Canadian work force than ever before.

Some of the figures which have been placed before us today reflect the minister's views—these figures, which disturb members of all parties, reflect the widespread technological displacement of labour in this country. This is precisely one of the reasons we need the wide-ranging reforms in unemployment insurance which were brought into the House by the Minister of Labour—the minister who has been criticized unfairly, in my view, this afternoon. It is to be hoped all members of the House realize that no new program of the magnitude of the new unemployment insurance program can be put into effect without a great deal of thought and planning, and that it would be wrong to set aside the far-reaching and comprehensive plan now under review in favour of stopgap, short-term modifications. Surely the present arrangements require something more than patchwork. They must be replaced by an over-all plan which will provide new and meaningful benefits for the work force.

The plan which is now before the House and, specifically, before the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, is the product of two years of hard work and planning by the government. Yes, and now with the co-operation of government and opposition members. Of those two years, close to six months was required to review and approve the proposal in all its aspects, to write the white paper, print it and distribute it. The government in no way apologizes for the time required to achieve an adequate public understanding of the white paper and to enable Canadians to express their views. Additional time has been required for this review by the public and by the House committee. Certainly, the work of the Standing Committee under the able chairmanship of the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. Weatherhead) deserves commendation.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. I regret to interrupt the hon. member, but the time allotted to him has expired.

Mr. Lincoln M. Alexander (Hamilton West): Mr. Speaker, I am afraid the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault) who sits with me on the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration, presently dealing with unemployment insurance, has missed the purport of the motion before the House. The first part of the preamble to that motion reads:

Whereas there has been a relentless upward climb in the level of unemployment in all regions of Canada—

I do not think the hon. member will disagree with that. The motion continues:

Whereas a number of responsible economic authorities have predicted record levels of unemployment this coming winter—

I believe the hon. member will agree with that, too. Then there is a third paragraph, one which is of some concern to me, I should like to discuss it as it applies to the province of Quebec, the city of Hamilton and, indeed, to all regions. One thing which puzzles me is that a country which is so rich in resources, so rich in technical know-how, so industrially advanced and served by so many employable people who wish to work, should find itself in a position calling for a motion such as we have before us today.

I am not saying the government has intentionally and heartlessly followed a program designed to bring about the present state of affairs, but I do say the government is proving itself complacent and apathetic in the face of it. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) told us that he had been concerned ever since the sixties by the trend which showed there was an acceleration of inflation to an extent which threatened not only Canadian economic development but Canadian unity itself. It seems to me that rising unemployment also threatens not only the stability of our economy but the stability of the whole nation. A balance must be maintained. At present the scale seems to tipping away from the government in this regard.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) takes an attitude which can only be called complacent and apathetic. The Premier of Ontario says rising unemployment has been deliberately brought about by policies adopted in Ottawa. The answer given by the Prime Minister some time ago spoke of unemployment as being a regrettable side effect of government fiscal and monetary policy. Surely we must take note of the disastrous side effects of this policy on those unable to combat it successfully. I think it is time the government reassessed the regrettable side effects of its fiscal and monetary policies.

An editorial which appeared on Wednesday in the Toronto *Telegram* of October 11 stated:

In Quebec we are seeing how social unrest caused in part by chronically high unemployment has been a root cause of political extremism. If regional unemployment goes unsolved elsewhere no one can be sure violence will not be tried again in other parts of Canada.

It appears to me that the government is ignoring the frustration of the old, the anger of the young, the hopelessness of the poverty-stricken and the frustrated incentive of employables. It seems to me that the prospects of revolution will be determined to some extent by the social and economic status achieved by the groups I have just mentioned. It seems to me that we have been dealing with the effects. We must not let the War Measures Act and the temporary emergency powers bill cloud our vision and turn us away from a study of the causes. One has only to look back over the past couple of weeks to a policy adopted by politicians in the country to the south of us who tried to emphasize the need for law and order, a policy that was not accepted by the vast majority of Americans. They were more concerned, as I have often said, with the nuts and bolts, nitty-gritty issues, one of which of prime importance is unemployment.

• (5:50 p.m.)

We have found that those politicians who concentrated on attempting to alleviate the horrendous suffering from unemployment were, generally speaking, successful. It has been projected that this winter, out of a labour force of about 8,400,000 there will be a vast army of 750,000 to 800,000 men and women making a frustrating and disillusioning struggle for economic survival. In the Atlantic provinces the projected figure of unemployment is 18 per cent, in Quebec 12 per cent and Ontario is sneaking up to 6 per cent.

Donald MacDonald, president of the Canadian Labour Congress, has said that as far as he is concerned unemployment this winter will be around 9 per cent, or 750,000 people. It does not matter to the man who is unemployed whether we talk about the seasonally adjusted rate, the unadjusted rate or any other rate; all he is concerned with is that he will be one of the 750,000 people out of work in and around the month of February. This is the situation to which we should direct our attention. What disturbs me is that the Prime Minister has indicated that such a rate has not been predicted by any responsible source.

Mr. Olson: Stick to the facts.

Mr. Alexander: I repeat what was said by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis). He put on record some responsible views on this matter. For example, he mentioned Mr. Forrest Rogers, who is an economic adviser to the Bank of Nova Scotia. Mr. Rogers said that unemployment would be around 8½ per cent but he would not argue that we could not reach 9 per cent or even go beyond. Reference was also made to Professor Sidney Ingerman, a labour economist at McGill University, who said that the actual rate of unemployment nationally will be in the area of 9 per cent. The hon. member did not remember the prediction of Premier Ed Schreyer, but according to my information he predicted an annual unemployment rate of 9 per cent.

The Lord above did not give all the brains to members on the other side of the House. Many members of the House as well as people without the confines of this grand chamber have sufficient expertise and economic background to challenge the government and its bureaucrats. My leader referred to the unemployment figures, actual and adjusted, between the years 1960 and 1970. I should like to refer to another responsible paper, the *Financial Times,* which last month suggested that if this pattern of increasing unemployment, be it seasonally adjusted or actual, is not reversed, by February and March of 1971 there will be a rate of unemployment of 9 per cent to 10 per cent, or more than 750,000 Canadians out of work.

Reference was made to the rate of unemployment, adjusted and actual, in 1961. These figures led in 1962 to an actual rate of unemployment of 8.5 per cent in January, 9.1 per cent in February and 8.7 per cent in March. Therefore, unless the present pattern is reversed one can easily accept the statement that we might have 750,000 people out of work this winter or even as many as one million.

I see my time is running out. This has been a constructive debate. The hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour said that the NDP had nothing to say. Perhaps I am wrong and it was another member who said that the NDP had nothing constructive to say. I ask hon. members to refer to the speech made by the hon. member for York South, wherein he placed before the government many constructive ideas. In addition, I emphasize the points that were made by the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield).

When one listens to members who come from slow-growth regions of Canada, one must remember that Canada is divided into five economic sectors. These divisions are the Atlantic provinces, Quebec, Ontario, the Prairies and British Columbia. These regions differ in terms of employment, rates of growth and composition of output. I do not think the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson), who is looking at me, would disagree with that. I should like to know why the government implements policies meant for the over-all good of the country but which nevertheless have disastrous effects on certain regions.

In closing, may I say that this motion is an important one. We must continually press the government to take responsibility for this situation, because the projected level of unemployment for February and March of next year is unacceptable. I return to my original premise, that we must concern ourselves not so much with the effects as with the causes of revolutionary movement. Revolutionaries prey upon the discontented. They prey upon those who are without proper housing, those who feel there is no room for them in our established, democratic way of life. It does not matter to me how many of these people there are; as long as our programs are not geared to assist those who are frustrated, in my view we are in for trouble.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. It being six o'clock I do now leave the chair. The House will meet again at 8 p.m.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

AFTER RECESS

The House resumed at 8 p.m.

Mr. James Hugh Faulkner (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, the debate so far has ranged rather loosely over various forms of criticism directed at the government's monetary and fiscal policies. I think it can probably be reduced to simply a judgment of our timing or fine tuning, to use the words of Milton Friedman. Basically, it is reduced to a matter of judgment as to the wisdom of the timing or fine tuning of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) versus the allegedly more accurate and more refined tuning of those opposite.

There has been little offered in support of the contention that their handling of the situation would have been any better. I shall not get into that area because it does not seem to be one that is very effectively dealt with by the opposition.

I should like to come to grips with what is, surely, part of the problem in respect of unemployment and specifically an industry which is of central importance to our economy, an industry that has over the past few years been living in a state of siege beleaguered by imports from low-wage countries, an industry which in my view should be a key sector of our economy, with policy developed accordingly. I am referring to the electrical industry. I propose to deal with it in two sections. I should like to relate the position of the electrical industry to two policy statements which have come from the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce, both of which I concur with and both of which I consider to be directly relevant to the situation in which the electrical industry finds itself. These statements offered some hope of reprieve from what otherwise might have been a very damaging and potentially dangerous situation.

I do not have to remind you, Mr. Speaker, of the importance of this industry because you know it as well as I. You know the range of engineers, draftsmen, workers and scientists employed by the industry and you are aware of the level of research and development carried out by it. You know its record in the field of nuclear research and atomic power development. Right now it faces some very serious threats.

I want first of all to deal with the potential problem of offshore concessional financing, specifically as this relates to mining contracts and projects. I am speaking specifically of the Iron Ore Company of Canada in the Sept Îles area and other mining projects which might also be affected by the situation in respect of offshore concessional financing. I begin by referring to a statement made by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce (Mr. Pepin) in the House on May 26, 1970, which appears in *Hansard* at page 7319. It was a statement on Motions under the heading "Announcement of program to alleviate adverse impact of concessional financing by foreign governments".

The minister in his statement recognized clearly that the manufacturing industry had been making representations to the government concerning what it considered to be highly attractive financing terms available to their competitors abroad. In his statement at page 7319, the minister on behalf of the government said:

> The government is satisfied that in several instances the availability to foreign manufacturers of export credit at lower rates of interest has resulted in substantial loss of business to individual Canadian companies which otherwise would have been competitive in price, performance and delivery.

The minister went on to recognize the difficulties or dangers involved in a full-scale credit race and concluded, prior to stating his policy recommendations, with this statement:

> —the government has decided to take a number of steps designed to mitigate the adverse impact of foreign government financing of exports to Canada which causes injury to Canadian industry.

He went on to mention four proposals, one of which relates to the invocation of the provision of the anti-dumping act. He said:

> First, Canada will use all available means consistent with its international obligations to curtail foreign government financing of exports to Canada in cases where it causes material injury to Canadian industry. In this context, consideration will be given to invoking the provisions of the anti-dumping act in specific cases.

One of the steps he suggests the government should take involves closer co-operation with the OECD to work out arrangements in respect of concessional financing in trade between developing countries. He raises other points and emphasizes certain proposals to deal with this problem.

I think all of us in this House strongly support the position outlined by the minister on May 26. All of us, particularly those who represent ridings which have industrial manufacturers within their boundaries, realize the importance of this statement. It so happens that right now one of the important industries, namely, the electrical industry, is faced with the prospect of offshore concessional financing which, if not matched by a Canadian equivalent, could lead to the loss of a large number of jobs related to mining projects in Quebec. I have in mind jobs that could be handled by Canadian manufacturers who are totally competitive. These jobs could be lost simply because the accounting is wrong, because offshore concessional financing is not matched by an equivalent in this country.

I refer specifically to the Iron Ore Company of Canada and a project there which could involve some $200 million. The part of the project which could be handled by Canadian manufacturers in the electrical sector amounts to at least $15 million, and the part in the mechanical sector—such as pelletizing equipment, grinding mills, etc.—probably runs in the area of $60 million. Canadian manufacturers are competitive in every sense of the word, in these particular areas and probably in others. At least in these areas there is no question at all about competitiveness. But there are competitive United States suppliers who would have available to them, through concessional financing, terms which could make the Iron Ore Company of Canada lean toward United States suppliers rather than toward Canadian suppliers.

• (8:10 p.m.)

What this mean in terms of jobs, and in this debate we are concerned about unemployment, I can only guess. My guess would be that in the electrical sector it would probably mean 750 man-years, but in terms of related industries such as steel and aluminum, plus the service industries, that figure could probably be tripled. This is a specific contract in respect of the Iron Ore Company of Canada where concessional financing is being offered, but there are other companies in respect of which it is not yet offered. However, if concessional financing is not matched in this case,—all subsequent contracts may well be affected.

My point is that until the principles laid down in the statement of May 26 are enforced by general agreement, or until through co-operation and consultation with the OECD ground rules are laid down governing concessional financing between developed countries, we in this country must match the sort of concessional financing that threatens the manufacturing sector. This clearly is not in our interest in the long term because it would become a full-scale credit war, which benefits no one. But until comparable terms can be made available or until agreement can be reached, we must offer comparable terms.

I am aware that the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and the Minister of Finance know about this situation. The guideline in the May 26 statement is there and it becomes critical that through a consortium of our chartered banks comparable terms be offered so that Canadian manufacturers can compete with their United States equivalent. Otherwise the jobs involved, the technology, the drafting, the engineering and the whole range of skills in general will be lost to our competitors in the United States.

I see that I am running short of time. The second point I should like to raise concerns the Canadian electrical industry generally. It seems to me that what is needed now, and what has been argued for for some time, is a general review by the federal government and by the provincial governments—because some of their agencies are utilizers of electrical equipment, particularly the power utilities—plus the Canadian Electrical Manufacturers Association and the trade unions involved, such as the United Electrical Workers and others.

There should be a review of government policy as it affects the Canadian electrical industry. There are two fundamental facts available to anyone who reviews the situation. The first is that the industry has not realized its full growth potential. Second, areas of the industry are under a state of siege. In today's *Globe and Mail* there is an announcement to the effect that Philips Electronics Industries Limited of Toronto will close down its division. We have known that the Marconi Company has laid off 800 and intends to lay off another 700. The Canadian General Electric plant at Rexdale, and other companies, are involved in lay-offs.

This is an important sector of the industry which has employed a large number of Canadians and Canadian skills. As I said earlier, areas of the industry are in a state of siege. I think the only possible approach at this stage is not to try to balance out a particular sector in an ad hoc way, but to review the total electrical industry and make a decision concerning its importance to our economy. My argument is that this is a key sector of the economy whose importance should be assessed from the point of view of the technology it contributes, the engineering it contributes, the employment it provides and the growth potential it offers and its relevance to a science-based economy. On that basis I believe it can be declared an industry of national importance and one in respect of which a policy should be developed to ensure that its growth potential is developed.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw your attention to the textiles policy. The textiles policy is one which everyone cannot help but support. It is one of the most intelligent pieces of government initiative in the field of industrial policy which I have observed. What were the reasons for the review? I quote from the statement on textiles policy as follows:

> Firstly, major and fundamental changes in world technology, production and market demand are creating a new competitive situation ... Secondly, present policy designed to cope with the problem of "low-cost" imports have become increasingly difficult to administer. This has led to delays and uncertainties which have resulted in severe disruption and hardship to producers and workers.
>
> Thirdly, the textile companies, the unions and the provinces have expressed concern about the adequacy of the present policy in terms of future investments and employment in the industry ...

The position of the textile companies applies equally to the electrical companies. I suggest that the reasons for the review of textiles policy are on all fours with the situation about which we complain today in the electrical industry. The reason this very intelligent, progressive and in many ways imaginative textiles policy was evolved applies equally to the electrical industry.

In conclusion, I wish to repeat the electrical industry is basic and central to our economy. I consider others to be important, but the electrical industry has been in a state of siege from Japan, Hong Kong and a whole range of low-wage countries. The purpose of my intervention tonight is to stress the importance of this industry and the importance of a government policy vis-à-vis the industry. For these reasons I have raised the question and I hope the government will reappraise its policies regarding this particular industry.

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, I find the speech of the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour, the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault), and the speech of the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Faulkner) interesting because both hon. members scold our party for moving this resolution. The hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour said we have offered nothing constructive and that there are more people working now than ever before. He ignores the fact that unemployment in Canada is higher than it has been for a dozen or more years, and that unemployment in British Columbia in October of 1970 was 69,000, compared with 40,000 in October of last year.

The hon. member for Peterborough says our criticism of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) is one of fine tuning. He disagrees as to when certain measures should be taken and then proceeds to lecture the minister about circumstances in the electrical industry. I agree with him, but why does he say this situation applies particularly to the electrical industry? It is a very large employer in his constituency and therefore he makes representations on behalf of the industry. I do not blame him.

We are not concerned only with the electrical industry. We are concerned about the high rate of unemployment throughout this country. It is now agreed by experts in

federal and provincial governments, in the business community, in labour circles, among economists and in the academic community that the prospects for higher unemployment are now very great and that heavy unemployment will continue, not just through the winter but into and possibly through the whole of 1971.

• (8:20 p.m.)

I say to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Labour, who said that we had nothing concrete to offer, that we have said for the last two years that in choosing to make the increasing cost of living a more important issue than rising unemployment the government was making the wrong choice and we would wind up with both a higher cost of living and higher unemployment. In fact, we have been proven correct, as have the academic economists who have argued to that effect even longer than we have.

A very conservative estimate of the situation, made by a leading academic economist who I saw about a week ago, is that we will have this winter a seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment of more than 7 per cent and that the picture for the whole of 1971 will run at not less than 6 per cent, seasonally adjusted. Unemployment in Canada rose from 314,000 last year to 419,000 in October of 1970. That is an increase of 33-1/3 per cent. It is little comfort to the 419,000 unemployed to tell them that more people are working than ever before; it does not help them to meet the bills they have to pay in order to live.

In Quebec, unemployment rose from 135,000 in October of last year to 159,000 in October of this year. The economist whom I have consulted estimates that unemployment in January of 1971 will be 789,000 and in February of 1971 it will be 811,000—9.8 per cent of the labour force, or a seasonally adjusted rate of 7.2 per cent. That is not very far from the calculations which Mr. MacDonald, president of the Canadian Labour Congress, made recently and which the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) derided so stridently the other day.

What do these national unemployment figures mean? We have been spending most of the time since the House reconvened this fall discussing the problems of Quebec. Every Member of Parliament is concerned about the violence, the bombings and the kidnappings with which Quebec has been afflicted. We in this party who have been critical of the government's reaction to the events in Quebec, and who have been told that we do not understand Quebec because we do not have a Member of Parliament from that province—and of course we do not—do know that a seasonally adjusted unemployment rate of 7 per cent nationally means 9 per cent unemployment in Quebec.

Quebec has consistently had 20 per cent to 50 per cent higher unemployment than the Canadian average and an unemployment rate about twice as high as that of the province of Ontario. Quebec, which contains 25 per cent of the Canadian population, has consistently had about 40 per cent of the unemployment. When you realize that four out of ten unemployed people in Quebec are under 25 years of age, you appreciate the dimensions of the problem.

The Prime Minister recently said in a television interview that one of his main objectives was to get the people of Quebec to choose between federalism and separatism. I say—and I say it with a good deal of regret—that given the unemployment among young people which I have mentioned, it is not surprising that the young people of Quebec in the last election seemed to opt so heavily for the Parti Quebecois. If we want to do something to maintain federalism, it is not good enough to say, as the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance have said so often, that heavier unemployment is just one of the side effects we have to face in dealing with the problem of rising costs.

What about the future of Quebec? Mr. Bourassa in his election campaign promised that he would produce 100,000 new jobs by the end of 1971. But this year only 3,000 new jobs were produced in the province of Quebec, compared with the fact which was pointed out by Dion Cohen, who writes a column in the Toronto *Star* every week, that in each of the next ten years the Quebec labour market will grow by 75,000 workers a year.

To cut unemployment in Quebec to 6 per cent, which is still intolerably high, Quebec would need to attract about $7 billion in investment every year for the next ten years. That is a goal hopelessly out of the reach of that province, on the basis of past performance, without very great assistance from the federal government. Yet we have a federal government which is concerned about federalism and simply says, "We cannot do anything about Quebec or about unemployment because we have to deal with higher prices."

The large increase in unemployment has meant sharp increases in welfare costs in cities in every province of Canada. It is true that half the costs are paid by the federal government, but this is of little consolation to hard-pressed taxpayers at the municipal level. Every city and every province in Canada which budgeted for sharply increased welfare costs this year has found that despite those increases in the estimates, they put much too little into their budgets to meet the increased costs of welfare. The skyrocketing costs of welfare are to a large extent the result of rising unemployment.

We have been told we have offered nothing concrete in the way of programs to deal with the problem of unemployment. As I indicated earlier, that of course is not true. We have said for the last two years at least that it is impossible for Canada to do much about the rising cost of living when inflation has gripped every country in the western world. Canada buys more from the United States and sells more to that country than any other country with which we deal, and when the U.S. is gripped by inflation it is simply nonsense to think that we can check inflation in Canada.

We warned the government that its policy of restraint and deflation would mean higher unemployment and difficult living conditions for the working poor and those on fixed incomes such as pensions and welfare. This, of course, is what has happened. We have been saying all

along, and will continue to say, that if the government has to choose between full employment and a gradually rising cost of living, or no increase in the cost of living and heavy unemployment, it should opt for full employment. That is what we would have done and that is precisely the policy the government of Canada rejected, basing its policy on the advice it received from the head of the Bank of Canada, the Deputy Minister of Finance and the chairman of the Prices and Incomes Commission. They opted for restraint and we are suffering as a result.

• (8:30 p.m.)

Provincial governments are becoming concerned. A few days ago the Conservative Premier of Ontario, Mr. Robarts, made it clear he was going to consider what programs his government could initiate in order to put people to work in that province. On October 30 the government of Manitoba announced a program to alleviate as much as possible the heavy unemployment expected in that province. It will draw on the $74 million capital fund placed in its estimates as a reserve against unemployment. It will go ahead as quickly as possible with a program to build schools, improve its university, provide public housing and a host of other projects. It expects to be able to gainfully employ in the neighbourhood of 10 per cent of those expected to be unemployed this winter.

We urge the government of Canada to join with the provinces and not wait for the provinces to come forward with proposals. The government should call a conference. That does not sound very revolutionary and in fact it is not; it is too late to be revolutionary about employment for this winter. The government should call a conference with the provinces at which the larger cities would be represented, to see what programs they have ready and to see what the federal government can do to finance those programs.

It is not good enough to say that we have more people working than ever before. It is not good enough to say that the percentage of unemployment is less than it was. The fact remains that this winter we will have 800,000 people unemployed; we will have a higher unemployment rate than any other industrialized country. That is something of which all Members of Parliament, regardless of party affiliation, ought to be ashamed. I close by urging the government to change its priorities, to make full employment a more urgent objective that the illusory goal for which it has been striving, that of holding the line on rising costs—a goal that can only be achieved and has only been achieved at the expense of the poor people of this country.

[*Translation*]

Mr. J.-A. Mongrain (Trois-Rivières): Mr. Speaker, I spent the whole day listening with the greatest possible attention to the remarks of my hon. colleagues, and I come to the conclusion that though many of their arguments were brilliant, they have said countless useless things. Were businessmen from the various parts of the country—company directors, for instance—to attend our debates, they would be shocked to hear us jabbering away for days on end, to solve such matters as that before the House. They would tell us: "Solve the problem, legislate, instead of repeating the same things over and over again."

Naturally, that is part of the procedure and one must submit to it. That is why, in part, I am following the bad example and making a few remarks. I shall try not to repeat what has been said up to this point, Mr. Speaker.

I apologize for the looseness of my remarks but I do not want to repeat what has been said before. For instance, the government has been accused of implementing an unsound economic policy. I question the competence of those who say such things when in all countries, namely the United States, world renowned economists such as President Nixon's advisers, disagree about inflation and hold views diametrically opposed to those of experts as competent as they are. I wonder where my hon. colleagues who blame the government for having followed such or such economic principle in its fight against inflation, have collected their information.

After having read the notice of motion, I was satisfied and convinced that nobody would object to it. Since it justifies the action taken by the government months ago, why spend a whole day on it?

A whole series of measures are already in force. We could have devoted this day to pass some of them in order to speed up our business, but obviously this is part of the political tactics of the opposition. I noticed that some of my collagues opposite whose sincerity is apparent at times were reluctant to make certain bold statements.

As for me, I will simply point out what has been done in my area. Incidentally, I thank my friends opposite for showing a special concern for the province of Quebec in their notice of motion. It was time Parliament saw to it. In the last 100 years, there has been no excess of sympathy in this house for Quebec. On behalf of my province, I therefore wish to thank the mover for his thought which will certainly do no harm.

From 1968 to 1969 in my riding, the federal government paid $845,732 to retrain the unemployed. It is obvious that this is a worthwhile effort. Then during the same period, it granted the unemployed $995,800 in living allowances. Furthermore, from 1969 to 1970 allowances were granted to 1,260 people to help them retrain, improve their education, teach them new trades so as to enable them to earn a living. And the federal government spent the amount of $1,080,000 in my riding with a population of 150,000 distributed over three municipalities. I refer to my riding, but I imagine that the same thing applies in most other constituencies of the province.

In 1969-70, the federal government spent $12,058,000 for the building of technical schools or CEGEPs. In my view, that is an effort to reduce unemployment.

My colleague spoke a moment ago about the policy concerning the textile industry. That new policy has been of help to us because we have in our province an important industry, called Wabasso Cotton, which is nationally known. The new policy has not yet produced all the results we expected of it.

• (8:40 p.m.)

On behalf of the company, I thank the government for such a policy which has prevented unemployment on a large scale in our community since Wabasso Cotton employs thousands of workers.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to hear the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) tell us that next year millions of dollars will be invested in new industries across the country and I lost no time in inquiring to what extent my constituency will benefit from that. Charity begins at home.

I therefore found out that the Department of Regional Economic Expansion has received 22 requests from industries wishing to settle in my constituency, and which will benefit all, if their applications are approved, from government incentives, contributing thus to reduce the rate of unemployment, a realization much more efficient than any speech.

I am not talking about the substantial grants made, for instance, to composite schools, about the $4.5 million granted recently to the municipality of Trois-Rivières, under the designated areas program, for housing projects. Because of certain representations, this assistance has been considerably increased, with the result that today, we have in our region a fairly decent employment rate.

For instance, certain amounts were allocated to the construction of decent housing for some 3,000 or 4,000 students of our University of Quebec, and there were many more. Therefore, the government has done something, and if the opposition wanted to be efficient, rather than waste a day in yacking, it would say: We will study the next measure and try to adopt it as soon as possible in order to reduce the unemployment rate. I believe that this would solve many more problems than all the palaver we now have all day. I apologize for behaving as badly as some others, but it is very easy to be led astray, even with the best intentions.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a correction. It was said that the situation which exists in Quebec, this uprising of a few FLQ members, could be a movement of revolt from young people who are held in unemployment and who are dissatisfied with the government. Well, I have another explanation. I know a good deal about this matter, because I have been studying it for the last 25 or 30 years.

Young Quebecers have 200 years of frustration rankling in their mind. They are trying to eliminate them. It was only recently that our English friends from other parts of the country realized that Quebec has the right to live on equal terms with everyone. I am not a separatist, but a federalist. I had to fight for being a federalist, and I still believe in federalism. I remember when I first came to Ottawa, people would tell me to "speak white" whenever I used the French language. I could relate scores of such incidents where French Canadians, barely accepted, were insulted. We are now attempting to redeem two centuries of history and this cannot be done in a year or two. The government under the Right Hon. Mr. Pearson initiated this movement and our present government under the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) is carrying on. I call upon all my friends of the opposition who, I am sure, are true Canadian patriots, to co-operate with us in order that we may achieve the understanding which is required to have all Quebecers accepted on an equal footing everywhere in Canada, in all fields of endeavour. Thus there will be fewer FLQ members and fewer unemployed people.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Hon. Théogène Ricard (Saint-Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, upon reading the motion of the hon. member for York South, it is impossible not to note three very important points.

First of all, there is an unrelenting escalation of the unemployment level in all regions of Canada.

Then, those responsible in the field of economy foresee a still higher level of unemployment during the winter months.

Finally, substantial measures should be taken immediately to eliminate that unfavourable situation in the province of Quebec and particularly in the city of Montreal.

Mr. Speaker, what is the present situation in the province of Quebec and throughout Canada? The government members, particularly the one who has just sat down, may attempt by their speeches to convince the people that everything is for the best, but it remains, nevertheless, that there were, throughout the country, 419,000 unemployed workers in October 1970. These 419,000 people have the right to work but they cannot find employment because of the lack of foresight of those sitting on the government side.

In October 1970, the number of unemployed persons in Canada exceeded by 105,000 the number recorded in October last year and by 21,000 the number recorded in September of this year. In fact 6.6 per cent of the labour force is unemployed.

There was a time when we were sitting on the opposite side of the House and when those now sitting there were on this side. We heard quite a lot about unemployment in those days.

There could not be a lay-off without the three most influential Liberals, namely Messrs. Pickersgill, Chevrier and Martin, rising to sympathize with the unemployed workers' fate. And the story we now hear from the former mayor of Trois-Rivières and from others is quite different from what we heard in those days.

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. The hon. member for Trois-Rivières on a question of privilege.

Mr. Mongrain: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend for whom I have a great deal of esteem and whom I know to be very

honest, has just said that all those who sit on this side used to sit on his side. I have never sat on that side.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. I shall point out to the hon. member for Trois-Rivières that there is no foundation to his question of privilege and that the hon. member for Saint-Hyacinthe has the floor.

Mr. Ricard: What is the situation in the province of Quebec, Mr. Speaker? In October 1970, there were 159,000 unemployed. This is a record which does not cheer me up. In Quebec, 8.8 per cent of the working population is unemployed.

It is the responsibility of the members of the opposition to call the attention of the government members to their responsibilities and to make sure that they assume them.

By looking at their previous speeches, it is clear that they are responsible for providing employment to those who want to work, but however 159,000 people are unemployed in the province of Quebec.

What is still worse, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the forecast for the winter months is even darker. It is estimated, in some quarters, that there will be from 750,000 to 800,000 unemployed in Canada. Are we justified in protesting loudly and asking the ministers and the hon. members opposite to do something to alleviate unemployment, this cancer of our society.

• (8:50 p.m.)

It is also disturbing to realize that unemployment periods last longer. In October 1970, 74,000 people had been unemployed for a period of four to six months. This represents 18 per cent of the unemployed, in that category. For the corresponding period last year, there were 42,000, or only 13 per cent of the unemployed.

As to those who have been unemployed more than six months, there were 72,000 in October, that is 17 per cent of the unemployed, while in October 1969, 46,000 were in that category, that is 15 per cent, and fiery speeches, appeasement speeches from the other side of this House will not succeed in disproving those facts based on D.B.S. figures.

In the building sector, 34,000 jobs were lost in October 1970; among the bush workers, there are 10,000 fewer jobs than last September.

And who is responsible for that situation? It will be recalled that in order to fight inflation, this government found that solution, namely create unemployment and thus fight inflation at the expense of workers, farmers and low income groups. That is an inhuman way, I repeat it, following my leader who said so on several occasions in this House, and the government has no reason to be pleased. Instead of coming up with an expansion policy, the government has found nothing better than to implement restrictive measures in order to create unemployment.

Mr. Speaker, I would be angry with myself if I did not take advantage of the few minutes I still have to once more point out the situation prevailing in my constituency.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps for the twentieth time, I will say that 20 per cent of the labour force is unemployed in the Saint-Hyacinthe area. What are the reasons for such unemployment? I shall mention the closing of some plants a reduction of personnel on account of foreign competition and the adverse effect of the refusal of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) to recognize as a designated zone the Saint-Hyacinthe area, though all the required criteria for designation apply to it. The city council, the common front of Saint-Hyacinthe and I myself made representations to the minister, but we all met with a refusal.

A while ago I said that some plants had closed down in the Saint-Hyacinthe area. According to a study made last summer by the Richelieu-Yamaska Social Development Council, from 1964 to March 1970, we lost ten industries that were providing work to at least 494 employees.

In the field of shoe manufacturing, we have also lost at least one industry that employed several hundred workers. According to this study, we have lost the share that the Saint-Hyacinthe region had a right to expect, had it been fairly treated by the federal government.

I would like to quote a few excerpts from this study in order to put on record what our people think of the refusal by this government to make the Saint-Hyacinthe region a designated area. After considering the reasons why the federal government disregarded the Saint-Hyacinthe-Drummondville region for the development of an international airport, the report states, and I quote:

The federal government, for technical as well as economical reasons, did not comply with a request submitted by the province of Quebec on behalf of the Yamaska region.

We venture to think that no political consideration intervened in the rejection of the Saint-Hyacinthe region as the airport site and as a designated area.

And further, we can read:

In support of this hope, let us mention that the "Snow Jet" plant, which would have created 700 immediate jobs, chose to locate in Drummondville, not in Saint-Hyacinthe, for the only reason that the economic advantages were better there.

This is, in my opinion, and in the opinion of my people, an injustice to our region. I would again draw the attention of hon. members and, in particular, of the powers responsible, one of which is the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, to this fact, so that this injustice can be corrected as soon as possible.

It has often been repeated today that the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) had announced a series of measures which had already been put into effect to remedy this situation. It must be recognized that if these measures were actually taken, then they were inadequate, since the unemployment rate only keep rising month after month. It is the responsibility of those who sit on treasury benches to see that this situation, which is degrading for the workers, is eliminated as soon as possible.

Winter work subsidies must be reinstated to meet the requirements of municipalities, and the 12 per cent tax on building materials must be removed in order to give new impetus to the building industry.

Besides, arrangements must be entered into with the province of Quebec to give the premier of this province, who promised 100,000 jobs, an opportunity to keep his promise.

Mr. Speaker, the people will not be content with promises any longer, and disorders will keep increasing, unless the people are given what they have a right to.

[*English*]

Mr. Hu Harries (Edmonton-Strathcona): Mr. Speaker, the motion addresses itself to the short-term future. It would be difficult to deny that in that time we will be facing some immediate and important economic difficulties, although we may well differ on our description of the magnitude and causes of the difficulties. Without belabouring the obvious, it may be useful to define three segments of the economy that should be considered.

The first segment is that which is continuing to undergo technological readjustment. I am referring to the farmers on the Prairies and other regions of Canada, fishermen, lumber operators and others involved in small-scale resource industries. These people are not restricted to any particular geographical region, but they do constitute a separate and important force in the economy.

Second, we must consider the special geographic areas where, due to a combination of labour force and capital circumstances, there is a failure to get the needed economic expansion. These areas, the most significant of which is Quebec, have been described as slow-growth areas. The third general group may be included in the description of those affected by a slowdown that extends all across Canada and is in response to policies, both business and government, and fiscal and monetary restraints. What is happening now is that these three segments, each of substantial significance, have gone on a strong downward trend all at the same time. Whether this could have been foreseen is not of much help in meeting the problem as it exists, although I belong to the group with the 20-20 hindsight that says we had ample warning.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Harries: What is the government doing? What suggestions can be made with respect to the problems of technological adjustment? I suggest that this government is pursuing good policies enthusiastically and with vigour. In my view, the technologically unemployed bear an unfair and unreasonable share of the cost of our affluent society. I hope the government will continue to do as it recently did, announce that more funds will be poured into retraining and into those programs which are directed specifically to meeting the needs of those who bear, as I have suggested, a completely unreasonable share of the burden of change in our society. In Edmonton alone, last year the government spent $2,880,000 on retraining and $3,305,000 on allowances incidental to this retraining.

• (9:00 p.m.)

With respect to the slow-growth areas, the government has recognized that federal investment alone cannot do the job. It is clearly folly to spend capital funds on projects which do not provoke revenue and can only result in the imposition of large annual service charges. Employment arising from expenditure of this type is economically cannibalistic. At the same time, capital contributions to private industry are not the answer, per se, to rising employment opportunities. Let us face the facts. The industrial projects undertaken by the Department of Regional Economic Expansion amount to a pretty mixed bag. Payments to build a cattle-feed lot in Alberta can by no stretch of the imagination be justified economically. On the other hand, assistance to develop new technology in the building industry could have a profound effect throughout the country and is the kind of investment which should be undertaken.

I would not want to be unfair to a new department which has an important and difficult job to do, but I suggest that capital funds, even when made available in co-operation with industry, are not likely to be the answer in the long term. Quite clearly, they are not the answer in the immediate future. More attention should be given, now, to encouraging competitive production through payment, if necessary, on a cash basis for specific production inputs. For example, there is presently a strong world market for ships. We have steel, we have men, we have yards. Surely we do not need to wait upon the Japanese, the Germans or the British to show us how to put these things together into tankers and cargo ships. There is no need for us to design the wheel, but what we need is some enthusiasm and some push. We as Canadians have an odd outlook which seems to demand that government be the only customer for major capital goods if government is providing some of the money. This is self-defeating paternalism which I hope we can cast off.

Lastly, on the matter of the general economic slowdown, it is clear that government policy has been workmanlike if, at the same time, unimaginative. Indeed, if the government can be criticized for its monetary fiscal policy it can be argued it has been too often persuaded by the plodding arguments of the opposition. The conventional wisdom respecting the position of the central bank, the budget and specific tax items is hard to ignore, but I for one hope we shall not have to wait too long before specific taxes are recognized not only as productive revenue sources but also as a key factor in economic policy. I see no reason, for example, to continue to impose the federal sales tax on building products.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Harries: Similarly, this tax applies to a number of other quasi-capital items. Surely at a time when we are looking for specific developments we can use or, if you wish, manipulate this kind of tax to the benefit of the

economy. There may be sections in which specific taxes could be used to great advantage and I hope the government will consider the possibility, not only of using monetary fiscal policy but of being a little innovative in its approach to specific needs where we possess the technology and where what is required is some incentive of a kind which the government could rapidly and, I believe economically provide.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, I want to take five or six minutes in which to discuss the unemployment problem in Canada generally and in my own province in particular, as a representative from the east coast. I suppose it would be a waste of time for me to repeat the statistics which have been quoted, to deal with inflation and the government's attempts to combat it or the ill-effects of mounting unemployment in various parts of Canada, particular in urban environments.

I have listened carefully to the observations of the leaders in the House of Commons today and have been impressed by their ability to present their case and advance positive suggestions for easing the unemployment burden. I was most impressed by the remarks of my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), his questioning of the present incidence of taxation and his speculation as to whether relieving the tax burden might not stimulate the economy to a tremendous extent. I think his contribution was most reasonable and rational.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lundrigan: It is difficult for me to convince Members of the House of Commons and, it seems, Canadians generally of the particular seriousness of the unemployment problem in my part of the country. Newfoundland is a small province with only half a million people, and we live a long distance from the centre of activity. For many years Members of Parliament from my province have been bemoaning the fact that severe crises have been brought on by heavy unemployment. I will be reasonable; I do not think the unemployment in my province is entirely the responsibility of the federal government.

Recently events have taken place in the province of Quebec which have driven home the fact that there is a serious social and economic crisis in that province. In recent weeks I have heard members of this House rise in this chamber day after day and argue, with insistence, that Quebec needs particular help in its economic and social problems. Although these, I suppose, have been developing since 1760, suddenly people have become very concerned about the serious crisis in Quebec. I agree there is a crisis in Quebec; but need the people of Canada hear about that kind of revolution and social unrest in my own province before they are convinced that we, too, face a serious economic problem?

[Mr. Harries.]

• (9:10 p.m.)

In a rational way we have been trying to show the Canadian people, and not only in the most sophisticated manner, that we on the east coast of Canada sometimes wonder about this just society, about confederation and the benefits we have received from this great union of Canada. Certainly unemployed Canadians are asking themselves this question. We are concerned because today there is in Canada 6.7 per cent unemployment, with a forecast high of 9 per cent. I believe in February of 1962 there was a 9 per cent unemployment situation in Canada. Using the same model, we are forecasting 9, perhaps 10 per cent at the end of this year or at the beginning of 1971.

How many Canadians fully realize that last year the Dominion Bureau of Statistics admitted that in February there was 15.3 per cent unemployment in my province? Not only that, but unemployment statistics do not truly reflect unemployment in the nation. There is an old expression that statistics can lie. They do not lie intentionally. Those who draw up these statistics are researchers, scientists—reasonable people all. However, the basis upon which they arrive at an assessment of unemployment is inadequate. For example, I could prove that when the Dominion Bureau of Statistics talked last year of 15.3 per cent unemployment, we had in our province perhaps 22 per cent. I further predict that we will reach the point between now and the spring of 1971 where one quarter of our people will be unemployed. Even during the great depression years in North America the unemployment rate was never as high as it is in the province of Newfoundland.

I am not a bit concerned whether the rate is actual or adjusted. How many unemployed Canadians worry over this distinction? What a lot of gobbledygook for us to debate in this House day after day! The unemployment situation is reaching critical proportions. As the Leader of the Opposition has stated, it is no longer a regional problem. For the last two decades the people of Newfoundland have had to leave the province and travel to Toronto in order to take advantage of the seasonal employment situation. As a result, they became skilled in various construction trades. They adapted themselves to urban Toronto life, a difficult adjustment to make. They also made a contribution. Their contribution was a great one because many Newfoundlanders distinguished themselves in the construction trades in various parts of urban Canada. Many of them returned to the province to take advantage of construction opportunities in recent years in my province. Nowadays most of these Newfoundlanders who went to Toronto are part of the breadlines that now form up in that great city. A serious unemployment situation in Canada as a whole affects every region of the country. The unemployment problem in Toronto is having a debilitating effect on the employment situation in the province of Newfoundland.

I should have liked the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand) or his Parliamentary Secretary to hear what I have to say now, but I see neither is in his seat. I trust that someone will bring my remarks to

the minister's attention. During the last two years a program has been developing in Newfoundland called the DREE program. That is not its real name; it is a compounding of the initials of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. The aim of the program is to bring about a change within 20 to 25 years from a rural economy to an urban economy, with 50 or 60 communities in Newfoundland instead of the thousand we presently have.

The basis for this regional development philosophy was the provision of an infrastructure, a word somebody dug up from somewhere which sums up the provision of public services, things like roads, water and sewer systems, schools, industrial parks and the like. The aim was to create an industrial economy in the province of Newfoundland, in the province of Prince Edward Island, in Nova Scotia and in that province which recently went through a period of political renaissance, New Brunswick. Although we have been made aware of this theory of regional development, the problem is that the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council in the last couple of days has taken very serious issue with the regional development philosophy, mainly because the department is de-emphasizing and overlooking the resource base of the provinces right across the nation.

Let me point out why I raise this point. In my province a fishing industry still survives, despite the downgrading over the years of the role of the fisheries. We feel that the Department of Regional Economic Expansion should seriously consider an input of funds to upgrade the fisheries in the province. For example, we feel that in addition to improving marketing, transportation, conservation and resource management and dealing with the problem of overfishing, which my colleague from St. John's West (Mr. Carter) will raise in a few minutes, we should have more sophisticated fishing facilities, bigger boats, better technology and more research in oceanography.

I admit, Mr. Speaker, that for me to suggest this evening that this policy should be revised would not be realistic. Nevertheless, I feel the government would make an excellent beginning by loosening-up its spending in order to provide efficient facilities and alleviate the unemployment problem. I am not one of those Members of Parliament who believe that this kind of emergency measure should be regarded as a long-term solution. I agree with those who declare that this is a band-aid policy. However, I would rather see tens of thousands of my fellow countrymen this winter at least given the dignity of being employed, with the government providing facilities that might in the long run be the stimulus for the development of one of the basic resources in my province.

If the minister were here I would issue a challenge to him. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Laing) has been a tremendous discouragement to the province in recent years because of his disinterest in fishing facilities. The Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) is not in the House this evening, but he too should take a keener interest in this problem. These Canadians who occupy positions of eminence in the federal cabinet should heed my pleas. On behalf of 500,000 Newfoundlanders and my Maritime colleagues here, I plead for something to be done in the immediate future to alleviate the problem of unemployment, while at the same time providing worthwhile fishing facilities on the east coast. I am sure I would have the concurrence of all the members of the Atlantic provinces—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Lundrigan: —as well as the agreement of the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault), who this afternoon tried to justify the government's position, coming as he does from the affluent province of British Columbia which is now also suffering a serious unemployment situation, when I suggest that a new input of funds should be made to provide efficient fisheries facilities in the province. I am not talking of a new deck on every little wharf in every little cove, but of facilities which have been required for years. I could give both the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) a list of a dozen justifiable projects which require immediate action.

For example, since the spring of 1969 the Department of National Defence has been waiting to call for housing tenders in the town of Gander so it can move in personnel to the $17 million communications centre. The tender has not been called because a bunch of bureaucrats and civil servants in Ottawa do not understand what hardship, poverty and unemployment really mean. I should like all hon. members to stand in their places, even if it means extending the debate beyond ten o'clock, and express their ideas on how the government should act immediately to deal with the unemployment crisis. The situation is getting chronic, though in my province it has been chronic for years. It does not make us feel any better to know that other Canadians are now faced with the same situation. We feel that perhaps we can make other Canadians a little more aware of our problems in Newfoundland particularly and in eastern Canada generally.

• (9:20 p.m.)

I know that hon. members have gone back to their constituencies and talked about the problems in Quebec. The Quebec people are aware of these problems. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) will not tell us what proportion of federal government money is going into the province of Quebec. I know what proportion is going into that province. I do not intend to expose this fact because I do not want to create the impression that I am against the idea that the bulk of the $60 million announced recently will be spent in Quebec. I am not going to indicate the exact proportion, between $2 million and $3 million, of that amount which will be going into Newfoundland, but it is not enough to build a good breakwater.

This minister, along with others, stands and talks about the efforts being made on behalf of the unemployed in Canada. I hope Canadians realize that we, too, have a

problem in Newfoundland that is so chronic it is almost beyond description. This winter we will have a larger percentage of people unemployed in my province than the United States or Canada had during the great depression. Let us stop fooling around with great political jargon and speeches. Let us have action. I hope the Minister of Finance or some other dignitary will stand up tomorrow and announce an all-inclusive policy to deal with the problem of unemployment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Guy LeBlanc (Rimouski): Mr. Speaker, as several previous speakers, I also think it is time for action. It is through action that we will solve our problems and not through lengthy discussions.

However, as the old saying goes, since light comes from the exchange of ideas, and to bring my own contribution to the solution of those problems, it is my pleasure to express my opinion on this motion which relates to a most serious problem, as everyone says, namely that of unemployment. It is imperative to consider the measures taken by the government to help the unemployed and the poor as well as the new measures required.

About the general principle of the motion, when it is a matter of upward climb in the level of unemployment foreseen for this winter and steps to be taken to alleviate its consequences, we can only approve it. Indeed, we must congratulate the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis) for the opportunity given to us to discuss this serious problem.

The situation, specially in the Rimouski riding, which I have the honour to represent, and in the area of the Lower St. Lawrence and Gaspé, is not very rosy either. It is quite clear there is work to do in urban centres and in small towns, but in the so-called marginal municipalities there is a lot of unemployment. A great many citizens in these hamlets and villages, live mostly on government sponsored social measures, either federal or provincial. If we consider for instance certain figures, we see that in 1969 the monthly average was 16,437 unemployed in that region or 18 per cent of the labour force on the basis of the whole population. This is a very high rate of unemployment. For all Quebec the rate of unemployment was 6.9 per cent in 1969. This means that the rate of unemployment in our area is between two and three times higher than the provincial rate. Needless to say several families are in distress because of that unemployment. All of us want to do our utmost to solve this problem.

The motion states that according to certain economic experts, a record unemployment level is expected during winter. In the light of that essential action initiated to eliminate inflation, the government had foreseen those difficulties, but in my opinion the government must not solely be held responsible for the increased unemployment rate. Indeed, the various strikes by construction workers, post-office employees and other workers encouraged by union leaders, some of who are very good friends of the mover, have certainly contributed to create some uneasiness, especially by unbalancing our economy and discouraging enterprise, especially since summer is over and that winter will soon be here.

We are all in favour of immediate steps being taken, of having the federal government come to as early an understanding as possible with the provinces and the municipalities with a view to reducing the unemployment rate during next winter. This is our ardent wish. However, it does not suffice to settle the unemployment problem, we have to solve various other problems as well to insure our financial and economic stability.

One thing has struck me in the speech of the mover whom I consider very clever and very competent: he has again referred to the terrorism in the province of Quebec.

It seems to me that we should take some action in that area and that we should give more objective consideration to the problems in order to achieve progress.

If I am not mistaken, he said a moment ago that unemployment is no more no less than the cause of terrorism and that the unemployed are terrorists. If we consider those who have or apparently have taken part in terrorist activities and those who have been arrested, we find that they are far from being among the unemployed.

One is a teacher, another an editorial writer for a well known magazine, a third a sociologist, another a taxi driver, another a lawyer and yet another an important union leader. I do not think the latter is unemployed as I know what salaries are paid to union leaders with the contributions of those poor workers and unemployed.

• (9:30 p.m.)

Some CBC announcers or moderators are far from being unemployed people from the point of view of their income. Some professors of the University of Quebec or other universities are equally far from being unemployed. Some of those born with a silver spoon in their mouths, certain students who can study thanks to the effort of governments and to the money of their parents are far from being unemployed people and it seems to me that those who promote all those terrorist movements in Quebec do belong to a privileged class.

In spite of all that, it can be said that the government took very serious action in order to reduce the unemployment rate and to check poverty. Let us simply consider the measures about unemployment insurance. Moreover, the government is soon to improve the lot of unemployed persons through the implementation of the recommendations of the white paper on the subject. It is expected that higher allowances will soon be approved. The Unemployment Insurance Act will apply across the board and benefits will be increased.

Some efforts at least have been made in the field of regional economic expansion. Members from other provinces have been upbraiding the Minister of Regional

Economic Expansion (Mr. Marchand). The minister is one of those who knows the province of Quebec and is eager to help his fellow-citizens.

The legislation on designated and special areas supplies two most useful weapons to fight the scrouge of unemployment.

In my region of Rimouski, the lower St. Lawrence River and Gaspesia, we benefit, as does all Canada, by the acts fostering updating and vocational training.

For instance, if we consider that for the year 1968-69 this retraining program has cost $1,231,692 for the district of Rimouski alone and that a further amount of $1,450,-244 was paid on allowances incidental to this retraining; if we consider for the year 1969-70, the allowances paid to the 1,260 persons who took those courses amounted to $1,509,000 and the federal government contribution to composite schools, we can say that the government has done its share to help alleviate the unemployment situation. As for the proposed measures, I feel that the granting of tax credits should be one of the first short term measures the government might take to encourage private enterprise and, but the same token, to create jobs.

The new measures designed to improve the Unemployment Insurance Act should be applied as soon as possible. Furthermore, in this fight against inflation, it would be advisable to gear those measures to particular areas, because we are all aware that in Canada some areas suffer from unemployment on account of their situation. Then, care should be taken so that the people of these regions do not have to suffer too much from the war we have to wage against inflation.

As far as Quebec is concerned, long-term social animation and education work should be done among our youth in order to encourage those who have chosen scientific or technical careers to create jobs instead of relying on the government, once they have completed their studies and earned a little money. Let them be self-reliant, depend on their own efforts. This would greatly improve the manpower situation in Quebec, particularly when we think that in the last few years, according to my information, 75 per cent of students majored in arts, literature and human sciences. It is necessary and very useful but 75 per cent is surely too high a percentage because those students will later be unemployed.

Finally, I think that the fight against unemployment must be considered very seriously by the government. On behalf of my fellow-citizens, I ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) and the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) to take the necessary steps in the next few weeks to lessen the danger of economic deterioration this winter, that we might live with a certain amount of pleasure and have the satisfaction of working towards better living conditions for our fellow-citizens.

[*English*]

Mrs. Grace MacInnis (Vancouver-Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, as I listened this afternoon to the glowing words of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) in describing the government's anti-inflationary policy of these last months, I was reminded irresistibly of the famous medical bulletin "The operation was a great success, but the patient died."

An hon. Member: That is an old one.

Mrs. MacInnis: Yes, it is an old one, and so is unemployment. The fact is that while the Canadian patient is far from being dead, he is in a very critical state at this time in respect of unemployment, and the government's policy has contributed immeasurably to that state. The fact also remains that the government's own research people tell us that during this coming winter 700,000 people will be looking for work in Canada and that three million Canadians will face loss of income due to unemployment.

The minister quoted various experts to buttress his rosy opinions, but neglected to give us this quotation from the latest report of the Economic Council:

> We regard recent and current rates of unemployment as unacceptably high. Canada probably now has the highest rate of unemployment among the more industrialized, advanced nations, even after allowance for the differences for the basis of unemployment estimates.

He also neglected to give the opinion of the general public, the every day men and women, many of whom have experienced unemployment in a very direct way. A Gallup poll of November 7 asked this question:

> On the whole would you say the government is doing a good job, or not a good job of handling unemployment?

The following was the Canadian picture. Sixteen per cent said that the government was doing a good job of handling unemployment, 19 per cent said it was doing a fair job and 57 per cent said it was doing a poor job of handling unemployment. The highest level of disappointment was in the province of Quebec, where 63 per cent said the government has been doing a poor job. Quebec was closely followed by the west, where 60 per cent said the government had been doing a poor job.

We have heard a great deal about Quebec this afternoon. I shall say only a few words about it. What a tremendous job the Premier of that province is facing now in finding jobs. He promised 100,000 new jobs by the end of 1971. The Economic Council says that the total number of jobs created for Quebec in 1970 is 3,000; so he will have to provide 97,000 jobs in the coming year. Meanwhile, without federal assistance and federal programming neither the province of Quebec nor any other province will be able to cope with the unemployment problems they will face in the months immediately ahead because we are dealing with an immediate and urgent situation.

I agree with the member from Newfoundland who said he had no interest in talking about seasonally adjusted figures, because what we are dealing with is not figures but men and women and their families and the fact that

they face deprivation and frustration in the period immediately ahead. In the meantime misery, insecurity and frustration abound in Canada and particularly, as we have seen, in the province of Quebec. We have seen the climate of desperation that has been created there and what a haven for terrorists has been created by this general climate.

• (9:40 p.m.)

I say quite seriously that if you were to arrest every FLQ member in the province of Quebec tonight and were to apply capital punishment to them, there would be a fresh crop there tomorrow morning until and unless you get rid of the economic conditions which make it possible for these people to flourish. They flourish in an atmosphere of social insecurity and social despair. The fact that 38 per cent of all the unemployed in Canada in October of this year were living in the province of Quebec adds immeasurably to the dangers and troubles not only of that province but of all Canada.

Now I want to turn my attention to the other side of Canada, my own province of British Columbia. This morning's issue of the *Globe and Mail* reported a rash of lay-offs in the softwood plywood industry in B.C. That province manufactures practically all the softwood plywood in Canada. These lay-offs are being carried out by the five big plywood companies in B.C. Reference was made by one hon. member tonight to a certain industry being a key sector in his riding. Well, I say that the forest industry is the key sector in B.C. It is by far the biggest industry and it provides more help to other industries and services, more jobs and security for people, than any other industries in the province.

The lay-off situation which the *Globe and Mail* reported this morning is the latest blow in a whole series of unemployment disasters that have overtaken B.C. these last few months. We are deeply worried in the province, particularly when we see the forest and lumber industry being overtaken by unemployment. We are appalled by the refusal of the government to reconsider its policies and try to study ways and means of providing immediate employment. This would not deal with the situation in a large way but could provide help for a great many families this winter.

Let me give the House the B.C. unemployment figures very briefly. In September of 1969 there were 33,000 unemployed people in B.C. and in September of this year there were 58,000. In October a year ago there were 40,000 unemployed in B.C. and in October of this year 69,000 were unemployed. Even those tragic figures do not tell the whole story. I am told that the unemployment figures do not include Indians. Evidently Indians are not considered persons when the unemployment figures are computed. I do not think women, either, are counted as persons because I know—reference was made to this matter by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis)—that when unemployment is bad there is much less chance for women to get jobs and a great many women, having tried in vain, stay home and give up in despair. This simply means that the standard of living in that family goes down, with all the unfortunate consequences for the family and the lack of opportunities for its children.

Some time ago the Economic Council told us that we in Canada could not tolerate a higher rate of unemployment than 3 per cent and still have an acceptable standard of living. We have almost 8 per cent unemployment in British Columbia today. We also have well over 100,000 people on welfare in that province. This means a great many things so far as a healthy situation in B.C. is concerned.

Taxes in Vancouver on ordinary family homes have gone up over 10 per cent every year for the past four years. They have increased in the past four years by nearly 50 per cent. What do the taxes go for in the city of Vancouver? The largest costs for the city of Vancouver are the police. The police union is suggesting an increase in pay, and already their costs constitute the largest single item in the city's operating budget at $10.5 million. The police commission is also asking for more policemen and more equipment. The total extra bill will be about $750,000. I want to say right now that increasing the number of policemen and their equipment will not do any more for B.C. to ensure law and order in that province than it will to do the same in the province of Quebec, if the economic situation is allowed to worsen.

Social assistance costs are another major item in the city of Vancouver's budget. They amount to about $7 million. This figure is four times what it was just four years ago, and it is going up. Even if the economic climate in 1971 improves, the city's share of social welfare costs will be much higher for the total year than they have been this year. The influx of young transients has added to the problem. I dealt with that matter earlier this year. The costs that were being added by the young transients—and even at that, the welfare department reports that less than 10 per cent of the assistance money is paid to people from out of town—have added to the problem still further.

I point out that a serious situation is being faced by Canada's third largest city, when over 100,000 people in the province are receiving welfare and when the welfare budget in the city of Vancouver has increased to four times what it was just four years ago. It is not surprising to find that the mayor of that city is longing to apply a similar measure to the War Measures Act, to divert attention from the fact that he is not dealing at all with the unemployment situation there.

I should now like to recapitulate some of the measures which we think should be taken. This afternoon the hon. member for York South spoke of the federal government calling together the provincial premiers with a view to seeing what could be done, not as a long-range measure but to get us through the winter. That is an eminently sensible suggestion and one with which I think the government would find it very hard to quarrel. The only point is that it must be done now, because very speedy action will have to be taken if people are not to suffer

desperately, not only in Vancouver and in B.C. but also in the Maritimes and in Quebec this winter.

Various methods and schemes have been suggested. Comments have been made that while the government says they are not going to have a winter works program, there might well be similar programs under another name. All the municipalities have projects that could be proceeded with, many of them in the winter months. In our province most of these projects could be carried out in the winter because the weather is not sufficiently severe to prevent work from being done in the wintertime. We have mentioned construction of schools, hospitals, sewage plants and other projects such as pollution clean-ups.

• (9:50 p.m.)

Let no one say we do not have the money for it. All hon. members within sound of my voice, and a lot of other people across the country know that if a catastrophe like war were to break out tomorrow, the money would be found, just as it has been on previous occasions. To hon. members who are slightly amused at the idea that we could do this in peacetime, I say we ought now to consider that we have a war of another kind on our hands—a war against social injustice, a war which unless we tackle it now will lead to the insurrection kind of war which has already erupted in one part of our country.

Mr. P. M. Mahoney (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, for those of us who were looking for ideas and inspiration this, in many respects, has been a rather unusual and unsatisfactory debate. The leader of the party that chose to introduce this particularly important resolution did not participate in the debate although all the known candidates to succeed him certainly did. On the other hand, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) did participate, although none of the known candidates to succeed him did. In both cases, however, the financial spokesmen of the two parties, the hon. member for Waterloo (Mr. Saltsman), and the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert), did not participate in the debate. It leaves one wondering just what the opposition expected from the debate. We have been left to deal with pretty well the same old generalities.

The most important and widespread criticism of government policies is that the degree of economic restraint imposed by fiscal and monetary policies, and the resulting increase in unemployment, are undesirable and unnecessary. The argument takes various forms, apart from those who contend that no purpose is served by restraints since there is nothing Canada can do to halt inflation generated largely from abroad. There are those who suggest that Canada can work its way out of inflation by vigorously expanded economic growth. This position has been taken by the Conservative and NDP spokesmen and it has also been taken by organized labour, particularly the Canadian Labour Congress. The Conservatives have suggested that voluntary guidelines are sufficient to prevent a renewal of inflation, the NDP has proposed price controls, while the CLC has advanced no alternatives.

While acknowledging the strong impact of inflation from abroad, the government has taken the position that much of the present momentum behind costs and prices has been domestically sustained. It has been argued that all nations must exert efforts to bring inflation under control. The fact that price increases in Canada have been substantially less than those in other nations appears to deny the argument that Canada can do little by herself to curb inflation. There are also those who have argued that inflation is a matter of no concern in Canada because the rate of domestic price increase has been running well below that of other countries. There appears to be an assumption, on the part of those who advance this contention, that the relatively better price performance in Canada is something that just happened rather than something that resulted from government policy.

The leader of the Conservative party has long advocated voluntary restraint as the only measure to bring inflation under control. But since the Prices and Incomes Commission launched its efforts in 1969 to promote such restraint, the Leader of the Opposition has contended that the government should have taken more initiative to promote guidelines and has accused it of failing to provide sufficient support for the commission. The only other alternative advanced by the Leader of the Opposition for dealing with the problem of inflation is the elimination of the sales tax on building materials, echoing belatedly a position taken earlier by the New Democratic Party.

The Conservative leader has provided no public support for a series of tax incentive measures proposed by the hon. member for Prince Edward-Hastings (Mr. Hees), which were aimed at rewarding those who hold down prices and increase productivity. Today would have been an excellent opportunity for him to endorse the hon. member's public proposals, should he have seen any merit in them. The main thrust of the Conservative position has been to attack government policies on the ground that they were deliberately aimed at restricting the growth of the economy. That, of course, is nonsense.

The NDP has strongly attacked the government's restraint policies. It has contended that there is little Canada can do to control inflation because most of it is imported from abroad. Various spokesmen have alternatively suggested the necessity of comprehensive price and income controls, despite the fact that such controls have largely been rejected by organized labour. There is considerable inconsistency between the NDP's contention that inflation is largely imported and, its advocacy of controls, since such controls would have little or no effect in curbing inflationary pressures exerted from abroad.

The government has taken the position that while it does not reject the possibility of government controls, it would be most reluctant to impose them except as a last resort because of the problems they would bring to the working of the market economy, including their impact upon the collective bargaining process. The leader of the

NDP has suggested that the anti-inflation fight in Canada is unnecessary because of the lower rate of price increases here compared with abroad. This, again, is a development that can only be attributed to the government's economic policies.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. It being ten o'clock p.m., it is my duty to inform the House that pursuant to Standing Order 58(11) the proceedings on the motion before the House are considered to have expired.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 40 deemed to have been moved.

FISHERIES—DEPLETION OF MARINE RESOURCES—DISCUSSIONS WITH SOVIET UNION

Mr. Walter C. Carter (St. John's West): Mr. Speaker, on November 10, as recorded at page 1048 of *Hansard*, I asked the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry (Mr. Davis) the following question:

> Can the minister say if he has succeeded in arranging talks with the Soviet Union concerning the depletion of our marine resources? If so, when will these meetings take place?

The minister replied that no meetings had been scheduled at least to that date, November 10. This came as quite a surprise to us because we were led to believe from a statement made by the minister, and reported in the St. John's *Daily News*, that efforts were being made by him to arrange some kind of meetings with the Soviet government with a view to arriving at some kind of management control and conservation of our marine resources. I am sure the House is aware that there is a very serious danger of depletion of the fishing resources in the territorial waters off the east coast of Canada. Scientists say, and the minister has gone on record as agreeing, that unless something is done in the next five to ten years to impose management control, the cod species could become a rare delicacy.

• (10:00 p.m.)

Mr. Bell: It is now.

Mr. Carter: The hon. member for Gander-Twillingate (Mr. Lundrigan) has raised this matter in the House on numerous occasions. We have urged the minister to get together with the member nations of ICNAF to agree upon some kind of management control. In the past ten years, despite improved methods the cod catch in Newfoundland has been reduced by 50 per cent. In the same period, from 1958 to 1968, the catch on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland increased by something like 700 per cent because of the increased capability of foreign

nationals. This, of course, is to the detriment of the fishermen of Newfoundland and all those on the east coast of Canada.

Some time ago we learned that the minister was meeting with the delegation from the Soviet Union to discuss conservation methods and management control on the west coast of Canada and we raised the question of why the conference should be confined to that area. The minister has since stated that he does intend to have similar talks with the Soviet Union concerning the east coast.

Mr. Speaker, tonight I ask what this minister and the government intend to do about the present situation on the east coast of Canada.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Carter: Our marine resources are being raped; they are being depleted to a frightening degree. In Newfoundland, while our catches are decreasing the catches of the Soviet Union, East Germany and other European countries are increasing. Mr. Speaker, I realize that I only have seven minutes in which to make my point, so perhaps right away I should ask the minister this question: What is going to happen to the east coast fisheries unless something is done by the government to bring an end to this rape and plunder?

I know the minister has only three minutes in which to reply, so I ask him to make the government's plans and intentions known. I hope he will tell us if he plans to talk to the Russians, to the East Germans and the other countries of the world that are plundering our east coast fisheries. When are these meetings to take place? Will there be representation from eastern Canada? As I asked earlier: When will these representations be made? The minister will probably say there will be a Law of the Sea conference in the near future. We contend that this conference will not take place for another five years, which may be too late as far as the east coast fisheries are concerned.

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. John's West (Mr. Carter) is correct in his understanding that we are endeavouring to talk with the Russians in a bilateral way—that is, Canada and the U.S.S.R. only—about common problems in the North Atlantic, problems in the fishing industry and in particular the problem of overfishing.

I spoke to the Russian delegation that visited Canada after several preliminaries on our part to discuss the situation on the west coast at which time I suggested such a meeting. I received some indication from them that they would be prepared to discuss this matter specifically with us. We will of course be following this up. As of this moment I do not have a reply from the Russians saying there will be such a meeting. However, we will continue to press for a meeting of this kind.

As the hon. member knows, there is a commission, made up of interested nations, that meets each year on the North Atlantic. The annual meeting of the North Atlantic Fisheries Commission is attended by the Russians, West Germans, Poles, Americans and ourselves. The last meeting was held in St. John's, Newfoundland, in June of this year. Each year all countries fishing in the North Atlantic meet to compare notes with regard to catch over the years and their estimates of the sustainable yield of the North Atlantic.

I have stated on several occasions that we are coming perilously close to the point of overfishing, the point at which the total catch can drop dramatically. All the nations I referred to are aware of this fact. There have been negotiations which have resulted in quotas being established, particularly at Georges Bank, off Nova Scotia. We have yet to establish an agreed sharing of a sustained yield operation in other areas, particularly off the Grand Banks. This is another objective of ours. We have this commission and are talking to the Russians in that forum. We have been carrying out, particularly on Georges Bank, an investigation of the herring resources, for example, with the United States and the U.S.S.R. We are meeting them there as well.

The hon. member is quite right that the resource is under serious pressure. The typical catch of an inshore fisherman today is half what it was ten years ago. The only bright aspect has been an increase in the price of his product, otherwise he would be in very bad shape indeed.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—NON-PAYMENT OF MINIMUM WAGE—DISCUSSION BY MINISTER OF TRANSPORT WITH PRESIDENT

Mr. David Orlikow (Winnipeg North): Mr. Speaker, Canadian National Railways, one of Canada's largest employers, is a Crown corporation; its assets are owned completely by the people of Canada. The CNR is managed by a board of directors who are quite properly independent of the government and parliament in their day-to-day operations of the company. I am sorry to say that in my opinion the officers of the CNR and the board of directors are rapidly giving the CNR the reputation, deserved, of being a cheap, chiselling company.

There has been specific legislation on the statute books of the province of Saskatchewan in the past few years. This says plainly that employers in the province are required to give employees who have worked for the company for five years, three weeks holiday with pay. The CNR is arguing in the province of Saskatchewan that its hotel employees are not entitled to this three weeks holiday with pay because it is a federal company and it does not, therefore, come under the jurisdiction of the province's labour laws.

• (10:10 p.m.)

In a number of provinces, including, Manitoba, Ontario and Alberta, where the CN has hotels, it has argued, since the federal Parliament enacted the $1.65 an hour minimum wage for employees coming under federal jurisdiction, that its hotel employees are not entitled to $1.65 an hour because the hotels are under provincial jurisdiction. I say that any private employer who advanced that kind of specious argument would be laughed out of any court in Canada and would receive the kind of condemnation which cheap, chiselling employers deserve. Yet this is precisely what the CNR is doing.

I raised this question on October 27 and again on November 10 after it had become clear from statements by the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) that the department intended to prosecute the CNR for failure to observe the federal minimum wage laws. I asked the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) if he would discuss with the board of Canadian National the desirability of their living up to the laws of Canada. The situation in which the Department of Justice, on behalf of the Department of Labour, prosecutes a Crown corporation is a ridiculous one. The Minister of Transport, whom I like very much, contented himself by saying that he could not comment on the case because the matter was before the courts.

Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in the minister's comments on the case publicly in parliament. What does interest me is that the Minister of Transport should discuss the matter with the officials of the CN. It is true they are independent. It is true we do not watch every single action they take. But it is also true that we are dealing with a Crown corporation whose president and directors are appointed by the government.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): And can be fired by the government.

Mr. Orlikow: And can be fired by the government.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): And should be.

Mr. Orlikow: I suggest to the Minister of Transport that he drop this false modesty and speak to the officials of the CN. I want to say to him and to the president of the CN that if this matter is still outstanding when the estimates of the company come before the Transport Committee, those officials will be spending an awful lot of time in Ottawa rather than in Montreal where they should be, conducting the affairs of the company.

Mr. André Ouellet (Parliamentary Secretary to Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my hon. friend from Quebec East (Mr. Duquet), who is unable to be here tonight, I should like to reply to the hon. member for Calgary North—

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): Winnipeg North.

Mr. Ouellet: —and say I appreciate the observations he has made. Obviously, I am not in a position to tell the House the whereabouts of the Minister of Transport and the various meetings he has. I should like to indicate to the hon. member, as previously stated by the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) in reply to a question asked on Tuesday, November 10, I believe it was, that this question is already before the courts and it would be improper for me at this time to make any statement about it. I think all hon. members will appreciate that under the circumstances this is the appropriate manner in which to reply to the point and I shall say nothing about the possible outcome of the proceedings. Obviously, the minister and his department will be watching very carefully the outcome of the proceedings.

I would also inform the hon. member that the Jasper Lodge case, which in fact is a test case, is scheduled to be heard by the Supreme Court of Alberta within three weeks, I believe at the beginning of December. Thus, I think we can expect an early decision on the application of the law and I hope that this very important issue will then be finalized.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10.19 p.m.

END OF VOLUME I